By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 12620. A bill for the relief of James B. Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12621. A bill for the relief of Lt. Robert J. Scanlon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 12622. A bill for the relief of Russell L. Chandler; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 12623. A bill for the relief of Julian G. Carr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

162. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the 21st Saipan Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Marianas Islands, relative to assignment of Peace Corps volunteer attorneys to assist the people of the municipality of Saipan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

163. Also, petition of the 21st Saipan Legislature, Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Saipan, Marianas Islands, relative to enactment of an official plebiscite for the people of the Marianas not later than June 30, 1972; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. Also, petition of the American Legion, Washington, D.C., relative to a resolution of the national executive committee assembled in St. Louis, Mo., commending Congress for granting educational benefits to veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

165. Also, petition of the Board of Supervisors, Santa Cruz County, Calif., relative to a resolution opposing taxation of income from municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

166. Also, petition of the City Council, Harrisonburg, Va., relative to taxation of State and local government obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

167. Also, petition of the Association of County Treasurers of California, Oroville, Calif., relative to retaining the tax-exempt status of State and local government bond issues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

168. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, York, Pa., relative to Charles A. Lindbergh; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—*Monday, July 7, 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:

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not upon thine own understanding. In all thy ways acknowledge Him and He shall direct thy paths. Proverbs 3:5 and 6.

Teach us, O Lord, in the coming crucial days not simply to acknowledge Thee, but in the depths of our nature to trust Thee for wisdom, for judgment, and for strength. Deliver us from the coldness of heart, the indolence of attitude, and the indifference of mind that shuts Thee out, or the busy-ness that will not let Thee in. As we move from this sacred interlude to take up our duties, preserve in us a sense of Thy pervading presence and the assurance of the quiet direction of Thy spirit in the work of this Chamber and in the affairs of the Nation.

Rekindle in all the people the flame of holy living and let the bright light of a glowing patriotism shine throughout the land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 2, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 1, 1969, the following reports of committees were submitted on July 3, 1969:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 1458. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association (Rept. No. 91-288).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 545. A bill to amend section 9 of the District of Columbia Bail Agency Act (Rept. No. 91-287); and

S. 2185. A bill to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324) (Rept. No. 91-289).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works, with amendments:

S. 1072. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, as amended, and title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended (Rept. No. 91-291).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 2546. An original bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-290).

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 1, 1969, the following report of a committee was submitted on July 7, 1969:

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2547. An original bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 (Rept. No. 91-292).

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar of unobjected to bills under rule VIII be waived.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING 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.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO INCLUDE PARENTS-IN-LAW IN THE DEFINITION OF DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 401 of title 37, United States Code, to include parents-in-law in the definition of dependents of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STREET READJUSTMENT ACT

A letter from the Assistant to the Commissioner, government of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Street Readjustment Act, and eliminate guarantee clauses in pavement construction contracts for streets in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings in shipments of printed matter from Japan to points in the Pacific, Department of Defense, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on improvements needed in Army supply management and stock fund activities in Korea, Department of the Army, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on savings attainable through improved application of the economic order principle in the procurement of military supplies, Department of Defense, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on opportunities for better service and economies through standardiza-

tion of pharmacy items and consolidation of bulk compounding facilities, Veterans' Administration, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, reporting, pursuant to law, on activities of the Office of the Government Comptroller of the Virgin Islands, fiscal years 1966 and 1967, Department of the Interior, dated June 30, 1969; to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law a report on the effectiveness and administration of the Wellfleet Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, South Wellfleet, Mass., Department of the Interior, Office of Economic Opportunity, dated June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED FEDERAL CORRECTIONAL CENTER AND FEDERAL PARKING FACILITY, CHICAGO, ILL.

A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a prospectus which proposes construction of a Federal Correctional Center and Federal Parking Facility at Chicago, Ill. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives, North Carolina General Assembly; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 11

"A House resolution withdrawing the concurrence of the North Carolina House of Representatives in a joint resolution memorializing Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the constitution of the United States relating to the apportionment of State legislatures;

"Whereas, a resolution was introduced in and passed by the House of Representatives during its 1965 Session, wherein the Senate concurred, which resolution was designated as 'Resolution 60', which resolution memorialized Congress to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Congress of the United States relating to the apportionment of state legislatures; and

"Whereas, certified copies of such 1965 resolution were transmitted to both houses of the United States Congress and to certain other federal officials as provided in such resolution; and

"Whereas, such resolution has not been acted upon by the United States Congress and is still pending before that body at the time of the passage of this resolution; and

"Whereas, at the time of the passage of this resolution the requisite number of states have not passed similar resolutions in order to require the call of a Constitutional Convention as provided by the Constitution of the United States; and

"Whereas, the North Carolina House of Representatives does desire to withdraw its concurrence in 'Resolution 60' referred to above; Now, therefore, be it resolved by the North Carolina House of Representatives:

"Section 1. That this House of Representatives does hereby withdraw its concurrence in a resolution adopted by the House of Representatives and Senate during the 1965 Session of the General Assembly of North Carolina, which resolution is designated as 'Resolution 60', which resolution was ratified on the 12th day of May, 1965, and does hereby declare that its action in this regard is rescinded, revoked and repealed as of the date of the passage of this resolution, and this House of Representatives does memorialize the Congress of the United States not to call a Constitutional Convention under present circumstances or until such time as the Congress of the United States has prescribed regulations relative to the call, agenda and conduct of such Convention and until members of the public and the legislative bodies of the various states of the United States have had an opportunity to consider such acts of the Congress in this regard.

"Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is hereby directed to transmit certified copies of this Resolution immediately to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress, to all members of Congress, to the President of the United States and to the presiding officers of the legislatures of the other forty-nine states.

"Sec. 3. This Resolution shall become effective upon its adoption.

"EARL W. VAUGHAN,
"Speaker, North Carolina House of Representatives, 1969.

"Attest:

"THAD EURE,
"Secretary of State, State of North Carolina."

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, urging that Peace Corps volunteer attorneys continue to be assigned to assist the people of the Municipality of Saipan; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, praying for the enactment of an official plebiscite for the people of the Marianas; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Cruz, Calif., remonstrating against legislation that would deprive State and local government obligations of their traditional immunity from Federal taxation; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Association of County Treasurers of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to strengthen State and local governments by assisting local government to meet the ever increasing operating costs; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 2068. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 to permit employer contributions to trust funds to provide employees, their families, and dependents with scholarships for study at educational institutions or the establishment of child-care centers for preschool and school-age dependents of employees (Rept. No. 91-293).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

William F. Buckley, Jr., of Connecticut, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information;

John A. Calhoun, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Tunisia;

Joseph J. Jova, of Florida, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative on the Council of the Organization of American States, with the rank of Ambassador;

Ridgway B. Knight, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Portugal;

David D. Newsom, of California, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Joseph Palmer 2d, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Kingdom of Libya;

John C. Pritzlaff, Jr., of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Malta;

Luther I. Replogle, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Iceland;

John Richardson, Jr., of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of State;

Kenneth Rush, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary to the Federal Republic of Germany;

Adolph W. Schmidt, of Pennsylvania, to be Ambassador Extraordinary to Canada;

John R. Stevenson, of New York, to be Legal Adviser of the Department of State;

J. Fife Symington, Jr., of Maryland, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Trinidad and Tobago;

Terence A. Todman, of the Virgin Islands, a Foreign Service officer of class 2, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic of Chad;

Philip H. Trezise, of Michigan, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be an Assistant Secretary of State; and

Samuel Z. Westerfield, Jr., of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to Liberia.

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

W. Byron Sorrell, of Maryland, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 2548. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and improve the food service programs provided for children under such Acts; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The remarks of Mr. TALMADGE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 2549. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 2550. A bill to require that State programs approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act make the aid available thereunder to children in need thereof because of the unemployment of their father; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. DOMINICK when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2551. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to civil service retirement credit for employees injured in

line of duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON):

S. 2552. A bill to amend the Act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2553. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Cerrato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. CHURCH, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 2554. A bill to provide certain services for Government employees in order to assist them in preparing for retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(The remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2555. A bill for the relief of Renato Geliza Ramil;

S. 2556. A bill for the relief of Chung Ja Nohara;

S. 2557. A bill for the relief of Erminia Ancheta Mandac; and

S. 2558. A bill for the relief of Manuel Paris Guerrero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOYA:

S. 2559. A bill to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the transportation in U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargoes related to the activities of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. MONTOYA when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. PERCY (by request):

S. 2560. A bill to authorize additional appropriations to the Small Business Administration for economic opportunity management assistance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. DOMINICK):

S.J. Res. 131. Joint resolution to welcome to the United States all Olympic athletes and authorized Olympic delegations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(The remarks of Mr. MURPHY when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

S.J. Res. 132. A joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the period beginning August 3, 1969, and ending August 10, 1969, as "National Shorthand and Stenotype Reporters Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. BROOKE when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 2548—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO STRENGTHEN AND IMPROVE THE FOOD SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR CHILDREN

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, recent efforts to combat hunger and malnutrition in this country have been quite gratifying. The Senate Committee on Agriculture's action in reporting to the floor a bill for the comprehensive revision of the food-stamp program is illustrative of a new sense of commitment on the part of the Congress—a commitment to stamp out hunger and malnutrition in this Nation of great agricultural abundance.

The committee markup shows that many of us are determined to do something now to provide adequate nutrition for the hungry of the Nation. I am extremely pleased that the major parts of my own food-stamp bill have been incorporated in our committee bill. However, we cannot allow ourselves to become complacent and self-satisfied. We must not delude ourselves into thinking that the enactment of a comprehensive food-stamp law will completely solve the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

Throughout my examination of the problem, I have felt that our efforts should be directed toward seeing that hungry children receive the proper diet.

In far too many cases, lack of adequate food has already left its mark on poverty-stricken adults. An improper diet in the formative years has resulted in mental retardation and habitual lack of energy and initiative in an unknown segment of our adult population. The most tragic aspect of this problem is that many of these deprived adults are producing offspring who must endure the same unfortunate cycle of poverty.

We must break this cycle. We must do everything within the power of the Government to see that all the children of this Nation are given adequate nutrition.

Of course, a major instrument for achieving this objective can be the food-stamp program. Hopefully, expansion of the food-stamp program will provide improved nutrition for the majority of deprived children of the Nation.

We are deluding ourselves, however, if we think that the food-stamp program can, by itself, provide sufficient nutrition for all children who are not now receiving an adequate diet.

Although a liberalization of the food-stamp program will bring millions of additional families into the program, there are many families who will never participate. Many needy families will have too much pride to ask for any form of public assistance—including food stamps.

Many families—those in the upper limits of eligibility—will feel that the bonus to be gained by participation in the food-stamp program is not enough to warrant the trouble.

Furthermore, we must face the harsh fact that in a small minority of cases, mothers are too ignorant, too lazy, or too callous to prepare adequate food for their children, even where such food is available.

Therefore, I believe that we must enact legislation which will insure that appetizing, nutritious school lunches are available to all deprived children.

We must use food as a tool of education. A child cannot learn if he is hungry. It has been the experience of school administrators in economically deprived areas that there is a marked improvement in school attendance when children can look forward to the prospect of a good meal at school.

During my tour of the school lunch program of Georgia in April, I was made aware of the importance of food as an educational device. While in Macon, Ga., I visited a school in which a very successful breakfast program was operating. The teachers of that school were extremely pleased with the program, for they had found that children who had taken advantage of this breakfast program were much more apt pupils and were less of a discipline problem. The principal of the school told me:

> Before we got the breakfast program, we could not teach some of these kids anything until after lunch. Now they are eager to learn throughout the day.

I am delighted that the public conscience has awakened in many areas to the need to insure that no hungry child should go without a school lunch. In both Macon and Atlanta, of my own State, and in other areas, ambitious service organizations, working with news media, have been able to raise thousands of dollars to provide free lunches for needy kids.

However, I do not believe that a Nation as wealthy as ours can afford to rely on sporadic efforts of good will to provide adequate nutrition for our greatest resource, our children.

As I toured Georgia's school lunch programs—both urban and rural—I was taken by the incongruity of hungry children in a Nation with so much wealth, so much agricultural abundance as ours. I do not believe that anyone who has stood as I have stood in Alexander II Elementary School, in Macon, Ga., and watched eager little children file in to eat their breakfast with obvious enjoyment, can feel that we should not spend more for the nutrition of our children.

As I made a thorough study of this problem—by a tour of my own State and by reading data and testimony from other States—I was surprised and shocked by the great unmet need for additional funding and services in our school lunch programs. I think most middle-class Americans assume that every child who is in need gets a free lunch through the school lunch program.

Nothing could be further from the truth. By the most conservative estimates, the odds are 3 to 1 against the needy child getting his free lunch. According to an Elementary and Secondary Education Act statistical study, there are 6 million school-age children in this country who belong to families in the lowest poverty level—families earning less than $2,000 a year and/or are receiving aid to families with dependent children. But fewer than 2 million children receive free or reduced-price lunches under the national school lunch program.

Make no mistake—the national school lunch program has been a wonderful instrument for good. It has provided badly needed nutrition for millions of hungry American children. This program, enacted into law in 1946, stands as a great legislative achievement of two of our most beloved colleagues, Senator RUSSELL and Senator ELLENDER.

The whole Nation has been richer because of the foresight displayed by these gentlemen back in 1946.

However, there has been a great deal of change since the late 1940's. Although originally there were sufficient funds to pay the maximum allowable reimburse-

ment rate of 9 cents per lunch, the average cash reimbursement nationally is now only 4½ cents per lunch.

There have been many additions and improvements made to the School Lunch Act since 1946, but they have not been adequate. We have come to realize that a special effort must be made to provide assistance to low-income schools. The special assistance section added to the School Lunch Act in 1962 has greatly increased funding for free and reduced-price lunches served to the needy.

The passage of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 provided for pilot breakfast programs and other improvements in child nutrition. Other programs, such as the special milk program, utilization of section 32 surplus foods, and funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—all of these have improved the school lunch programs and child nutrition.

While all of these programs have made a difference, they have not provided a comprehensive solution to the problem. They have not solved the problem for a number of reasons. However, the primary shortcoming of all of these programs is a shortage of funding.

During my study and analysis of the different child feeding programs over the past two months, I have also realized that there is a great need for revision of the laws which have set up the child feeding programs. In all too many cases, funds now appropriated do not go to children who need help the most.

In many cases where free or reduced-price lunches are available, the embarrassment with which the programs are administered prevents the full utilization of school lunches by children in bad need of adequate nutrition.

In many schools, such as those in Boston, Mass., there are no facilities for the preparation of hot lunches.

In some areas of the country, there is no desire to participate in the school lunch program, for it is thought that adequate child feeding is not a responsibility of public education. For example, Los Angeles, a city of almost 3 million people, does not participate in the school lunch program.

In other areas where there is participation in the school lunch program, the price of lunches is pegged so high that children of low-income families do not participate.

With these facts in mind, I am today introducing legislation to expand and improve school lunch services throughout the country.

My proposed legislation would:

First. Provide for increased funding.

Second. Allow advance planning by authorizing the appropriations of funds a year in advance.

Third. Insure that the funds appropriated reach the children who need it most.

Fourth. Provide that there would be no overt identification of children receiving free or reduced-price meals.

Fifth. Where there is no equipment for the preparation of food, my bill would provide additional funding to purchase the necessary equipment.

Sixth. Where these facilities and equipment cannot be installed immediately, my bill would allow the utilization of private food services for purposes of providing nutrition for schoolchildren.

Seventh. The bill would require greater State participation in the funding of the school lunch program. It would insure that the States would pay part of the cost of child nutrition out of general revenue.

Eighth. The bill will make available additional money for the payment of operating expenses in needy schools.

Ninth. My bill provides for special development projects to experiment in new methods of improving food service for children.

Tenth. The bill provides for elimination of a discriminatory aspect of the present law in regard to payment of State administrative expenses.

Eleventh. I provide for the employment of experts specially trained in child nutrition for assistance on the State and local level.

Twelfth. In order to assist State educational agencies in carrying out the purpose of child feeding acts, my bill would provide the Secretary of Agriculture with funds for research surveys and demonstration projects in the field of school food service and for the dissemination of information obtained from these research programs.

Thirteenth. In order to encourage continued improvement and innovation in our child feeding programs, I would establish a National Advisory Council on Child Nutrition.

Last April, I toured school lunchrooms of my State to investigate the breakfast and lunch programs. At that time I made a commitment to not only my people of Georgia, but of the entire Nation. I promised that I would introduce legislation in an effort to insure that no child who came to school hungry would go home hungry.

The legislation I introduced today indicates my readiness to fulfill this commitment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2548) to amend the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 to strengthen and improve the food service programs provided for children under such acts introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, my bill would improve child feeding programs by making 13 important changes.

PROVISIONS FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDING

My bill provides $38 million for the purchase of food service equipment in fiscal year 1970. As the equipment need is met, funding would be decreased to the level of $10 million per year.

I would provide for funding of $200 million for special assistance to needy children in fiscal year 1970. This amount would be increased to $250 million in fiscal year 1971, and $300 million in fiscal year 1972.

ADVANCE FUNDING

Under the present system school districts have great difficulty in planning for the oncoming school year. My bill authorized the appropriation of funds a year in advance of the beginning of the fiscal year in which the funds would become available to the States.

PROPER UTILIZATION OF FUNDS

Under present law a needy child is benefited by special assistance funds only if he happens to attend a school designated as a "special assistance school." My bill requires that special assistance funds follow the needy child. Under my plan these funds would be available to needy children regardless of the school they attend.

OVERT IDENTIFICATION

Due to embarrassing and insensitive administration of the school lunch program by some school officials, needy children in some schools refuse to take advantage of free lunches. My bill would insure that there would be no overt identification of children receiving free or reduced-price lunches.

EQUIPMENT ASSISTANCE

In many areas school systems have no facilities or equipment for the preparation of school lunches. To meet the urgent need in this area, my bill would provide $38 million for equipment funding during 1970. This sum would be reduced as the need is met. It would be $33 million in 1971; $15 million in 1972; and $10 million every year thereafter.

UTILIZATION OF PRIVATE FOOD SERVICES

Where the school system is unwilling or unable to obtain the necessary facilities and equipment immediately, my bill would provide that private food services could be utilized.

GREATER STATE PARTICIPATION

At present, the States match each dollar of Federal money with $3 of State money. However, there is no requirement that any part of the State money be obtained from State revenue sources. The $3 matching requirement may be met solely from revenue obtained from child and adult payments for school lunches. My bill would provide a new matching formula of $1 of State money for every $1 of Federal money. However, the States would be required to meet a percentage of their matching funds from State revenue sources. Initially, States will be required to obtain 10 percent of the matching requirement from State sources, and eventually this matching requirement will be raised to 50 percent.

OPERATING EXPENSES

For needy schools, my bill would provide for additional Federal assistance in the payment of operating expenses. It would allow the USDA to pay up to 80 percent of the operating cost of the feeding program, including the cost of obtaining, preparing and serving food.

SPECIAL DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

There is a need for innovation and for improvement of child feeding programs. The bill would provide for special development projects which would experiment in the utilization of special fabricated food items, attractive packaging, and new delivery systems.

STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Present law restricts the States in utilization of funds for administrative expenses. My bill would eliminate the discriminatory aspect of the present law

which differentiates among States purely on organizational differences.

CHILD NUTRITION EXPERTS

There is a need for personnel specially trained and educated in matters related to the diet and nutrition of children. My bill allows the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the number of personnel needed and to make money available for their employment.

RESEARCH AND TRAINING

There is a need to encourage additional research and surveys in the area of school food service. My bill allows the Secretary to make funds available to State educational agencies for this purpose.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON CHILD NUTRITION

There is a need for continued examination of our child feeding programs. The need is great for elimination of overlapping and for coordination of the various feeding programs. It shall be the function of this council to make continuous studies and to recommend substantive changes in the child nutrition programs.

S. 2549—INTRODUCTION OF MEDICAL LIBRARY AND HEALTH COMMUNICATIONS ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, legislation to improve and extend those provisions of the Public Health Service Act authorizing assistance to medical libraries and related facilities. This bill—the Medical Library and Health Communications Assistance Amendments of 1969—would extend and expand an essential national program for improving communications throughout the health field.

There is a vital need to assist the orderly growth of our country's health communication resources. Biomedical libraries constitute a fundamental "knowledge bank" for our national health effort in patient care, biomedical research, and professional education. When the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 was passed, Congress recognized that the massive growth of biomedical knowledge had wholly outstripped our facilities for collecting and disseminating information in the health sciences. At that time American medical libraries, to which all other biomedical communications media must relate, were in a deplorable condition—inadequately housed, equipped, and staffed.

Under the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, a total of $95 million for fiscal years 1966–70 was authorized for the seven programs funded under this legislation. But a total of only $34 million has been appropriated through fiscal year 1969 for these seven programs, not half of the money Congress authorized.

Grants totaling $11.2 million have been awarded to assist the construction of 11 health libraries in educational institutions throughout the country.

For the purpose of increasing and organizing the health library resources of the Nation, 392 resource grants totaling over $11 million will have been awarded by the close of fiscal year 1970 for improved and expanded services in health libraries.

During the same period, nine regional library awards totaling $5 million will have been made, thus organizing health information services under regional cooperative arrangements designed to utilize available resources more effectively.

To expedite access, availability, and utility of health information through research and development, 64 projects, totaling some $5.9 million, will have been supported. In addition, 67 awards have been made, totaling $2.9 million for 29 projects, to prepare, synthesize, and distribute secondary literature resources in a wide spectrum of the health sciences.

In 1965, there were less than 3,000 trained medical librarians. With just under $4.5 million appropriated under the Medical Library Assistance Act, some 20 graduate and postgraduate training programs have been initiated, and 309 persons will have received training through 1970. These programs have gone beyond traditional training in their orientation to innovative technology to serve information processing. To present legislation has brought to the attention of health leaders the potential contribution well-organized biomedical communications has for more effective use of scarce manpower resources.

The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 has made a good beginning toward the solution of health information problems. However, I am impressed by the magnitude of the problems which remain.

At the present time we need 5,000 trained medical librarians and other health communication specialists. Less than 20 percent of the 7,200 accredited hospitals in the United States have library facilities that are in any way adequate for their needs.

Without continued and expanded support through the Medical Library Assistance Act, our health information problems will only grow worse. On the basis of current progress and future plans, it is estimated that over 10,000 physicians will graduate from medical school in 1975, an increase of one-third over the present time. Leaders in other health professions are also preparing for greatly expanded personal requirements in the coming decade. To meet the instructional requirements this expansion will impose, more educational leaders are turning to greater use of medical library resources, particularly to programed learning in specifically designed learning resource centers. It is hoped that this combination of bibliographic resources, technological apparatus, and educational research will make teaching of the future more effective and more responsive.

The extension of the Medical Library Assistance Act that I am introducing, while similar to the present act, incorporates several changes to take advantage of the experience and progress gained so far. This legislation would authorize a 5-year program with an increased authorization funding level from $21 million to $41 million per year, or $205 million over 5 years, a level commensurate with the need we must attempt to meet. Language changes are proposed to allow greater flexibility in administration and to permit more equitable and efficient utilization of funds.

The Medical Library and Health Communications Assistance Amendments of 1969 will not resolve all the needs and problems in health communications. They will, however, provide assistance where needed and stimulate the formulation and adaptation of new ideas and new concepts for making health information available.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill with a summary of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have a number of letters requesting this legislation, printed in the RECORD at this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary, and letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2549) to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2549

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Medical Library and Health Communications Assistance Amendments of 1969".

CLARIFYING AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

DECLARATION OF POLICY AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) (1) Clause (3) of subsection (b) of section 390 (42 U.S.C. 280(b)) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "the awarding of special fellowships to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists," and inserting in lieu thereof "grants to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health, and scientists, and public or nonprofit private institutions on behalf of such individuals,"; and

(2) Clause (5) of such subsection is amended by striking out "improving" and inserting in lieu thereof "establishing, improving,".

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

(b) (1) Subsection (b) (1) (B) of section 393 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–3) is amended by striking out "subject to subsection (c),".

(2) Section 393 of such Act is further amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof and redesignating subsections (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i) as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h), respectively.

ASSISTANCE TO SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS

(c) (1) The heading of section 395 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–5) is amended to read:

"ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS, AND FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCE AND RELATED FIELDS"

(2) The second sentence of section 395 of such Act is amended by striking out "Surgeon General for the establishment of special fellowships to be awarded to physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health and scientists" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary to make grants to

physicians and other practitioners in the sciences related to health, and scientists, and public or nonprofit private institutions on behalf of such individuals".

(3) The third sentence of such section is amended (A) by striking out "In establishing such fellowships, the Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "In making such grants, the Secretary"; and (B) by striking out "fellowships are established" and inserting in lieu thereof "grants are made".

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCE AND RELATED FIELDS

(d) Subsection (a) of section 396 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–6) is amended by striking out "research and investigations in the field of medical library science" and inserting in lieu thereof "research, investigations, and demonstrations in the field of medical library science".

GRANTS FOR IMPROVING AND EXPANDING THE BASIC RESOURCES OF MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND RELATED INSTRUMENTALITIES

(e)(1) The heading of section 397 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–7) is amended to read:

"GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHING, IMPROVING, AND EXPANDING THE BASIC RESOURCES OF MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND RELATED INSTRUMENTALITIES"

(2) The first sentence of subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "expanding" and inserting in lieu thereof "establishing, expanding,".

(3) Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In no case shall any grant under this section to a medical library or related instrumentality for any fiscal year exceed $200,000; and grants to such medical libraries or related instrumentalities shall be in such amounts as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe with a view to assuring adequate continuing financial support for such libraries or instrumentalities from other sources during and after the period for which Federal assistance is provided."

GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARIES

(f)(1) Subsection (b) of section 398 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–8) is amended by striking out "and" at the end of clause (4), by redesignating clause (5) as clause (6), and by inserting a new clause (5) to read as follows:

"(5) planning for services and activities under this section; and"

(2) Subsection (c)(1) of such section is amended by striking out "(A) to modify and increase their library resources so as to be able to provide supportive services to other libraries in the region as well as individual users of library services" and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) to modify and increase their library resources and to supplement the resources of cooperating libraries in the region so as to be able to provide adequate supportive services to all libraries in the region as well as to individual users of library services".

(3) Subsection (c)(2) of such section is amended by striking out clause (A) and redesignating clauses (B) and (C) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively.

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The Secretary may also carry out the purposes of this section through contracts as well as grants, and such contracts shall be subject to the same limitations as are provided in this section for grants."

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR BIOMEDICAL PUBLICATIONS

(g)(1) The second sentence of subsection (a) of section 399 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–9) is amended by striking out ", public or private nonprofit institutions of higher education and individual scientists" and inserting in lieu thereof "public or nonprofit private institutions and organizations, and individual scientists".

(2) Subsection (b) of such section is repealed.

(3) Subsection (c) of such section is redesignated as subsection (b).

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

EXTENSIONS OF DURATION

SEC. 3. (a) Section 399a of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–10) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 399a. Funds appropriated to carry out any of the purposes of this part for any fiscal year shall remain available for such purposes for the fiscal year immediately following the fiscal year for which they were appropriated. Funds appropriated under this part for grants for construction shall remain available until expended".

ASSISTANCE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES

(b) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, subsection (i) of section 393 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(i) For the purposes of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $20,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary".

GRANTS FOR TRAINING IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCES

(c) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, subsection (a) of section 394 of such Act is amended by striking out "In order to enable the Surgeon General to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such sums not to exceed $1,000,000, for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Surgeon General in making grants—" and inserting in lieu thereof "In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(2), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary. Sums made available under this section shall be utilized by the Secretary in making grants—".

ASSISTANCE FOR SPECIAL SCIENTIFIC PROJECTS

(d)(1) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, the first sentence of section 395 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(3), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary."

(2) The second sentence of such section is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT IN MEDICAL LIBRARY SCIENCE AND RELATED FIELDS

(e)(1) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 396 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(4), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $3,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary."

(2) The second sentence of subsection (a) of such section is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

GRANTS FOR IMPROVING AND EXPANDING THE BASIC RESOURCES OF MEDICAL LIBRARIES AND RELATED INSTRUMENTALITIES

(f)(1) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, subsection (a) of section 397 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(5), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $6,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary."

(2) Subsection (b) of section 397 of such Act is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

GRANTS FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF REGIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARIES

(g)(1) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 398 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(6), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $6,500,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary."

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (a) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR BIOMEDICAL PUBLICATIONS

(h)(1) Effective with respect to fiscal years ending after June 30, 1970, the first sentence of subsection (a) of section 399 of such Act is amended to read as follows: "In order to enable the Secretary to carry out the purposes of section 390(b)(7), there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and ending with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, such sums, not to exceed $2,000,000 for any fiscal year, as may be necessary".

(2) The second sentence of such subsection (a) is amended by striking out "Surgeon General" and inserting in lieu thereof "Secretary".

REDESIGNATIONS

SEC. 4 (a)(1) Title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by redesignating (A) part I as part J, (B) part II which has the heading "Part II—National Library of Medicine" as part I, and (C) sections 371 through 378 in such part as sections 381 through 388, respectively.

(2) Clause (2) of section 391 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–1) is amended by striking ous "section 373(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 383(a)".

(3)(A) Subsection (a) of section 392 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 280b–2) is amended (i) by striking out "373(a)" and inserting in lieu thereof "383(a)" and (ii) by striking out "373" and inserting in lieu thereof "383".

(B) Subsection (b) of such section 392 is amended by striking out "part II which deals with the National Library of Medicine" and inserting in lieu thereof "part I".

(b)(1) Section 395 of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately under "Sec. 395.".

(2) Section 396 of such Act is amended (A) by striking out the heading thereto, (B) by striking out "Sec. 396.", and (C) by re-

designating subsections (a) and (b) thereof as subsections (b) and (c), respectively.

(3) Sections 397, 398, 399, 399a, and 399b of such Act (and all references thereto) are redesignated as sections 396, 397, 398, 399, and 399a, respectively.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Sec. 5. Except as otherwise provided, the amendments made by the preceding provisions of this Act shall take effect July 1, 1970, and shall be effective with respect to grants and contracts made after June 30, 1970.

The summary and letters, presented by Mr. YARBOROUGH, are as follows:

SUMMARY OF MEDICAL LIBRARY AND HEALTH COMMUNICATIONS ASSISTANCE AMENDMENTS OF 1969

This bill would amend the Public Health Service Act to improve and extend the provisions relating to assistance to medical libraries and related instrumentalities. The Act is cited as the "Medical Library and Health Communications Assistance Amendments of 1969."

The bill proposes a five-year extension of these provisions of the Act (through fiscal year 1975); increases the maximum appropriation authorization from $21 million per year to $41 million per year; and makes a number of clarifying and technical amendments to facilitate its administration.

These amendments would allow the Secretary to make grants for special scientific projects to institutions on behalf of qualified individuals as well as to such individuals directly. They would consolidate similar authorities of this section (Section 395) and the research and development authorities of Section 396 and permit the use of funds for demonstration projects, as well as research and development of new techniques in medical library science and health communications.

Under grants for medical library resources (Section 397 of the Public Health Service Act), the proposal would continue the limitation of $200,000 for any single grant. However, it would permit the Secretary to prescribe by regulation the amount of the grant, in order to assure adequate, continued financial support from other sources during and after the period of Federal assistance. This would be in place of the present provision under which grant amounts are required to be reduced annually by a prescribed percentage of either the prior year's grant or the institution's annual operating budget.

The Act would also authorize planning grants and provide contracting authority with respect to regional medical libraries. In order to obviate any administrative difficulty caused by the wording of the law, the bill deletes a provision requiring the Secretary to give priority on the basis of "need" to applications for grants for regional medical libraries since by the same provision the Secretary is also required to base his main consideration in making grants on the potential of the grantee library in meeting "needs" for services.

The amendments would expand the categories of eligible recipients for biomedical publication projects to public or nonprofit institutions or organizations (now restricted to institutions of higher education) as well as to scientists and would extend the permissible grant period for publication support beyond the current three-year maximum to any such publication as the Secretary may determine will be advantageous to carry out the purposes of this Act.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, M. D. ANDERSON HOSPITAL AND TUMOR INSTITUTE,
Houston, Tex., May 1, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: A vital part of the progress in medicine is concerned with continuing and intimate contact with medical information by way of medical libraries in a given region. We are very concerned about the status of the Medical Library Assistance Act renewal legislation and the effect any further reductions in the funding would have upon this progress.

At my request, a member of our staff has prepared a review of the present status of programs funded through this legislation and specifically the benefits which have been derived from it in Texas. A copy of this review is forwarded for your information.

Sincerely yours,

R. LEE CLARK, M.D.
President.

REVIEW OF MEDICAL LIBRARY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The need for medical library assistance from the federal level was created largely by the heavy Public Health Service research grant funding beginning after World War II and continuing to the present. As more research money was made available, more requests for medical library materials and services were generated by the investigators. In addition, the published papers from the federally-funded research has resulted in an exponential increase in the amount of available medical and scientific information. Inadequately budgeted medical libraries could not acquire and organize this "flood" of material for use by the producer/consumer, i.e., the physician and the investigator.

The Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (PL 89-291) authorized the following amounts for each fiscal year of a 5-year period:

Construction	$10,000,000
Training	1,000,000
Special projects	500,000
Research	3,000,000
Resources	3,000,000
Regional Medical Libraries	2,500,000
Total	20,000,000

Since its enactment, all sections of the Act have been funded only to about half of the level authorized. In the two year period from 1966 through 1968, approximately $20,000,000 have been granted to medical libraries in the United States. This level of funding cannot close the gap created by the 20-odd years of research support before the Medical Library Assistance Act was written.

Funds for two sections of the Act have proven particularly inadequate: Construction, and Regional Medical Libraries.

Through June 30, 1968, only 8 grants for construction of medical libraries had been awarded. Most of the 90 older university medical schools maintain only over-crowded areas for their libraries. Many have resorted to heavy withdrawals of volumes or to storing volumes in areas unavailable for use. The advent of rapid, long-distance access to information via television and on-line computers is still more or less promissory. Undergraduate and postgraduate education in the biomedical sciences still relies primarily on printed materials to supplement laboratory and bed-side teaching. Approximately 30 approved medical library construction applications are now on file at the National Library of Medicine awaiting funding.

To date six Regional Medical Libraries have been approved. None has received funding to meet fully the minimum requirements of the Act itself, e.g., to supply free photocopy to all medical libraries in a given region and to all health science personnel requesting it. The Act requires a MEDLARS station in each official Region. None of these six Regional Libraries has received support for computer operation of the MEDLARS program. This results in unacceptable delays in the receipt of MEDLARS printouts by the local physician, while his request is processed in Bethesda at the National Library of Medicine.

Four applications for Regional Medical Libraries remain to be approved. All have been informed that their funding will be at the same low level as the six operating regions.

The local physician and the investigator are expected to provide a higher level of health care each year. Unless the Medical Library Assistance Act is renewed in 1970 and all its sections funded at the level authorized, the nation's basic biomedical information resource will become even more unable to supply the literature necessary to assist the health scientist in this achievement.

Institutions in Texas have received the following amounts under the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965:

Construction:	
The University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston, for construction of a new library	$1,598,406
Resources:	
The University of Texas Southwestern Medical School, Dallas	$39,577
The University of Texas Medical Branch, Galveston	39,808
The University of Texas Medical School, San Antonio	50,179
The University of Texas M.D. Anderson Hospital and Tumor Institute at Houston	36,520
The University of Texas Dental Branch, Houston	8,195
The University of Texas College of Pharmacy, Austin	3,949
University of Houston College of Pharmacy	7,204
Austin State Hospital, Austin	4,110
Baylor University, Dallas	11,940
Southwest Foundation for Research and Education, San Antonio	5,084
Total resources	206,566
Total	1,804,972

ST. LOUIS STATE HOSPITAL,
St. Louis, Mo., April 29, 1969.

Re Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965, category 6.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: This is to let you know of my personal interest and need for the continuing funding for the projects carried out under this act. I would find it possible to keep up with the printed material which comes out monthly in the areas for which I have responsibility in this hospital. I find it very important to receive selected articles in the fields of religion and mental health, group therapy, and community mental health.

To research for articles, collect the magazines, and keep up with the reading would be impossible. With the present program which regularly sends me excerpts of all of the articles in the fields for which I have responsibility, I find that I can just barely keep up with the necessary reading. Without this program I would fall hopelessly behind in my professional field. I urge you to support the continuing funding of these programs.

Sincerely,

JON WAGNER,
Chaplain-Counselor, Southwest Mental Health Center, St. Louis State Hospital Complex.

THE FRANCIS A. COUNTWAY LIBRARY OF MEDICINE,
Boston, Mass., May 14, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We medical librarians are conscious of the fact that re-

newal legislation for the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (PL 89-291) will be coming before Congress soon. We feel that renewal of the Act and, indeed, increased funding are essential to the continuing effective dissemination of biomedical information to health scientists in this country. I hope that I can give you some examples of how funds provided by the Medical Library Assistance Act have concretely benefited the health science community served by the Countway Library, namely, the health scientists of Harvard University, all physicians in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and as you will see later, all health scientists and practitioners in the six New England states.

The Countway Library has received funds from two parts of the Assistance Act: a Resources Grant and a Regional Library Grant. With Resources Grant funds we were able to strengthen our library resources and to make our resources more available to the health community in the following ways:

1. We mounted a project to merge and improve the records of periodical sets belonging to the Harvard Medical Library and the Boston Medical Library, the two institutions which came together in the Countway building in 1965. This unparalleled collection of biomedical periodicals is now, for the first time, in efficiently retrievable order on our shelves and is keyed to records which accurately describe our holdings.

2. We completed the programming effort necessary to produce a computer-printed list of health-related periodicals in the Countway Library from the above-mentioned records. This immensely valuable holdings list of Countway's 17,000 periodical titles has subsequently been made available to all health-science libraries in New England.

3. We hired an Oriental Language Cataloger to initiate a program of acquisition and cataloging of materials from mainland China and to catalog and process our valuable but unprocessed backlog of materials in the Chinese, Japanese, and Korean languages.

4. We hired a Slavic Language Cataloger to process a large and unique collection of Slavic materials and to keep up with our ongoing program of acquiring these materials.

5. We purchased backfiles of ninety periodical titles. These costly files were identified as the most urgently needed lacunae in the Library's collection through a study of requests from our health community.

None of these projects could have been completed or even begun in the context of the Library's regular sources of income.

The Countway Library was designated in 1967 as the country's first Regional Medical Library, serving the six New England states. This designation by the National Library of Medicine followed on a long tradition of library service to the general community by the two component parts of the Countway Library. The Regional Library Grant, however, provided funds for the first time to enable us to attack the problem of regional service in a creative and realistic way.

Our basic goal has been to equalize the opportunity for medical library services between the health science practitioner at a distance from a large medical center and his counterpart who, by accident of geography, works in or near such a center. The focus in this endeavor is the community hospital—the single agency which can act universally as a local learning center, center for continuing education, and center for library service.

To this end we have supported the development of a Core Medical Library for community hospitals, a basic minimum standard collection which is financially within reach of every hospital library in New England. (This list appeared in the *New England Journal of Medicine on* February 27, 1969, and is receiving wide acceptance). Consultation from the Countway Library to hospitals in the region has been made available to aid in the solution of a variety of library problems. An educational program, designed to teach untrained persons to become effective hospital library supervisors, has been initiated.

Communication channels have been optimized: a monthly *Newsletter* listing Countway acquisitions and news of interest in the region reaches 20,000 health scientists. Wide Area Telephone Service (WATS) and Teletypewriter Exchange (TWX) have removed the subtle communication barriers of long distance telephoning.

The Countway provides rapid loans of library materials needed in hospitals but not in their collections. Regional reference librarians ferret out answers to questions posed by health scientists in the region.

This program, made possible only through the Medical Library Assistance Act, has had a visible impact on the provision of medical library services in New England and, thereby, on efforts for the continuing education of health professionals.

We sincerely hope that you will agree with us as to the importance of these exciting programs and will lend your support to renewal legislation.

Sincerely,

HAROLD BLOOMQUIST,
Librarian.

MEDICAL SOCIETY OF THE COUNTY OF KINGS AND THE ACADEMY OF MEDICINE OF BROOKLYN, INC.,
Brooklyn, N.Y., June 5, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I am writing to urge your support of the Medical Library Assistance Act.

The Academy of Medicine of Brooklyn is the owner of one of the greatest complete medical libraries in the country. It is now housed at the Downstate Medical Center, State University of New York. Five full-time personnel are employed whose sole function is to handle interlibrary loans. We have been able to satisfy 87 percent of the requests sent in for material.

This function is extremely important both to medical education and medical research. It is a costly function and one which we could not continue without federal funds under the Medical Library Assistance Act.

We strongly urge your support of this legislation.

Sincerely yours,

MATTHEW BRODY, M.D.,
President.

UNIVERSITY OF LOS ANGELES,
Los Angeles, June 2, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We are writing to tell you how much the Medical Library Assistance Act has contributed to the programs of the UCLA Center for the Health Sciences and to urge that it be extended for at least three years, with higher appropriation authorizations. We have been most concerned to learn that the Administration has proposed only a one year extension in place of the five year extension we had confidently expected. Anything less than the three year extension proposed in HR 11223 is almost certain to prove wasteful because it would prevent adequate planning in terms of personnel, materiel and sound development of projects.

The Biomedical Library here, and through it the health sciences community it serves, has benefited directly from the Act's provisions for training, resources, research, and regional libraries.

Support for training has enabled us to continue and expand the medical library internship program begun as a pilot project funded by the National Institute of General Medical Sciences. Through this program four recent library school graduates, chosen on a national basis, spent a year at UCLA in a program combining further academic work in the biological sciences and other appropriate fields with rotating assignments in each department of the Biomedical Library. Graduates have gone out from this program to responsible positions in many parts of the country. Those who have elected to accept positions in our own library have added strength to it at a time when qualified personnel are in desperately short supply.

The Medical Library Resource Grant awarded three years ago to the Biomedical Library has enabled us to make substantial progress in reducing our cataloging backlog, in an extensive and much needed revision of the subject catalog, and in developing practical computerized procedures for processing materials and improving bibliographic access to them. A research grant recently approved, but not yet funded, will allow us to experiment with on-line access to computerized records.

Obviously the programs of our schools at UCLA are significantly improved by improved access to the health sciences record, but the effects go far beyond our own walls. The Biomedical Library, as a training center, influences students in the School of Library Service, local librarians and librarians visiting from many more distant areas. In line with University policy, the Library has long been a resource available to and widely used by the health sciences community of Southern California. Now, with its designation this month as the Pacific Southwest Regional Medical Library, under provision of the Medical Library Assistance Act, and in cooperation with the medical libraries of Arizona, California, Hawaii and Nevada, it is beginning the organization of a regional network with lines to the National Library of Medicine and other national and regional resources. The aim of this network will be directed to taking information to health professionals rather than passively waiting for them to find their way to it as has been necessary in the past.

The actual dollar amount spent thus far on implementing the Medical Library Assistance Act has not been great (less than half of the modest authorization allowed), but judging by what it has already done for our own library and the libraries in this area, the returns have been large. The job of establishing an adequate health sciences information service, however, has just begun. We strongly believe that completion of this task is essential to the ultimate success of the national effort in health research and health care.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN W. KNUTSON, D.D.S.,
Acting Dean, School of Dentistry.
SHERMAN M. MELLINKOFF, M.D.,
Dean, School of Medicine.
LOUISE DARLING,
Biomedical Librarian.
FRANK J. MASSEY, JR., M.D.,
Acting Dean, School of Public Health.
Miss AGNES A. O'LEARY,
Acting Dean, School of Nursing.
ROBERT VOSPER,
University Librarian.

NEW ENGLAND REGIONAL MEDICAL LIBRARY SERVICE,
June 3, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Renewal legislation for the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 (PL 89-291) will soon be coming before Congress.

I understand that the Librarian of the Countway Library has described to you in some detail the important activities we have been able to perform, and the services that we have been able to provide to New England medicine, as a result of funds received under PL 89-291.

As the Department Head charged with the responsibility of administering the Regional Service program, I have been made aware of the benefits that the Service has brought to health professionals. I think particularly of

those who live and work at some distance from urban centers and who have great difficulty securing the bibliographical material they need. If only for their sakes I urge your support for renewal legislation.

I am, Sir,

Sincerely yours,

T. MARK HODGES,
Director, NERMLS.

YALE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF NURSING,
New Haven, Conn., June 20, 1969.

Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Chairman, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Health, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. YARBOROUGH: For nurses and nursing librarians to urge renewal of the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 will be no surprise to discerning legislators, who know that improved library service is essential to the expansion of knowledge necessary to the improvement of health care in the United States. And for the nursing profession to plead for greater attention in the new legislation to *nurses'* needs for library service may also be thought inevitable.

You may be less prepared, however, for our expression of concern that the present legislation's provisions for funding regional medical libraries are being interpreted in some regions of the country in a manner that impedes the development of the best kind of library service for nursing and certain allied health professions. We believe that the law should be broadened to correct this situation.

Specifically, the National Library of Medicine has required that some regional medical libraries (e.g., in Boston and Philadelphia) rely on nursing collections in other institutions rather than build strong nursing collections in the central regional library itself. This refusal to fund central collections in all health fields encourages perpetuation of the present fragmentation and scattering of health literature collections. As a result, a nurse or other health worker in search of a comprehensive health library has no single place where her library needs can be met. It is not enough to coordinate mail service from a variety of back-up libraries, as is done at present. Strong centralized collections are needed in each region to serve visiting library users according to their special health interests.

We ask that divisions of the Medical Library Assistance Act of 1965 contain clear directives that, while existing library resources continue to share through cooperative arrangements in providing better health library service for all, positive steps be taken to build up one central, comprehensive health library collection in each region for the in-house use of visiting health scholars.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HENDERSEN,
Chairman, Advisory Committee on Library Resources for Nurses in the New England Region (ad hoc).

EMORY UNIVERSITY,
SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY.
Atlanta, June 5, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I would like to take this opportunity to provide you with information that may help you in your decisions pertaining to the renewal of the Medical Library Assistance Act. I am associate professor of dentistry at Emory University and am presently Chairman of the Council on Dental Research of the American Dental Association.

I have seen how our library has used funds from this Act and see changes that will certainly increase the need for improved dental libraries throughout the nation. Our grant for the first year amounted to $6550.00. This money was spent for new stacks, a reference table, binding of older dental journals, buying needed books and to supplement the salary of a full-time library assistant. We are still not able to supply duplicated copies of journals to our recent graduates who live out in the state and are studying for their speciality boards or who need specific information.

We will be moving into our new dental school building soon with increased space for the library that will need furnishing and equipping. The limited budget of private institutions (especially) will not adequately cover these sorts of expenses.

I believe that practicing dentists will be required to attend specified numbers of hours of continuing education course work in the near future. Several states are already requiring physicians and dentists to produce evidence of such education in order to participate in certain health programs. This new requirement will certainly add to the use of dental libraries by dentists from private offices who come in to the schools for these courses.

The interest of our Council on Dental Research in promoting more practical research in methods of diagnosing and treating oral and dental disease, certainly includes our concern for the support and expansion of dental library facilities. Little progress can be made in research without adequate communication and information sources.

There is typically a 5 to 10 year lag between the publication of research in the Journals and the inclusion of this information in standard textbooks. The alert practitioner needs access to dental journals to avoid practicing dentistry that is 5 to 10 years obsolete.

I would therefore like to urge your full support of renewal of the Medical Library Assistance Act.

Sincerely yours,

PARKER E. MAHAN, D.D.S., Ph. D.,
Chairman, Council on Dental Research.

S. 2550—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO WELFARE REFORM

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, among the many problems in our outmoded welfare system, one must stand alone as an unparalleled oddity.

Where a man is living in the home in the 25 States which do not have an AFDC—unemployed fathers program: First, if the mother is married to him, she and the children are not eligible for assistance; and second, they are eligible, however, if the man and woman are not married.

This can and should be changed at once.

The largest and fastest growing group of welfare recipients is that of aid to families with dependent children—AFDC. It accounted for three-fourths of the increase in money payments in 1968, and is made up of:

First, 4.6 million children; and second, 1.6 million adults, 1.3 million of which are mothers.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that there are three or fewer children in two-thirds of the families. Almost half of the families have two children or less. More than three-fourths of the children are under 13 years old.

What about the fathers? Where are they and why are they not working to support their families?

The best estimate of HEW is that: First, 5½ percent are dead; second, 12 percent are incapacitated: third, 5 percent are unemployed; and fourth, over 75 percent are "absent" from home.

Until last year 28 States and the District of Columbia denied assistance if there was a man in the house. As a result, many fathers who were unable to find employment abandoned their families so the mothers and children could qualify for welfare.

In the 1968 case of King against Smith, the Supreme Court struck down the man-in-the-house rule. The Court held that States may not deny eligibility on the basis that there is an unrelated man living in the home.

The irony is that we are faced with the situation I described above. This hardly seems the sensible way to encourage some of those "absent" fathers to return home, and assume their responsibilities.

At the present time the unemployed fathers program is optional with the States. Only 25 have chosen to implement it in the 8 years since it was created.

For the family to receive help under this program, the child's father must not have been employed for at least 30 days prior to receipt of aid. The father must not have refused "without good cause" a bona fide offer of employment or training during that period. He must have had six or more quarters of work during any 13 calendar quarters ending within 1 year prior to his application, or in the alternative, received or been qualified for unemployment compensation during that time.

What makes the unemployed father program noteworthy, however, is that: First, the father must be referred to the work incentive program within 30 days after receipt of aid; second, aid is denied if, and for so long as, the father is not currently registered with the public employment office, or if the father receives unemployment compensation; and third, the State welfare agency must enter into a cooperative arrangement with the State vocational education agency to encourage retraining of individuals capable of being retrained.

I believe this program, if made available in all States, may significantly contribute to family stability, bring more families into the mainstream of American economic life, and aid in the prevention of extreme economic and social strain. It certainly could assist measurably in avoiding situations which lead to the desertion of a husband and father to qualify the family for assistance on other grounds.

Colorado already has some experience under the work incentive program, under which welfare payments to an individual are decreased as his or her earnings increase, and the unemployed fathers program. In Denver, for instance, they were able to reduce welfare payments under the unemployed fathers program by $25 per case during the first 3 months of this year.

I think the approach of the unemployed fathers program is eminently sound, and I hope the Senate will act expeditiously to make its provisions available to these families in the remaining States.

My bill, which I am introducing, would accomplish this, and I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2550) to require that State programs approved under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act make the aid available thereunder to children in need thereof because of the unemployment of their father, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2552—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH WILSON'S CREEK NATIONAL BATTLEFIELD, SPRINGFIELD, MO.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator EAGLETON and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park.

The battle at Wilson's Creek, 12 miles southwest of Springfield, Mo., was the first major Civil War battle west of the Mississippi River. On August 9, 1861, Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon of the Union Army marched his troops to Wilson's Creek to meet the Southern force. The battle that ensued was one of the most furious in the war. Confederate casualties in that battle were 1,242; Union casualties were 1,302. General Lyon was among those killed.

This history of legislative proposals to establish a national park at Wilson's Creek dates back to 1917 and the 65th Congress. In 1960, efforts were finally successful; however, that authorization placed a limit on appropriations for development that, according to the Department of the Interior, "has precluded the National Park Service from carrying out an adequate development plan for this area."

The bill introduced today would increase the authorization of funds to $2,300,000, as recommended by the Interior Department, and would change the name to Wilson's Creek National Battlefield.

Establishment of a national park at the Wilson's Creek Battlefield site is supported by local interests as well as the Missouri General Assembly which has appropriated funds for land acquisition. In May 1968, the Advisory Board on National Parks of the U.S. Interior Department endorsed the provisions of the bill presented today.

In view of present budgetary limitations, it would not be realistic to expect appropriation of the recommended authorization in the near future; nevertheless, passage of this bill would enable local interests who have continued in their strong support to proceed with plans with the assurance that when Federal funds are available their efforts to preserve the site at Wilson's Creek as a national park will be realized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2552) to amend the act of April 22, 1960, providing for the establishment of the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 2554—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL EMPLOYEES PRERETIREMENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I introduce for myself, the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), a bill to provide Federal employees with a comprehensive program of preretirement counseling and assistance. I introduced a similar proposal in 1967 as S. 2295 of the 90th Congress.

The bill I propose today is modified in significant detail and I am very hopeful that it will receive early and favorable consideration in the Senate. Enactment of this proposal will, I believe, take us far toward the goal articulated by President Kennedy—the objective of adding new life to the new years which science is adding to man's lifespan.

The institution of retirement has been described as one of the most difficult adjustments in life. Physicians have testified that one of the most common syndromes treated by general practitioners is that known as retirement shock. This underscores the preplexing combination of confusion and anxiety which afflicts many about to end their working careers.

Most retirees know something about the experiences they will encounter as retirees. Yet very few know more than a little about the actual dimensions of the psychological and physical adjustments which retirement necessitates. For the average retiree, the end of work brings a new awareness that ours is a society which is both youth-oriented and work-oriented. For many, therefore, retirement brings a loss of identity and incentive. For a few, retirement also results in a loss of interest in living.

I believe that retirement from a job need not lead to retirement from life. Scientists tell us that as a man slows physically he often matures mentally; as one's capacity for productive output decreases his facility for creative work often increases. Yet to maximize retirement potential one must prepare himself in advance; he must develop his interests and resources over the years against the day of his retirement. He must learn the importance of remaining active and of maintaining the vital, life-giving interest in others. He must, in a phrase, learn the technique which John Gardner has called self-renewal. That technique encourages an openness and flexibility in personal life which facilitates fulfillment and growth in every situation.

It has been said that "today, education is for life on the job, but more and more we need education for life off the job, so that we can derive the most from our leisure." I share that conviction. Education on the job for life off the job can, in my judgment, facilitate the kind of self-renewal which is essential to meaningful retirement.

At one of the hearings in 1967 before the Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual, Mr. Gardner, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

> Sometime during the middle years of life, preferably several years before retirement . . . every person should have access to effective preretirement information and education about some of the common problems and adjustments that are experienced in the retirement period.

He added:

> I would like to stress here again the importance of tailoring preretirement training to the needs of persons about to retire. Merely offering a series of lectures or classes will accomplish little. There must be individual counseling so that the special concerns of each person may be discussed privately and dealt with. And there must be a concerted effort to maintain contact with the older person as he nears the age of retirement and after he retires.

In his report to President Johnson in December 1968, Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, proposed a bill of rights for older people. Under one of the 10 proposed rights he included, "preretirement counseling of high quality to assist in meeting the problems of retirement."

The American Association of Retired Persons is keenly aware of the importance of preretirement programs. As a result of its 1967 study which disclosed that relatively few Federal employees had access to an adequate program of preretirement counseling, it recently prepared and published an excellent guide entitled "Preparation for Retirement." This guide is designed to assist agencies in developing appropriate programs for Government employees, and offers a practical outline of the subjects and factors that should be considered.

Universities have devoted a great deal of attention to the problems of adjustments to retirement; and organized labor, industry, and business have begun to recognize the need and desirability of preretirement planning. Many have established retirement programs. The United Steel Workers of America and the United Automobile Workers of America in cooperation with universities, have developed and introduced comprehensive programs and have trained union representatives to conduct them. Moreover, there is a growing belief that it is an employer's responsibility to provide such programs. It is my belief that this is a responsibility that the Federal Government can no longer shirk.

In order to ascertain the need for retirement planning programs, the U.S. Civil Service Commission conducted a study last summer in which a large sample of Federal employees nearing retirement or retired 1 to 3 years was asked to respond to a number of questions. Among other things, the study disclosed that almost all those interviewed liked the idea of a preretirement planning program and thought that a good program could help people enjoy retirement more; that less than 18 percent had a preretirement planning program available to them; and that most of those who did attend found the program useful.

Acting on this study, Chairman Robert Hampton of the Civil Service Commission announced in April that the Commission's position on preretirement counseling of Federal employees had changed "from one of neutrality to one of promoting, encouraging, and assisting in the establishment of retirement planning services throughout the Federal community." He also stated that the Commission planned to offer a program of training for agency retirement advisers.

The bill I am introducing today provides the statutory muscle for the Civil Service Commission by requiring that all Federal employees who are eligible for or approaching retirement shall have available an appropriate program of retirement assistance. It also calls upon the Civil Service Commission to establish standards for such programs, provide training for agency retirement advisers, and study and publish guidelines about related work-life programs such as phased retirement, trial retirement, new kinds of part-time work, and sabbaticals.

Enactment of this bill will, I believe, greatly reduce the anxiety and dread of Federal employees who approach retirement. Hopefully, it will stimulate positive thinking about retirement by providing employees with the factual information and counseling which will enable them to understand the nature of retirement problems and to plan their leisure years intelligently.

Mr. President, I believe that the preretirement training and counseling programs developed as a result of this proposal will enable the Federal Government to assume a leadership position in an important but largely neglected area. I am hopeful, moreover, that the programs engendered by this bill will serve as models for adoption by State and local governments and by industry and business.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2554) to provide certain services for Government employees in order to assist them in preparing for retirement, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Employees Preretirement Assistance Act of 1969."

That subchapter I of chapter 83 of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 8302. PRERETIREMENT ASSISTANCE.

"(a) For the purpose of this section, 'agency' means an Executive agency or the government of the District of Columbia.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (d)(3) of this section, the head of each agency shall formulate and carry out a program to provide comprehensive preretirement assistance to employees of such agency who are eligible, or approaching eligibility, for retirement.

"(c) Each such program shall provide for furnishing to interested employees such educational or informational materials, group training sessions, group and individual counseling services, and other assistance as may be necessary to aid them in preparing for and adjusting to a retirement status.

"(d)(1) Each such program shall be conducted in accordance with standards prescribed in regulations to be promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall provide appropriate training for any employee of an agency which is to provide preretirement assistance under such program. If deemed advisable, the Commission may enter into contracts with educational and other institutions to provide such training.

"(2) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare may provide—

"(A) such training and other assistance in the development and evaluation of such programs as the Commission may request; and

"(B) technical assistance and formulate such program models as may be necessary to meet the specific needs of an agency subject to the provisions of this section. Such models may be used in formulating the standards prescribed in the regulations promulgated by the Commission under paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3)(A) If the Commission determines, upon request of an agency, that it is not practicable for the agency to comply with the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, the Commission may grant such agency an exemption from providing a program of retirement assistance for its employees. Such exemption shall be reviewed at least once every six months and shall remain in effect if, at the time of each review, there is a determination by the Commission that it continues to be impracticable for the agency to provide such a program.

"(B) If an exception is granted under this paragraph, the Commission shall take such measures as may be necessary to provide employees of such agency with an appropriate program of preretirement assistance.

"(e) Such interagency cooperation as is necessary to obtain maximum utilization of resources shall be undertaken to achieve the purposes of this section. The head of an agency is authorized and requested to provide informational materials, group training services, group and individual counseling services, and other assistance to another such agency or to employees of such other agency when it is more economical or feasible to do so"; and

(2) by adding at the end of the analysis of such subchapter, preceding section 8301, the following new item: "8302. Preretirement assistance."

SEC. 2. The Civil Service Commission shall make a study of existing and recommended practices, both within and outside the Government of the United States, which relate to work-life and study programs, including phased retirement, trial retirement, new kinds of part-time work, and sabbaticals. With the assistance of agencies and officers of the Government of the United States, including the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and educational institutions, the Commission shall, based on such study, establish guidelines concerning such programs for the information and use of such agencies.

SEC. 3. Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Civil Service Commission shall submit a report to the President and the Congress on the program of retirement assistance required by the amendment made by the first section of this Act and on the development of new work-life and study programs by agencies of the Government of the United States.

SEC. 4. Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Civil Service Commission shall promulgate regulations to establish standards for conducting programs of retirement assistance as authorized by the first section of this Act. Not later than 6 months after such date of enactment, the Commission shall place into operation a program for providing the training required by section 8302 (d)(1) of title 5, United States Code (as added by the first section of this Act).

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with comments made by Senator MONDALE concerning introduction of a bill to provide programs of preretirement counseling and planning for Federal employees.

The need for this legislation has become clear in studies conducted by the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging. As chairman of that committee I am especially aware of the contribution made by Senator MONDALE and his Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual in conducting hearings which clearly established that an emerging "retirement revolution" is taking place in this Nation, even though this Nation is not prepared for all the consequences of that revolution.

Hearings conducted by the subcommittee in June and July 1967 showed conclusively that most retirees experienced great difficulty in adjusting to retirement, and that not only the individual but society also were generally unaware of the seriousness and complexity of the program.

Indeed, expert witnesses at committee hearings have described a "shock syndrome" which accompanies retirement. Many workers are only vaguely aware of the psychological and social changes they will experience after they leave the job. When they actually retire, they experience trauma that could have been avoided if they had prepared adequately.

We must find ways to begin thinking and planning for retirement well in advance of the actual date. Fortunately, the bill introduced today offers Federal employees a variety of services and programs designed to smooth the transition between work and retirement. They can look at retirement from a distance, prepare for it, and meet it well and wisely when it comes.

With the help of this bill, the Federal Government can at last become a model for other, similar efforts in business and in industry. This bill will set the stage for expanded programs of preretirement preparation, and those programs in turn, will set the stage for a more satisfying life after work is through.

S. 2559—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 901 OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to clarify and strengthen the maritime cargo-preference laws of the United States and put an end to the wasteful practice of paying double subsidies to certain shipping interests.

Section 1 of the bill deals with cargo generated by agencies of the U.S. Gov-

ernment and shipped to foreign nations under the provisions of Public Law 480.

Public Law 480 is the means by which the United States uses its abundant agricultural productivity to combat hunger and malnutrition in friendly countries. Since its inception in 1954, through 1967, over $12 million worth of foodstuffs have been shipped to needy nations. The program has been highly effective in opening up outlets for American surplus food and commodities. This has helped stabilize the U.S. agricultural economy and so lessen the public tax burden of storing surplus food.

Though the humanitarian objectives of the law are commendable, the law was also designed to assist the U.S. economy. The act states that the foreign currencies which accrue under title I sales—goods sold for local currencies—are to be used to "expand international trade" and to "encourage economic development."

The program, through its secondary grants of food receipts, is supposed to open up markets to American exports and eventually return dollars to the United States. From 1954 through 1967, $159,746,000, or 17.5 percent, of local currency receipts from Public Law 480 were used for U.S. obligations in the recipient nation such as payment of U.S. Embassy expenses. Since these expenses would otherwise have been paid in dollars this practice has exerted a favorable effect on the U.S. balance-of-payments position.

During the 10-year period, 1957–66, however, the American balance-of-payments deficit amounted to $23 billion. Without the contribution of $5.7 billion to the balance during this same period by the U.S. merchant marine the deficit would have been $28.7 billion.

The balance of payments is an accounting summary of transactions between the United States and foreign countries. The greatest gross value segment is the exchange of goods and services, including transportation. Commodity exports, under Public Law 480's title IV must be paid for in U.S. dollars. When these dollars are paid there is a positive and direct effect on our balance of payments.

However, the favorable effects of these transactions are diluted by the fact that 50 percent or more of the Public Law 480 cargo is carried on foreign ships. If the 50 percent were being shipped on the recipient nation's flag vessels one might argue that this practice was further strengthening the economy of these underdeveloped countries. However, the principal recipients of Public Law 480 cargo do not have the ships to carry this trade.

The third flag carriers are the highly developed nations of Japan, Norway, Germany, and England. In addition, 28.4 percent of all U.S. oceanborne commerce is carried by ships registered under the Liberian flag. A large share of these ships are American "runaways." The combined competition of these nations on the high seas has been so effective that the American merchant marine now carries only about 5 percent of our commercial imports and exports.

Each dollar spent on foreign-flag shipping has a negative impact on our balance of payments. Each dollar spent on shipping American flag has a positive impact. In the 3-year period 1964–66, American-flag carriage of Government-sponsored cargo resulted in a positive impact of approximately $1.3 billion to our balance of payments. Without the use of American bottoms our deficit would have been significantly worse.

Under the Cargo Preference Act, at least 50 percent of Government cargoes is required to be shipped on American-flag vessels. The present cargo preference system, as it is administered, has made this 50 percent a maximum, in contravention of the law and congressional intent, and ignored the formidable contribution American shipping can make toward solving our balance-of-payments position. For example, in 1967—the most recent year for which complete figures are available—only 39.7 percent of Public Law 480 shipments were on U.S.-flag ships.

Though it is true that American shipping rates are greater and frequently more than double foreign rates, the comparison, without considering the beneficial results of conserving U.S. dollars, would be incomplete. Although it is difficult to obtain complete information, the Economic Research Service of the Department of Agriculture has computed that the average 1968 ocean freight rates from U.S. gulf ports to the west coast of India was $11.65 per ton of grain on foreign ships, and $27.50 per ton of grain on U.S. ships.

Through March 1969, 810,000 tons have been shipped in India under a Public Law 480 grain agreement signed December 23, 1968, for 2.3 million tons; 408,000 tons have been carried on U.S.-flag ships, and 402,000 tons on foreign ships. These figures do not reflect the 1969 ratio of all Public Law 480 cargo carried by U.S. ships vis-a-vis foreign vessels.

The specific freight costs for these shipments to India are not available. However, based on the Agriculture Department's average rates for shipments to India from U.S. gulf ports, we can come up with an approximate freight cost of $4,683,300 for the portion shipped via foreign vessels, and $11,220,000 for American-flag shipments; or a total freight cost of $15,903,300. If foreign ships were exclusively used, the total freight bill would have been $9,436,500.

On the surface, American flag shipping might look like a $6-million extravagance. However, a Harbridge House study on the balance of payments and the U.S. merchant marine points out that there is a 35-percent gain in our balance of payments from using U.S. versus foreign-flag ships. This means that paying the higher U.S. rate actually contributed around $4 million to our balance of payments.

After taking the balance-of-payments contribution into consideration, it would appear the Government still paid out $2.5 million more than necessary. But this is not the case. The $4 million consists primarily of wages paid to American crewmen and relatively inadequate profits to American shipowners. This money enters America's economic bloodstream and is pumped into American consumer products, and taxes to Federal, State, and local government.

Every dollar spent by someone in the economy is also a dollar of income to somebody else. About two-thirds of income is spent on personal consumption. In light of the critical shortage of State and local funds for education, urban renewal, and so forth, the increased revenue generated through sales tax is particularly important. The remaining third is apportioned to savings and income and property taxes. Therefore, after each round of spending a smaller amount of personal income is generated. However, after several rounds of spending the total income generated will amount to approximately three times the amount originally injected into the economy. The $4 million contributed to the Nation's payments receipts will eventually generate around $12 million worth of income to American citizens.

A conservative estimate would be that the average American consumer pays approximately 16 percent Federal income tax and 8 percent State and local tax. Based on this figure, of the $12 million of generated income, close to $2 million will be returned to the Federal Government in income tax, and another million will be paid in tax to State and local governments.

This is only one example of the immediate economic effect of using American shipping. The unsubsidized segment of the American merchant marine is almost entirely dependent upon Government cargo for its existence. However, currently the unsubsidized ships are not earning enough to warrant replacing obsolete ships. There is no question that if the percentage of U.S. Government generated cargo shipped in American bottoms were increased, unsubsidized shipowners would be in a better position to build new ships. This investment in capital equipment would have an even greater effect on the economy and substantially increase the amount of money returned to the Government in taxes.

In 1967, 9,490,000 tons were shipped on foreign-flag vessels. Complete figures are not available as to the destination of these shipments or the freight costs incurred. However, if we assume an average American shipping costs of $15 per ton, about $142 million could have been spent on American shipping. This American-flag shipping investment would have represented an input of about $50 million to our balance-of-payments receipts. Experience in the United States has shown that an input of 50 million will generate about $150 million worth of additional American income. However, under existing cargo administrative practices, this additional income has been denied the American people.

The economic welfare of American industry is not based upon the artificially induced foreign aid markets, but is based upon the buying power of the American consumer. This is specially true of the American farmer. The American businessman and farmer can remain the wealthiest in the world only if there is a strong American dollar, and only if the American people, including the merchant seaman, have the economic ability to buy American goods.

Section 2 of the bill would put an end to the present practice of paying subsidy to the U.S.-flag lines to meet foreign-flag competition, and then permitting the subsidized lines to use the subsidy to bid against unsubsidized American operators

for carriage of cargoes reserved for U.S.-flagships. In this way, the subsidy paid is wasted, the U.S.-flag share of our foreign commerce is reduced, and unsubsidized operators are deprived of the cargoes they need if they are to survive without direct Government subsidy.

Despite Government subsidy payments of over $300 million a year, the American-flag merchant marine has been constantly declining. This decline can be attributed, in part, to administrative policies and practices which permit the misapplication of a large portion of the subsidy money appropriated each year. Much of the Government subsidy each year is not used to sustain American-flag competition with foreign-flag ships. Instead, and contrary to congressional intent, the subsidy paid is used by the favored few subsidized operators to compete against unsubsidized Americans for cargoes which are already reserved for U.S.-flag ships. This bill would plug up the loopholes in the law which permit this annual waste of scarce subsidy funds.

Instead of strengthening the entire American merchant marine, Government subsidies are now being used to destroy the unsubsidized portion of our fleet. This bill would stop the payments of double subsidies, and assure that all segments of our fleet can survive and grow.

According to the Maritime Administration—"Maritime Subsidies," 1969:

> Operating-differential subsidy is given operators to place American vessels on a par with those of foreign competitors.

The need for subsidy to meet foreign competition is obvious: American vessels cost in excess of $2,000 a day more to operate than foreign-flag vessels. Without subsidy, American vessels cannot meet this low-cost foreign competition for commercial cargoes. Only 14 U.S.-flag operators have subsidy contracts; they draw operating subsidies of about $200 million a year, and construction subsidies of over $100 million a year.

Unfortunately, instead of using their subsidies to carry cargo in competition with foreign lines, many of the subsidized lines carry huge quantities of military and other cargoes reserved only for American-flag ships. This is a complete waste of Government money, because direct subsidy is not needed to carry these cargoes for which there is no foreign competition.

Our American merchant marine needs all the support it can get. But, Government funds are scarce, and we cannot afford to waste $50 to $100 million a year on subsidy to carry cargoes which already are reserved for American-flag ships at premium rates.

This bill deals directly with this waste. It requires that direct subsidy payments be reduced in proportion to the amount of reserved cargo—that is cargo reserved for U.S.-flag ships—carried on any voyage. This is a direct and simple remedy for the subsidy waste. It has precedent in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—the subsidy law. Under the 1936 act, any subsidized line which carries domestic cargoes coastwise from U.S. port to U.S. port on a voyage has its subsidy reduced by the amount of such domestic coastwise cargoes. The logic of this is that domestic cargoes are reserved for U.S.-flag ships. Foreign ships cannot compete for this cargo and therefore no subsidy is needed.

The 1936 act has no similar provision for U.S. Government-generated cargoes—carried in foreign commerce—because these cargoes were not moving in any volume in 1936. Today they are, and the subsidy waste is evident. We cannot afford to let this waste continue.

American-flag steamship operators who do not receive subsidy are dependent for their survival on carriage of Government-sponsored cargoes. Without these cargoes, our unsubsidized fleet would disappear. We need these unsubsidized ships to maintain a balanced merchant fleet, but we cannot keep them operating and provide for their replacement if they are to be denied Government-generated cargoes as the result of unfair competition financed by subsidy payments which were intended to be used to make the 14 subsidized U.S. companies competitive with foreign-flag operators.

The procurement practices of the agencies now shipping military and other Government-sponsored cargoes require unsubsidized operators to bid against subsidized lines. For example, all our military cargoes are reserved by law for U.S.-flag ships. Yet, the subsidized lines are able to use their subsidies, intended to make them competitive with foreigners to underbid unsubsidized American operators for military cargoes. What is happening is that the Government is paying some lines subsidy to destroy the services of the unsubsidized lines.

This bill would stop this destructive use of our existing maritime subsidy system. Subsidized lines would not be paid subsidy to carry military and other reserved cargoes. A fair basis for bidding for these Government-sponsored cargoes would be provided; U.S. unsubsidized operators would be able to survive and American subsidized operators would be encouraged to compete for commercial cargoes on the essential trade routes for which they were granted their subsidies in the first place.

Obviously, the enactment of this bill would serve as a great incentive for the development of a revitalized and balanced U.S. merchant fleet with attendant benefits to all Americans in terms of a more favorable balance-of-payments account and a strengthened domestic economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2559) to amend section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, with respect to the transportation in U.S.-flag commercial vessels of certain cargoes related to the activities of the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. MONTOYA, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2559

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1241 (b)), is amended (1) by striking out "50 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum", and (2) by inserting at the end thereof the following: "For the purpose of this subsection rates charged privately-owned United States-flag commercial vessels shall be considered to be fair and reasonable if such rates are not greater than necessary to provide, taking into consideration American capital and operating costs, a reasonable profit on investment on an annual or longer basis and such additional amount as is necessary for vessel replacement. In any case in which equipment, materials, or commodities subject to this subsection are transported on vessels other than privately-owned United States-flag commercial vessels, the appropriate Government agency shall file a report with the Secretary of Commerce setting forth the reason or reasons such a United States-flag commercial vessel was not used for such transportation."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) of section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 is further amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" designating such subsection, and inserting at the end of such subsection a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) (A) No vessel for which an operating-differential subsidy pursuant to title VI of this Act is being received may be used to transport on any voyage any equipment, material, or commodity subject to this section (including supplies subject to the provisions of section 2631 of title 10 of the United States Code) unless the operator of such vessel agrees that any such subsidy payable on account of such voyage shall be reduced by an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount of such subsidy as the revenue from transporting such equipment, material, or commodity bears to the total revenue from such voyage. For the purpose of this paragraph revenue shall be calculated net of cargo loading and discharging cost. The Secretary of Commerce shall make any such reduction agreed to pursuant to this paragraph.

"(B) No vessel for which a construction-differential subsidy was paid pursuant to title V of this Act may be used to transport any such equipment, material, or commodity (i) on liner terms unless the operator of such vessel agrees to pay to the Secretary of Commerce an amount equal to that proportion of one twenty-fifth of such subsidy, plus interest thereon at 6 per centum per annum computed on a level basis for twenty-five years, which the revenue derived from such transportation bears to the revenue derived from such vessel during the entire calendar year during which such transportation was provided, or (ii) on charter terms unless the operator of such vessel agrees to pay to the Secretary of Commerce an amount equal to that proportion of such subsidy, plus interest thereon at 6 per centum per annum computed on a level basis for twenty-five years, which the duration of such charter bears to twenty-five years. Amounts received by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to this supparagraph shall be deposited in the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 131—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION WELCOMING TO THE UNITED STATES OLYMPIC ATHLETES AND DELEGATIONS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the year 1976 will mark the 200th anniversary of the independence of our Nation. In that year we will with just pride recognize and commemorate the spirit of freedom which has permitted our people, individually and collectively, to gain preemi-

nence in such a wide range of man's pursuits.

One area in which our citizens have distinguished themselves, and which our people as a whole enjoy with a passion, is in the field of sports. It seems, therefore, particularly appropriate that the U.S. Olympic Committee should be attempting to bring to our country the Olympic games of 1976. The city of Los Angeles has been authorized to seek the summer Olympic games and the city of Denver has been authorized to seek the winter Olympic games in that year.

As the senior Senator from California, and more personally as the son of our Nation's first Olympic coach, I want to do anything I can to help the Olympic committee bring the games to the United States in 1976. I know my colleagues will share this wish, and it is for that reason that I, with the junior Senator from California and the Senators from Colorado, am introducing now a joint resolution expressing our interest in the Olympic games and asking that the President issue a Proclamation welcoming the Olympic delegations to our country in 1976 and assuring that appropriate and convenient entry procedures will be provided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 131) to welcome to the United States all Olympic athletes and authorized Olympic delegations, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MURPHY, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referrred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 132—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION RELATING TO "NATIONAL SHORTHAND AND STENOTYPE REPORTERS WEEK"

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, the first week in August the city of Boston, Mass., will host the National Convention of the Shorthand and Reporters Association.

All of us who have practiced in court, or spent much time in meetings of congressional committees or in other meetings where witnesses are heard and cross-examinations conducted, are well aware of the vital work performed by shorthand and stenotype reporters. They truly are the silent transcribers of progress and effective government. Without them, the entire legislative process, our economy, and justice as we know it today would surely falter. No society has ever had a greater need for accurate and prompt recordings of its proceedings; and no society could ever be more ably served than by today's highly trained and skilled shorthand and stenotype reporters.

In recogntion of their invaluable services, I introduce, for myself and Senator KENNEDY, a joint resolution, and ask that it receive the prompt consideration of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 132) to authorize the President to proclaim the period beginning August 3, 1969, and ending August 10, 1969, as "National Shorthand and Stenotype Reporters Week," introduced by Mr. BROOKE (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 132

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That, in honor of persons engaged in shorthand and stenotype reporting and in recognition of the contribution made by such persons to the administration of justice and the performance of executive and legislative duties, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period beginning August 3, 1969, and ending August 10, 1969, as "National Shorthand and Stenotype Reporters Week", and calling upon the people of the United States and interested groups and organizations to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 835

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 835) amending the act authorizing funds for restoration of the Frederick Douglass home in Anacostia.

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I am glad to join with Senator HART in sponsoring his bill, S. 835, to authorize sufficient funds to finance the restoration of the Washington home of Frederick Douglass, a slave who rose to national prominence as an eloquent fighter for Negro freedom and equality in the last century.

In 1962 Congress ordered the Douglass home, located in the Anacostia section of the District of Columbia, preserved as part of the park system of our National Capital. It was the intention of Congress that the Douglass estate, known as Cedar Hill, be restored, refurbished, and developed as a "historic home museum," with proper safeguards to protect the furnishings and library.

While Congress authorized $25,000 for this work, the figure has proven to be insufficient, largely because of unanticipated storm and other damage to the home. Last August the Department of the Interior estimated that it will take at least $450,000 to complete the job.

S. 835 authorizes this increase in expenditures and I urge that it be approved promptly.

In preserving the Douglass home we will provide for future generations a tangible reminder of the life of this exceptional man.

Douglass was born, probably in February 1817, on a plantation in Talbot County, Md. His childhood as a slave on the plantation was a nightmare of privation. In his twenties he escaped to Massachusetts where he worked as a shipyard laborer for $1 a day. Douglass was a self-educated man and, by anyone's measure, a brilliant one.

In 1841 Douglass entered the abolitionist movement where he became a paid lecturer and organizer. Later in Rochester, N.Y., he published the newspaper "The North Star," which demanded emancipation and elevation of the Negro.

As an orator, Douglass probably was unsurpassed in his time. Eloquence, a fearless demeanor, and an irrefutable logic contributed to his success in rallying white as well as black to the cause of antislavery.

It is a measure of his vision that his spoken and written words are relevant even today.

In 1865 Douglass declared that "slavery is not abolished until the black man has the ballot." It is tragic that more than a century later the battle fully to enfranchise the Negro is incomplete.

Much is heard today about black separatism. A century ago Douglass addressed this point when he stated that "a nation within a nation is an anomaly. There can be but one nation—and we are Americans."

Frederick Douglass did not advocate reliance only on words to carry the struggle against discrimination. He believed that at times physical force may be necessary. But his general prescription for success in the civil rights movement was: "Agitate! Agitate! Agitate!"

Douglass befriended Lincoln and served him as an adviser. He also served under later Presidents as marshal and recorder of deeds in the District of Columbia. In 1888 he was appointed minister of Haiti and held that post for 2 years.

Douglass purchased Cedar Hill in 1877 and lived there until his death in 1895. The substantial house and grounds symbolized his achievements, including a measure of affluence. In the home Douglass kept the bill of sale which released him from slavery at a cost to English friends of $710.96; an order signed by Lincoln; and a gift of silver from Queen Victoria.

Together with the Frederick Douglass Memorial and Historical Association, the National Association of Colored Women's Clubs wisely and generously undertook to preserve the Douglass home so that future generations, both black and white, can be reminded of the enduring contribution that one exslave made to his country.

A grateful nation can do no less than complete this work without further delay.

S. 2076

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2076) to provide for the establishment and administration of a National Disaster Control Fund.

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

S. 2114

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) be added

as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2114) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property situated in the State of Hawaii to the State of Hawaii

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

S. 2488

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2488) to amend section 4(h) of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act so as to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to insure loans made to farmers for the construction or purchase of grain storage facilities for storage of grain on the farm.

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

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT TAX IN QUARTERLY INSTALLMENTS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 64

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 9951), to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year; to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year; to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the employment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972; to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded; and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 65 AND 66

Mr. GOODELL submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 9951, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON VETERANS HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL CARE BILLS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, for the information of Senators, I wish to announce at this time that the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, will hold hearings on July 17, beginning at 9:30 a.m., on nine bills which would amend title 38, United States Code, so as to broaden hospital and medical care benefits for certain veterans.

The bills to be considered are S. 345, introduced by Senator JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care in the case of veterans with service-connected disabilities; S. 1279, also introduced by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, to provide that any disability of a veteran who is a former prisoner of war is presumed to be service-connected for purposes of hospitalization and outpatient care; S. 1949, introduced by Senator DANIEL INOUYE, to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to share with public or private persons the cost of nursing home care for veterans in Alaska and Hawaii; and six House-passed bills—H.R. 692, to extend the length of time community nursing home care may be provided at the expense of the United States; H.R. 693, to provide that veterans who are 70 years of age or older shall be deemed to be unable to defray the expenses of necessary hospital or domiciliary care; H.R. 2768, to eliminate the 6-month limitation on the furnishing of nursing home care for veterans with service-connected disabilities; H.R. 3130, to provide that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs may furnish medical services for non-service-connected disability to any war veteran who has total disability from a service-connected disability; H.R. 9334, to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans homes; and H.R. 9634, to improve and make more effective the Veterans' Administration program of sharing specialized medical resources.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARING ON NOMINATIONS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to announce the scheduling of a hearing before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on Wednesday, July 9, at 9:30 a.m. in room 4232 on the following pending nominations for executive appointments:

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Hubert B. Heffner, of California, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Science and Technology.

Mr. William David McElroy, of Maryland, to be Director of the National Science Foundation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON AMENDMENTS TO THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights will hold hearings on S. 818, S. 2507, and S. 2456, bills to amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and has changed the hearings rooms as follows:

July 9 and 10 at 10 a.m., room 324, Senate Office Building.

July 11 at 10 a.m., room 2228, New Senate Office Building.

Anyone wishing further information, please contact the subcommittee office.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Bethel B. Larey, of Arkansas, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Arkansas for the term of 4 years, vice Charles M. Conway, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, July 14, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF SHOWING OF DOCUMENTARY ENTITLED "THE FACES OF RUSSIA"

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to announce that there will be a showing of the films I took in Russia during the latter part of last year. The film will be shown on Thursday and Friday in the Senate auditorium at 4 p.m., 6:30 p.m., and 8 p.m. on each day.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the notice be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER (D. La.) announces the first showing of his documentary film entitled "The Faces of Russia" on Thursday and Friday, July 10th and 11th. The film will be shown in the Senate auditorium, G-308, at 4:00, 6:30, and 8:00 p.m. on each day.

"The Faces of Russia" was photographed by Senator ELLENDER while visiting virtually every part of the U.S.S.R. last fall. The film is in color, with sound.

Senator ELLENDER, the Senate's second-ranking Democrat, said that the film should be helpful and instructive to the Congress during the ABM debate, and in the drafting of policies in the context of the cold war.

Members of Congress, their families, staff, guests, and the general public are cordially invited to attend.

CITIZENS CRUSADE FOR CLEAN WATER

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, as never before in our history Congress and the American people are deeply concerned about the asaults being made on our environment by pollution. This concern surfaced again last week when a major and unprecedented coalition of industry, labor, consumers, professional and conservation organizations, launched a citizens crusade for clean water.

The crusade was the spontaneous reaction of these groups to the woefully inadequate budget request for clean water appropriations. Their common action speaks eloquently of their conviction of the American people—that we must begin now to improve the quality of our environment. Each day others join their ranks, and I ask unanimous consent that a current listing of these organizations be printed in the RECORD along with press accounts of their activities.

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

American Association of University Women.
AFL/CIO.
American Fisheries Society.
American Institute of Architects.
American Paper Institute.
Association of Interpretive Naturalists.
Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.
Consumer Federation of America.
Izaak Walton League of America.
Monsanto Biodize Systems, Monsanto Chemical.
National Association of Counties.
National Audubon Society.

National Fisheries Institute.
National Rifle Association.
National Wildlife Federation.
Society of American Foresters.
South Jersey Shellfishermans Association.
Sport Fishing Institute.
The American Forestry Association.
The Conservation Foundation.
The League of Women Voters of the United States.
The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
The Sierra Club.
The Wilderness Society.
The American Institute of Planners.
The Wildlife Society.
Trout Unlimited.
United Auto Workers.
United Steelworkers of America.
U.S. Conference of City Health Officers.
U.S. Conference of Mayors.
Wildlife Management Institute.

[From the Washington Post, June 9, 1969]

ONE BILLION DOLLARS FOR CLEAN WATER URGED

Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel pleaded with a U.S. Senate subcommittee yesterday to appropriate a full $1 billion authorized for community sewage plants next year, instead of the $214 million sought by the Nixon Administration.

Mandel was a key witness for the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water, a group of three dozen national and local organizations that opened a clean water campaign yesterday.

Budgetary stresses resulting from the Vietnam war have kept Federal outlay slow, despite large authorizations voted by Congress in the 1966 Clean Water Restoration Act.

Mandel said his State's water cleanup program "will die" unless the Federal Government begins giving the states and communities the money it promised them under the 1966 law.

Maryland, he said, had planned community treatment plants and set up a sanitary facilities fund on the basis of an anticipated $57.5 million in Federal grants from fiscal 1968 to 1971, but would get only $14 million at the current rate of Federal appropriations.

"The sanitary facilities fund will go broke early in fiscal 1970 unless Federal appropriations are increased," the Democratic Governor said. He added, "Our people are fed up with billion-dollar talk and million-dollar action."

Mandel's demand for the full appropriation was echoed by Douglas Merrifield, of St. Joseph, Md., who spoke for the National League of Cities and U.S. Conference of Mayors, and by spokesmen for other groups sponsoring the crusade.

The grants would actually generate far more than $1 billion in construction, since communities normally match them 50–50 or better. Municipal sewage is one of the major sources of water pollution in the United States.

The request for $1 billion in appropriations was endorsed by Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee Chairman Edmund S. Muskie (D-Me.) and senior Republican J. Caleb Boggs (R-Del.).

When Allen J. Ellender (D-La.), presiding at the hearing as chairman of the Senate Public Works Appropriations Subcommittee, asked Muskie for a figure that would have a "realistic" chance of getting through Congress, Muskie said, "Some $600 million can be effectively spent, I'm informed."

The three-dozen groups that have come together to form the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water include the Conservation Foundation, Wilderness Society, U.S. Conference of Mayors, Natural Resources Council of America, United Auto Workers, AFL–CIO, National League of Cities, League of Women Voters, National Association of Counties, Izaak Walton League, Sierra Club, National Wildlife Federation and National Audubon Society.

[From the Evening Star, June 9, 1969]

ONE BILLION DOLLARS TO CLEAN UP WATER ASKED BY CITIZENS CRUSADE

(By Roberta Hornig)

A coalition of conservation and labor groups and state and local government officials today opened a campaign to put pressure on the Nixon administration to come up with the money needed to clean up the nation's water.

The "Citizens Crusade for Clean Water" will seek immediately to get Congress to appropriate $1 billion to help states and municipalities build sewage treatment plants. This represents the dollar gap between what Congress said it would spend to combat water pollution when it passed a clean water act in 1966 and what it has appropriated.

The group already has sent a telegram to President Nixon, pleading for more funds for cleaner water.

MANDEL TO TESTIFY

Delegates from the group, which represents more than 35 organizations having a membership estimated at about 10 million, were appearing at a special hearing before the Senate subcommittee on public works:

Among those scheduled to testify was Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel.

The coalition is made up of groups that often disagree, but have joined forces on the clean-water issue to galvanize public support.

PUT ASIDE DIFFERENCES

The committee's coordinator, J. W. Penfold, head of the Izaak Walton League of America, told a press conference:

"Our differences in objectives, programs, purposes, policies and procedures have all been put aside for the moment so as to join our voices in a single demand upon which we all agree."

The organizations represented include the AFL–CIO, American Fisheries Society, American Forestry Association, American Institute of Architects, Association of Interpretative Naturalists, Association of State and Interstate Water Pollution Control Administrators, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, and Conservation Foundation.

Also, the Consumer Federation of America, Izaak Walton League, League of Women Voters, National Association of Counties, National Audubon Society, National League of Cities, National Wildlife Federation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, United Auto Workers, U.S. Conference of City Health Officers, U.S. Conference of Mayors, United Steelworkers of America, Wilderness Society, Wildlife Management Institute, and Wildlife Society.

SUPPLY STAFF AID

Penfold said the coalition has no budget, but that each organization is providing some staff aid.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act authorizes $1 billion to be spent for treatment-plant construction in fiscal 1970 alone. It begins July 1.

But in budgets proposed by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, only $214 million in spending was recommended.

Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel, who is in charge of cleaning up waters, made a special plea for $600 million, but got nowhere.

At today's press conference, a spokesman for the coalition released a tabulation by states showing that local governments have grant applications totaling $2.5 billion on file with the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 12, 1969]

COALITION PROMOTES CLEAN WATER

(By Robert Cahn)

WASHINGTON.—A new nationwide coalition of citizen groups organized to fight water pollution is making its presence felt in places that count.

Representing 35 organizations—with more joining every day—the Citizens Crusade for Clean Water has made its first goal getting some of the money due cities to help finance waste-treatment plants.

On June 6, citizen groups which represent more than 6 million people sent a telegram to President Nixon.

They urged the President to increase his 1970 budget request for waste-treatment construction from $214 million to the full congressional authorization of $1 billion.

On June 9, leaders of the crusade took their cause to the Senate public works appropriations subcommittee.

VARIETY OF INTERESTS

Now they are working in their communities, explaining the problem to citizens and urging that the pressure of public opinion be brought to bear on the President and on Congress through thousands of telegrams and letters.

The coalition is a mixture of groups that often are not on the same side of issues. Among organizations in the crusade are the AFL-CIO, United Automobile Workers, United Steel Workers of America, National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, United States Conference of Mayors, League of Women Voters of America, Wilderness Society, National Audubon Society, National Rifle Association, National Wildlife Federation, Conservation Foundation, Consumer Federation of America, Izaak Walton League, and Citizens Committee on Natural Resources.

In addition, several industrial corporations including Monsanto Chemical Company and the American Paper Institute are lending their support to the coalition.

The problem, which is being severely felt in delays for construction of waste-treatment plants in many cities, exists because of a growing money gap between what Congress has authorized, and what the administration recommends and what Congress appropriates.

The Federal Government, under the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 and later amendments, agreed to put up from 35 to 85 percent of construction funds for city sewage-disposal plant construction. In many cases, the city puts up 25 percent, the state matches with 25 percent, and the Federal Government puts up the remainder.

HUGE BACKLOG OF REQUESTS

As of March 31 this year, a backlog of $3.2 billion existed in requests from states on pending applications to the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA) for assistance. The Johnson Administration had requested only $214 million, and despite the urging of Interior Secretary Walter J. Hickel for $600 million, the Nixon administration's 1970 budget kept to the $214 million figure.

Meanwhile, 14 states that have been advancing the federal share to cities in anticipation of federal funding, are being left in difficult positions. At the present time these states, including New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maine, Pennsylvania and Michigan, are out $635 million in these advances.

Miss Olga M. Madar, United Automobile Workers representative on the citizen crusade, explained the plight of her own state, Michigan.

"Last November, the people of Michigan, with a 70 percent 'yes' vote, passed a $335 bond issue for treatment abatement, Miss Madar said. Legislation has just been enacted by the state as to how the money shall be appropriated. But under the present federal request totaling $214 million, Michigan would be allowed only a little over $7 million.

MOBILIZATION URGED

"This is the time to mobilize citizen support. The people are willing to pay for the pollution problem that has accumulated through no fault of their own.

"The UAW intends to work in all of our communities through political-action lines. We will be getting out the information to our membership and asking them to exert pressure on the federal government.

"In testimony before the Senate Appropriations Committee, Maryland Gov. Marvin Mandel said even though the state had set up a sanitary-facilities fund, so much money had to be advanced to cities that the fund would go broke early in fiscal 1970 unless federal appropriations were increased.

"If the reason for deferring construction of these plants is so save money, this is short-sighted," Governor Mandel said. "Costs are increasing about 15 percent a year. If we delay five years, the cost will be double."

The new citizens crusade was organized following a meeting last April of the Natural Resources Council of America, a society of major national and regional conservation organizations. The meeting had been briefed by David Dominick, new director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, who had explained the shortage of federal funds and the effects on states and cities.

IDEA SPREADS QUICKLY

After the meeting, the executive committee of the resources council decided to look into the possibilities of forming a citizen coalition. The idea caught on, and by early June, 26 organizations had joined in the effort. The citizens crusade is being coordinated by Joseph W. Penfold.

The shortage of funds for water-pollution control is somewhat embarrassing to President Nixon, who has been stressing the urgency of cleaning up pollution, both before and after his election.

Mr. Nixon's own postelection task force on resources and the environment had been highly critical of funding for water pollution control.

"The gap between need and appropriations in the air and water pollution programs is critical and growing," the task force advised Mr. Nixon in its report.

"We attach the highest importance to these programs, and believe that adequate funding will remain a major key to their effectiveness," the report continued. "The annual uncertainty of appropriations of adequate funds for the cost share disrupts orderly local planning and financial arrangements and breeds distrust of the federal government."

OUR PRISONERS IN NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, one of the gravest atrocities being committed in the war in Vietnam is the manner in which the North Vietnamese hold virtually incommunicado all prisoners of war which they have taken. They permit very little information to leak out from behind their self-imposed bamboo curtain about prisoners of war. This has left the families of these prisoners of war in suspense about the health and safety of their husbands.

I am pleased that Secretary of State Rogers has designated Under Secretary Richardson the specific task of negotiating with the North Vietnam Government on release and care of Americans who are prisoners of war. It is an encouraging step in a continuing effort to secure needed information on these men.

There is also another effort being made by the POW wives from all over the country who are sending cablegrams to the North Vietnam delegation at the Paris peace talks. Recently in the Aberdeen American News there appeared an article about Mrs. Charles Lane, the wife of a South Dakotan, who is a prisoner of war, which tells about these activities of the wives of the prisoners of war. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

PLEAS FROM POW WIVES GO TO PARIS

(By Fran Vandervelde)

Cablegrams have been delivered to the North Vietnam delegation at the Paris peace talks at the rate of 10 to 20 a week since mid-March.

So what? At any international conference there are many messages sent to delegates daily.

But these particular cablegrams are different. They come from a special group. They are a plea for fair treatment of prisoners of war, treatment specified by the Geneva Convention and guaranteeing such things as neutral inspection of POW camps, the release of sick and wounded, release of mail, and fair and proper treatment of all prisoners.

These wives have had no mail, no direct word from their husbands since the beginning of the Paris peace talks.

"My husband has been missing in action for 22 months. His plane was shot down over North Vietnam and he is supposedly a prisoner of war," says the Dakota Midland woman who sent a cablegram bound for Paris in June.

She is Mrs. Charles Lane, whose husband is a pilot in the Air Force, and from whom she has had no direct word since his plane was downed by a MIG.

She and other POW wives over the country are sending the cablegrams (enough have been arranged to keep going through September), and requesting newspapers to publish editorials and stories to try to bring about North Vietnam's observance of Geneva Convention rulings in dealing with prisoners of war in that land.

"We hope that through the cablegrams, editorials and artcles in newspapers and magazines. North Vietnam might respond to evidence that the free world feels that a respectable government in the world community should treat its prisoners of war humanely, and abide by the Geneva rulings in relation to treatment of war prisoners," says Mrs. Lane.

This concerted effort by POW wives over the country started in March in California. A POW wife hadn't received a Christmas letter from her husband, as she had in former years. She decided to send a cablegram to Paris, and asked her friends to do likewise, and to ask their friends to join in.

So it was that this California start was brought to the attention of a Pennsylvania friend of Mrs. Lane. That friend wrote to Mrs. Lane.

The cable message program continues, and so does the group's plea to others to bring pressure on "the powers that be" to help the POW's plight.

It was after Secretary of Defense Laird made his appeal to North Vietnam that the women started their requests to newspapers on the local, national and international levels, and their pleas to others to join in their efforts.

"No one wants war," she asserts. "I'm a loyal American, and I hope President Nixon can solve the Vietnam problems. But we can't leave until the South Vietnam government is strong enough to carry on against Communism."

Patriotism to Mrs. Lane has been a natural part of growing up. "It starts in the home. It's the responsibility of the parents to teach it."

She is proud to be patriotic. She is proud that President Nixon praised South Dakota students in his recent talk at Madison, said he was glad to see that these Midwestern young people consider education a privilege, and that it is good to see both parents and students working to further their educational opportunities. But she thinks the student protesters in other parts of the U.S. have done more harm than good, especially in regards to goals of peace.

"President Nixon is going to bring my Daddy home," expresses the hope of the Lanes' two little daughters, Julie, who is 3½, and JoAnne, to be 2 in July. In fact, an American-News clipping which included Nixon's picture was about in shreds by the time Julie had carried it around for several weeks and told friends about her hopes for Daddy's return.

The little girls keep Mom well occupied. "A lot of our time is spent at the parks," she says. A lot is spent in playing games, working with jig-saw puzzles for tots, and story hours. Mrs. Lane isn't working—outside her home, that is—for she feels that with the girls' Daddy gone, "they would be cheated with a part-time mother."

The three were having a good time together Wednesday afternoon, the day that storm clouds and sunshine kept playing tag in the sky, and trips outdoors to play in the sun resulted in a return of rain and wet clothes for the girls. "Yes, they keep me busy, especially on rainy days," laughs this pretty young mother of two sweet little girls.

A RETURN TO THE THREE R'S ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I was particularly struck by a commencement address given at Wagner College on June 1, 1969, by Francis H. Horn, president, the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities of the State of New York. Dr. Horn was also president of the University of Rhode Island, Kingston, R.I., where he did an outstanding job.

Dr. Horn spoke of campus unrest and relates this all-pervading subject to the role and status of the smaller private institutions. I was also especially interested in a sentence of Dr. Horn's where he stated:

I do, however, want to urge the necessity of a return to the three R's on the college campus. These collegiate three R's are respect, responsibility, and rationality.

Perhaps if both students and school administrators took heed of Dr. Horn's address they would find it most beneficial.

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

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

NEEDED ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS: A RETURN TO THE THREE R'S

(By Dr. Francis H. Horn)

It is a pleasure to be here at these commencement exercises on this lovely hilltop campus, just a short ferry ride from downtown Manhattan, or a quick trip across the Verrazano Bridge to the center of Brooklyn, yet seemingly so remote from the hurly-burly, the tensions, and the crushing problems of metropolitan New York. You Wagner graduates are fortunate in having spent your college years here in an almost bucolic environment, yet close enough to the big city to enable you to share its educational and cultural advantages, to participate in its bustle and movement, and to feel a part of its all-pervasive dynamism. In effect, you have had the best of two worlds and the

thought of giving up this pleasant life, of terminating your Wagner experience, must temper the joy you feel at receiving your degrees today.

But commencement is a time to be happy and I appreciate the opportunity to share with you graduates and your families and friends the satisfaction of this occasion. It is an important and memorable event in your lives, but with the joy you feel that you have finally "made it" must go thankfulness to Almighty God and a commitment to use your education in His service and that of your fellowmen.

I need scarcely remind you graduates how proud your parents are today and how much you owe to them, many of whom have made sacrifices to enable you to enjoy the advantages of a college education. You owe much also to your professors, who have helped you lay the foundation for your further education or your occupational career. For them, your teachers, and for myself, I congratulate you warmly on your graduation today.

It is always a pleasure for me to participate in commencement exercises. I delivered a commencement address last night in Syracuse (It was quite different from this one) and I have two more to go, one of them, incidentally, in Las Vegas! But I am especially pleased to have been invited by your president to come to Wagner today. Dr. Davidson is an old friend. In addition, he was a member of the Commission on Independent Colleges and Universities when it brought me back to New York from Rhode Island to be its president. I have enjoyed working with Dr. Davidson and have learned to admire and respect his sound professional competence and his high personal integrity. Wagner is fortunate that at this time of crisis in American higher education, it has Arthur Davidson as its president.

Because of my position as a spokesman for the private sector of higher education, I want to say a word about the importance of preserving in this country its dual system of public and private colleges and universities. Fortunately, both the Governor and the legislature in New York have demonstrated that they want this states to continue its strong dual system. Governor Rockefeller, a year ago, after commenting on the phenomenal growth of the State university, declared "we must also have vigorous private colleges and universities standing alongside our public system. For our private institutions have special qualities that are irreplaceable and must be preserved."

The Governor had acted on that conviction two years ago, when in conjunction with the Board of Regents, he appointed the Select Committee on the Future of Private and Independent Higher Education in New York State, headed by Ford Foundation President McGeorge Bundy. The Governor charged the Committee to advise "how the state can help preserve the strength and vitality of our private and independent institutions of higher education, yet at the same time keep them free." The Committee, as you know, concluded that these objectives could best be met by a program of direct State aid to institutions of higher education, including when constitutionally possible, the church-related institutions like Wagner. The Governor then submitted bills, backed by the Board of Regents, to implement the recommendations of the Bundy Committee. A year ago the legislation establishing the principle of State support for private higher education became law. This year's legislature appropriated over $20,000,000 for this support. In addition, the legislature passed a bill making the church-related colleges eligible for such aid. The Governor's action on this bill is not yet known, but our Commission urged his approval. The Bundy Committee made a strong and thoroughly convincing case for including the church-related institutions, Catholic and Protestant—although, obviously, not the theological seminaries—in the state-aid program. Colleges like Wagner serve the public interest just as do branches of the State University or of City University. Soon, it is hoped, these colleges will benefit from the program of state assistance to private institutions.

If by any chance, however, church-related colleges like Wagner do not become eligible for direct state aid, they should not, in my opinion, so modify their legal and organizational structure in order to qualify as a nonsectarian institution that they repudiate their religious orientation and perhaps compromise their basic Christian character. One Lutheran College in New York State has already officially severed its connection with the Church. I am not criticizing the College's decision; but I believe it would be a great loss for American higher education if similar action were taken by many other church-related colleges—Catholic or Protestant.

Many colleges founded as church colleges have become non-denominational and nonsectarian, including my own alma mater, Dartmouth, where President Davidson was a professor for some years. But something important has disappeared in the process: the positive cultivation of moral and spiritual values, the encouragement of a religious commitment.

In an avowedly church-related college like Wagner, there is a definite emphasis, as your catalogue states, on quickening "the student's understanding of Christian beliefs and values," and on encouraging "the growth of religious convictions." I do not argue for a narrow sectarianism, intolerant or neglectful of other points of view or perhaps limiting faculty and students to adherents of one religious creed or denomination. But I do argue that our system of higher education will be much the poorer if we do not have a fair number of church-related colleges where the commitment to Christian values is emphasized and significant.

Convinced as I am of the importance of the Christian College, I believe that the sponsoring churches should strengthen their ties to their colleges, increase their financial support—alas, in all too many cases today, a mere pittance of what should be supplied, and take such other positive steps as will assist the institutions in making their Christian emphasis a meaningful and inspiring influence on the campus.

This, it seems to me, is especially important in these days of the confusion and change and discontent that surround the lives of all of us, but which effect the young most of all. Not only are our traditional values under attack, especially by college students, but also by many of their teachers as well, but indeed all of society, our whole way of life, seems threatened by the more militant activists in our colleges and universities. One is shocked by the resort to violence—in our cities but especially on our campuses. I want to devote the rest of these remarks this afternoon to some observations about the student revolt, noting, incidentally, that the trouble is not exclusively a revolt of our college students, but involves a minority of the faculty, though like the student radicals, a very active minority. It is somewhat surprising, in my opinion, that the growing public disenchantment with colleges and universities seems directed almost exclusively at the students. It is seldom aimed at the militant faculty members for whom the rejection of rational action is a repudiation of their professional commitment to things of the mind. In the long run, I am persuaded, higher education may suffer more deeply from the irresponsibility and tactics of faculties than from the demands and the destruction of students. In any case, it is imperative that the violence be stopped and the campus returned to what it is intended to be—a place of teaching and learning.

Violence is not, as Rap Brown and the Black Panthers are saying, "as American as cherry pie." If it is true, as a leader of the Panthers said last Sunday in a church in my neighborhood, "power comes from the barrel of a gun" and "you put a .38 on your hip and you get respect," and people act on that theory, then our society is as surely doomed as if someone dropped a nuclear bomb. A year ago this week when Senator Robert Kennedy was dead, a victim of gun power, President Johnson pleaded in a nationwide television address: "So let us—for God's sake—resolve to live under the law. Let us put an end to violence and the preaching of violence."

We must begin on the campuses, for it is the colleges and universities which have stood for many centuries as the citadels of reason, for the very opposite of emotion and passion which erupt into violence. The SDS and other militants are right, given their assumptions, in attacking the Establishment through institutions of higher education. If they can bring down the colleges and universities, the collapse of society is inevitable. I was appalled a year ago when in a commencement address, historian Will Durant cautioned educators not to become unduly alarmed over campus turbulence, which he referred to as just the "measles of intellectual growth."

The past year has been the most turmoil-filled in the whole history of American higher education. Serious violence has occurred at dozens of institutions. In one two-week period last month, over 200 fires broke out, apparently set, in New York City colleges and universities. Institutions have been closed by violence or to avoid violence and thousands of students denied the instruction they came to college to get.

If this violence is not curbed, and the campuses brought under control—and that quickly—the damage to higher education and ultimately to society may be irreparable. Professor Sidney Hook of N.Y.U., a noted radical over the years, has pointed out that "When black students and SDS radicals use the same methods Nazi students employed to destroy the Weimar Republic and trample into the dust traditional ideals of academic freedom, then no matter how different their rhetoric may be, fundamentally both are enemies of the rational process and of those values of civilization which have developed over the centuries against the forces of obscurantism and barbarism."

It is apparent that if the colleges and universities do not put their houses in order, outside forces will try to do it for them. Legislatures and the Congress have already moved not only to penalize students involved in campus violence, but also to take punitive measures against the institutions. Alumni and friends of higher education are curtailing, or threatening to curtail their financial support if the disturbances are not stopped. If student revolt continues as it has this past year, I am convinced that the American public will increasingly deny the support and the freedom which are essential to the health and vitality of American higher education.

What must we do if we are to avoid catastrophe? It is not my purpose to analyze the causes of today's student unrest. Nor do I intend to expound my views that students must be involved more directly in the affairs of alma mater without turning the control or operation of the institution over to them. I do, however, want to urge the necessity of a return to the three R's on the college campus. These collegiate three R's are respect, responsibility, and rationality.

All in the academic community must reestablish respect for one another. We elders must learn to respect our students, to try to understand them, and to work with them to improve our educational institutions and our society in general. Conversely, you of the younger generation must learn to respect us of the older generation. You must recognize

that those of us over thirty are not all hypocritical, venal self-seekers, that we have learned some useful and practical things from experience, that some of us at least have acquired a little wisdom about life that is worth heeding, and that we too have hopes and ideals and are committed to a better world for all individuals and all nations. Somehow we must find through mutual respect the means to bridge the generation gap and to join forces to work for the better world which we all desire.

In this process, we must recognize the need to treat others with the respect we expect others to show to us. Shouting obscenities, shoving speakers from the microphone, refusing to hear out someone with whom one disagrees, carrying people bodily from their offices—such rudeness and incivility are to be deplored and hopefully will soon disappear from the college scene. This is not to inhibit freedom of speech and dissent or the right of peaceful protest. It is to eschew the barbarities that characterize too many campus confrontations.

We also need to re-establish a sense of responsibility, not only on the part of student, but also on the part of faculties and administrations. Too many institutions of higher education have neglected their responsibility to their students, especially the responsibility for good teaching. If our students had enjoyed better teaching, we would hear much less about the relevancy of the curriculum—since a good teacher makes any subject relevant to his students—and have much less student discontent capable of being whipped up into violence.

But on the student side there has also been a serious lack of responsibility. There is too little concern for the rights of other students, or, indeed for the rights of faculty to teach undisturbed by hecklers, for example. The ruthless and senseless detruction of college property is nothing short of criminal. Such destruction serves no useful purpose—it is not a case of property having priority over human need. It is especially difficult to understand what motivates students to destroy a professor's notes, burn a dean's correspondence, overturn library card catalogues, set fire to the library itself. Last month a fire set at the Indiana University graduate library destroyed books valued at $600,000. The breaking of windows and similar vandalism are bad enough; the destruction of scholarly or historical material is the work of savages and its perpetrators have no place in an institution of higher learning. It is time for the academic community to regain its sense of responsibility.

And finally, there must be a return to rationality, to the process of reason. Today's student generation increasingly repudiates reason. There was a time, Robert Hutchins has said, when "rational living was the goal of life." This no longer is a goal of the young. They are suspicious of reason unless, as one N.Y. *Times* commentator put it, it is "adorned with emotion's clappings." They believe one must feel and act before one thinks. Typical is the reported statement of a Stanford student leader: "It's time we stopped thinking and started feeling." Sincerity, not rationality has become the goal.

But this way lies catastrophe. In his recent inaugural address at the University of Chicago, President Edward Levi warned: "We should reaffirm our commitment to the way of reason, without which a university becomes a menace and a caricature." And Professor Arthur Schlesinger recently said, "I can imagine nothing worse for our society than a rejection of reasoned analysis by the young. In the long run," he wrote in an important little book on violence, "any sane society must rest on freedom and reason. If we abandon this, we abandon everything."

If somehow in the year or years ahead we can on our campuses reestablish the rule of reason and restore law and order—and I realize the unhappy visions of George Wallace and Mayor Daley's police that the phrase conjures up—there is a greater likelihood that we can begin to rebuild our society, which seems to be falling apart. It will not be easy. Campus violence has seeped into high schools and even into the junior highs. The tactics of disruption and revolt are being learned all too well by our adolescents, and the SDS is actively working to teach them its tactics. The eighteen-year-old chairman of the New York Afro-American Students Association (a high-school group) recently stated: "If you think there are militant people in the high schools, you've seen nothing until you've seen the 11- and 12-year-olds in the next few years."

The outlook is terrifying. Unless ways are found to reverse this trend toward violence—to return our students—and our faculties as well—to respect, responsibility, and rationality—the future is as bleak as if, as I have said, someone triggered us into nuclear war. I wish I had the formula for bringing order and peace, and the freedom to teach and to learn, back into our colleges and universities. I do know that it must somehow be found—and soon.

I also know that students must be involved in finding the answer. I am convinced, moreover, that the voting age must be reduced to eighteen, so that our young people can make their influence felt through normal democratic channels. Unquestionably, some of the demonstrations and rioting that have occurred on campuses springs from youth's frustrations at their inability under existing political circumstances to influence policy on the war in Vietnam and the lack of war on poverty and racism here at home. Giving young people the vote might substantially decrease their recourse to riot and violence. The participation of college students in the McCarthy and Bobby Kennedy campaigns prior to the last election demonstrates their eagerness to work for the improvement of society through establishd political channels.

In any case, I know that discouraged as we elders may be about our present-day students, they are our sons and daughters, and the students whom we have taught, and the shape of tomorrow's world lies with them, with young people like you graduates. In many respects you graduates are smarter than our generation, and better prepared than we were to take your places in society. In addition, you have a greater opportunity than any previous generation to make this a better world. The world could be on the threshold of its greatest development in recorded history. Soon men will set foot on the moon and in the 80's, on Mars; they will also set up housekeeping on the ocean floor. Man holds within his grasp the possibility of ending everywhere the age-old scourges of hunger, disease and war. Given individuals with the intelligence and good will and moral courage to bring it about, the world can, with Divine help, achieve a new era of peace and prosperity and justice such as it has hitherto never known.

So it's an exciting time to be graduating from college. It's exciting because the future, despite my pessimistic observations on violence, which will, I know, eventually be overcome, holds out great promise for you. It is a future needing and demanding as never before, your talents and your energies and your dedication to something bigger than yourself. You enjoy unusual opportunities for service and achievement and happiness. So I congratulate you again upon your graduation today and urge you to remain true to the high ideals and the Christian commitment you have experienced here at Wagner. I wish you good luck and Godspeed in whatever lies ahead for you.

REPORT TO TEXANS ON THE AMERICAN FOLKLIFE FOUNDATION BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Richardson, Tex., Daily News of June 23, 1969, carried my report to my fellow Texans on S. 1591, a bill to create an American Folklife Foundation, which I have introduced in this Congress. This article sets forth my reasons for introducing this proposal. I hope my colleagues in the Senate will support the measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Senator Yarborough's Newsletter," from the Richardson, Tex., Daily News of June 23, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATOR YARBOROUGH'S NEWSLETTER

We in the United States are fortunate to stand in the midst of a vast and varied cultural heritage. Not only does each American enjoy the distinctive ways of his family, his ethnic group, his region and occupation which comprise his personal folk culture, but he also shares with all Americans a common body of customs and traditions.

This folk culture—the folk tales, the folk songs, the dances, the art forms, the legends and traditions—have been passed on from generation to generation with very few attempts to bring all the folk culture of any group together in one collection.

The tragedy of this situation is that much of the folkcustoms and culture has been lost. As each year goes by we are in danger of losing even more and those that study folklore now say that a greater danger is the threat of radio and television taking it and changing it into something else so that our true folkculture is lost.

This country has depended on private citizens to preserve the quality of folk culture for us. All Americans owe a great debt to men like Carl Sandburg and to our own fellow Texans John and Allan Lomax, Walter Prescott Webb, J. Frank Dobie, and Roy Bedichek. We are thankful for the contributions of these men, but we need to do something more to insure that our folkculture is saved and not lost from us. We must do more than depend on the work of a few individuals. Just as Texas, with its varied ethnic and cultural background, as a great body of folklore, so Texas has produced some of the greatest folklore in America. The legends of the land and its people, the cowboy ballads, the Negro spirituals, the country music, the Mexican corrido, all are worthy of preservation.

It was with this in mind that I introduced in the Senate a bill to establish an American Folklife Foundation. This Foundation will be an agency of the Smithsonian Institution.

This Folklife Foundation will sponsor programs of research and scholarship in American folklife. It will make grants and award scholarships for the study and preservation of American folkculture.

The Smithsonian Institution was the first to endorse this bill. Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, secretary of the Smithsonian, said, "There is much to be done in this country in the area of American folk tradition, through both study and public presentation, and these Senator Yarborough's bill will certainly encourage."

When Allan Lomax heard of the bill, he sent a telegram to me saying that he was proud that it was a fellow Texan who introduced the bill, the first bill in Congress to establish the American Folklife Foundation. Mr. Lomax expressed his concern that with-

out the support of the federal government, and the platforms the Folklife Foundation would provide that we are in danger of losing much of the cultural treasure of this nation.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JUDAISM AND OTHER RELIGIONS IN THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, although antireligious, the Soviet Union does guarantee through its laws certain rights to religious groups within its borders and does permit certain practices. However, to Soviet citizens the Jewish faith is denied rights and practices permitted other religions within the U.S.S.R.

There has been compiled a comparison of the status of Judaism and the Soviet's other religious faiths and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN JUDAISM AND OTHER RELIGIONS IN THE U.S.S.R.

Judaism: No central organization, no federation of congregations.

Other religions: The Russian Orthodox Church, the Greek Orthodox Church, Islam, Buddhism, each have central coordinating bodies.

Judaism: No kinds of communication permitted among the various Jewish communities in the USSR.

Other religions: Legally authorized to convoke congresses and conference of clergy and lay representatives.

Judaism: Not a single religious publication is authorized.

Other religions: The Russian Orthodox Church publishes an official *Review of the Patriarchate of Moscow*, which emanates from the highest body of its hierarchy. It also publishes religious texts. The same is true for Islam.

Judaism: No Hebrew Bible authorized since 1917.

Other religions: The Bible in Russian, of which a first edition was published in 1926 for the Russian Orthodox Church, was reprinted in 1957. Another Bible in Russian was published for Baptists. The Koran was published for Muslims in 1958.

Judaism: No edition of *Siddur* between 1917 and 1955. In 1956, a single printing of 3000 copies was published.

Other religions: Relatively large quantities are available for the various religions.

Judaism: No government aid.

Other religions: The government makes publishing houses and paper available.

Judaism: Manufacture of prayer shawls, phylacteries, matzo is practically forbidden.

Other religions: Permitted to produce the entire gamut of ritual objects—candles, crucifixes, rosaries, etc.

Judaism: One synagogue and one rabbi for each 25,000 worshippers. (Based on estimate made in 1960; since then, the number of synagogues and rabbis has declined.

Other religions: One church for each 1800 practicing Orthodox, one priest for each 1100 practicing Orthodox, one church and one minister for each 500 Baptists.

Judaism: A single so-called yeshiva in Moscow, with four students.

Other religions: The Orthodox Church has two Academies and eight seminaries. Islam has four training centers.

Judaism: No foreign contacts permitted.

Other religions: Moslem students study in El-Azhar in Cairo; Baptists in Great Britain. The Russian Orthodox Church is affiliated with the Ecumenical Council of Churches and has sent observers to the Council.

VIOLENCE IS NOT THE ANSWER

Mr. HART. Mr. President, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the NAACP, has been the source of courageous and sound counsel for the community of America for many years. His address on March 11, 1969, delivered at the National Conference on the Church and Violence, at Atlanta, is a clear case in point. That many more than were in attendance at Atlanta may have the opportunity to hear Mr. Wilkins, I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIOLENCE IS NOT THE ANSWER*

(By Roy Wilkins)

Despite the concessions being made in this uneasy season to advocates and practitioners of violence to compel change in race relations in this country, the fact remains that violence as a weapon, as a technique, as a major instrument of social change, is not the weapon of success.

There is a kind of embarrassment in maintaining this position because our political officeholders and lately our educators, have been vying with one another in yielding to naked threats of violence and acts of not only aggression, but of destruction. Even our churchmen, caught up in their religious tenets, have rationalized the bowing to a stick-up type of "demand." The popular excuse with all of these has been the umbrella contention of deprivation.

Their capitulation has been all the more remarkable when it is remembered that every important poll of public opinion—*Fortune*, CBS, Harris, Gallup, *Newsweek*—has shown the black extremists to be but a tiny minority of the total Negro population. The polls reveals, too, that a goodly percentage of young people under 30 believe progress is being made and want to go on for better schools, better jobs and better neighborhoods.

It is true that the Negro American has been crassly deprived of his rights and opportunities in a deliberate and systematic fashion for decades and generations. He has been exploited, robbed, beaten and killed. Politically he was long disfranchised and left defenseless in the society of his fellows.

This political disfranchisement made it much easier to limit his employment and income. It facilitated his being herded into ghetto compounds with all the denials of municipal services and privileges enjoyed by others. It left him prey to the maladministration of the law and to whimsical interpretations of his citizenship under the Constitution of the United States. Above all, it put him and his children completely at the mercy of an inferior Jim Crow school system.

A great part (but by no means all) of the present-day agitation on the school front is the result of this massive cheating on schooling. The young black opportunists of the day, spanning the period from the tenth grade through the graduate school, feel justified in demanding all the conditions that will guarantee their not being cheated as were their forebears. They are, therefore, insisting on new rules, on shortcuts, on key control spots and on a variety of other standards and procedures which not only will protect them in their advancement, but will actually insure their preferential status.

In their attempt to secure this status, which they regard as a mere evening of the score to make up for past inequities, they do not rule out the use of violence. According to reports which, understandably, are hard to verify through the mouths of the people most closely concerned, they have used threats of immediate physical assault.

The blunt, abrasive, revolutionary action of young black people is stimulated primarily by the treatment accorded their race by the dominant majority population, certainly over the past 100 years after slavery was supposedly abolished and citizenship instituted. But it stems, also, from the worldwide upheavals of youth in every land against the old rules, the old mores, the old moral values—against the Establishment. Except in some areas of calculation, young black Americans are not very different from the youth of any other origin.

It is in these areas of calculation of their chances of achieving their goals that the Achilles' heel of the black movement seems to lie. Unlike the Negro of the Reconstruction period and of the post-Reconstruction era, the young blacks today choose to ignore in their campaign plotting the inescapable fact that they are a very small numerical minority, unlike their kinsmen in the Congo or Nigeria or Senegal or Kenya or Trinidad or Jamaica.

This numerical position, this powerlessness, is enough to influence sound planning by any sound leadership. When there is added to this the political disfranchisement and fragmentation, even where there is little or no disfranchisement, the economic throttling, the hobbling in public education and the pervasive social ostracism rigidly imposed, the realities (which are, in truth and not merely rhetorically, hard) make it imperative that black folk, in planning for effective ethnic group advancement, plot a course which a minority so situated can profitably pursue.

The Negro American has been severely limited in employment, being confined to "Negro jobs" and Negro pay rates in the South, with similar, but less harshly labeled, policies in effect in the North. White collar jobs have been rare. Exclusion from organized labor has been either unequivocal and in writing or equivocal, laced with trickery, double talk and meager, highly restricted job opportunities. Farm and home ownership were undertaken at considerably more than the usual peril, with color bonuses, high interest rates, technical fine print and even nightrides all a part of the high-risk enterprise.

It is a soft indictment, indeed, to classify public education as discouraging. The statistics on funds spent per capita for the education of white and black children in the Southern states in 1900, 1910 and 1920 make one weep. There were heartbreaking differences in the length of the school years, in educational facilities, and in teaching standards.

These differences make one shudder today at the boycotts, school closings, strikes and shutdowns of one kind or another in our schools: for the payoff results are not in the heady confrontations and dialogues of the day, but in the glaring inadequacies that will be manifest 30 years from now.

The pressing, life-and-death condition faced by the Negro American was in the maladministration of justice. He was in plantation peonage, subject to a judicial machinery which he neither created nor influenced. If he could get as high as the United States Supreme Court, he found there the precedent of "separate-but-equal" constitutionality, set in 1896 in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, blocking his way. He was encircled with segregation boundaries in Northern cities and widely barred from public accommodations there. Worst of all, the ultimate in physical intimidation was his lot: he was lynched and

*Adapted from an address delivered at the National Conference on the Church of Violence sponsored by the Interdenominational Theological Center, Atlanta, March 11, 1969.

for decades and decades no man was arrested or tried for this crime.

So the NAACP dealt with the hard and bloody realities. We took the long, slow road that led to strength and growth and survival of both white and black populations. It took 30 years to turn the tide against lynching. With the help of World War I, migration to the North was stimulated and the base was laid for the black political strength that came later. This strength battered at the doors of proscription through the use of the ballot to build representation in Washington and in the city halls and state houses of the North.

With the rise of industrial unionism in the Thirties, organized labor, the toughest nut, was cracked. Today the battle is not by any means won. The access to, and upward mobility in, the unions is as yet only partially achieved, but the progress is definitely there. White collar and technical work is here today for the taking, in both the North and the South.

In public education racial segregation has been declared unconstitutional. What we worked for day and night since the enthronement of the iniquitous *Plessy* doctrine has come to pass: the Negro American has come under the umbrella of mandatory—not permissive—constitutional protection. The way is now open for him to finish the task of achieving citizenship.

When we look back on the sixty-odd years of uphill struggle against the *Plessy* doctrine of racial segregation and inequality, the performance of young blacks today is at best disquieting. The ultimate objective enters in, of course. Are we for reform of the present system or are we for the destruction of it? There is little doubt that the overwhelming majority of Negro Americans is for reform. It wants in, not out. It wants to build, perhaps on an altered pattern, but it does not wish to destroy. The young people who do destroy are certainly not listening to their elders. They are not even listening to their fellow students. In fact, in seeking an all-black society, they are running from the hard competition with other groups. They prefer the comfort of their familiar segregation.

Whatever has been accomplished has been through non-violence. This tack did not require the meek turning of the other cheek. It required an inner conviction of the rightness of the cause, a sense of the dignity of the human person, a fierce determination to hold the nation to its tenet of individual freedom, and a dedication to the use of any weapon of persuasion and competition in the democratic arsenal that was suited to the task at hand.

There is a popular but mistaken notion today that hard and insulting talk, profanity, obscenity and some of the most obscure tortuous and fallacious reasoning in all literature constitutes militancy. Nothing could be farther from the truth. True militancy consists of the pressing of a righteous cause with all suitable weapons and with due regard for the strength of the attackers, the terrain and the strength and deployment of opposing forces.

No general worth his salt would send his men, armed with swords, against a regiment armed with rifles and machine guns. Nor would a general plunge his army forward with its flanks exposed.

The preachers of violent action on the race relations front are hypnotized with the concept of guerrilla warfare. Perhaps they have to be thus mesmerized since they are so few in number among the 22 millions of black Americans. But the guerrilla tactics and the guerrilla mentality can cause only harassment, frustration and eventually the iron control that seems to be the objective of certain provocative leaders. Alone, they can win only skirmishes, not wars.

Negro Americans are not afraid of conflict. A people with a history like ours, going back to the slave rebellions and running up to the bruising encounters of yesterday cannot be branded cowardly simply because it refuses to adopt suicidal methods. We have overcome obstacles and forged ahead in situations that the black militants of today meet only with four-letter words, childish tearing up of schools and the naked (and simple) threat of assault.

The violence of our times has underscored with shock, and sometimes with blood, the glaring inequities that still exist. This is helpful and the exposure, in frank language, has won approval from millions of blacks who are nonviolent. Abrasive and even violent confrontation, however, cannot solve a problem; they can only uncover the festering. They must leave to the scalpels and the drugs and the skills of the non-violent the corrections and cures in social maladjustment.

The church is the ideal agency to make an evaluation, for it has passed through many cycles in its ministry to mankind. The debate is still proceeding on birth control, on social involvement, on forms of worship. Catholics, Protestants and Jews are caught up in this struggle.

But one thing is certain from any history of religious thought: violence was unable to destroy it. The Jewish faith has survived and grown stronger through thousands of years of persecution. The lions and the gladiators did not halt the growth of the young Christian church. Violence could submerge, but not crush a faith, a belief, a love that often failed, but more often succeeded, in including all men.

Today there is a tendency to deplore all aspects of militancy. In the on-going battle for life and growth this does not seem the wise course.

Assuming a unity on the goal of reforming this faulty society, there should be a working unity between the militants and the rest of the ethnic group. All organizations, institutions and individuals over 30 years of age are not evil and useless, just as all people under 30 are not wild men.

There is much to be done where the knowledge, ingenuity, fresh approach and, above all, energy of our youth can be of vital service in advancing the cause. We need voter registration and voting to build the political machinery that will bring about change. We need improvements in welfare and health services, in the entire education system.

We need to build our own racial inner strength through a knowledge of our history and a preparation, through excellence, of our young people for service. There are but two black lawyers in Mississippi. Our doctors and dentists are fading away. We need tens of thousands of retailers and thousands of entrepreneurs.

And we need these if we are to live in a world—not a black world or a white world, but the world of today. It is silly to disdain the training for life on the ground of some alleged mystique of skin color.

Let there be a partnership in mutual respect between all our people and let us go forward at a time when all systems, as the astronauts say, are go!

We can and do deplore the excess of militancy. We condemn the dogmatism and cruelty that accompany slavish service to a doctrinaire, impersonal philosophy or procedure. The people and institutions that the rampaging young people so sweepingly condemn may contain a few slothful ones, or some sickeningly subservient ones who raise not even a whimper of protest, but the vast majority is composed of warriors-with-a-purpose, of men and women who want to go somewhere and, importantly, who want others to go with them.

This is the kernel of the militancy of free men, whether they be white or black: to want genuinely for others to benefit also. For this reason, the exclusion of white people from the Fight for Freedom is cruel idiocy. Inherent in this desire is the dedication to a change in the operation of society so that all may benefit. And inherent in this latter is the realization that social changes do not occur among masses of humanity overnight.

Fifty years after the October Revolution the Soviet Union is still imperfect, still changing. After 900 years, Britain is still seeking change. After more than 5,000 years and many changes, China has changed again. After nearly 200 years, our young country is challenging some of its practices.

Militant, truly radical, unrelenting and uncompromising pressure for social change is the way to life and growth. For a minority, violence, whose handmaidens are death and destruction, is only a reprieve on the way to suicide.

THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION OF THE ORDER OF DEMOLAY

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, last Friday, the Fourth of July in Kansas City, it was my privilege to address the 50th anniversary commemoration of the Order of DeMolay. It was a real thrill to stand before those young men who so completely challenge the popular idea that the youth of this country is no good. It is refreshing, as it always is, to visit with these exemplary young groups.

I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARRY GOLDWATER, OF ARIZONA, TO THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION OF THE ORDER OF DEMOLAY'S, KANSAS CITY, MO., JULY 4, 1969

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests and members of the Order of DeMolay's: It is an extreme honor for me to be with you here today on the 50th anniversary of your fine order and on our Nation's day of Independence.

I fully realize that in light of today's current events involving campus disorders and protest demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, the U.S. Selective Service System, the ROTC, etc., it is more or less expected of public officials when speaking to a group of younger Americans to dwell on these developments.

When Henry Dormann, the Executive Vice Chairman of your International Supreme Order, asked me to make this address he emphasized that I would be speaking to several thousand young men between the ages of 14 and 21 and he added this very significant sentence:

"These are the young men who don't rip up draft cards, who don't riot and who are interested in getting a fine education and leading exemplary lives."

I naturally have always known about the fine caliber of young men which the DeMolay's attract. And I just want to say that Mr. Dormann's description places you young men among the vast majority of this nation's youth. I know the radicals, the SDS and all the rest of the agitators and protesters gain so many headlines and so much attention that it is easy to confuse their actions and their attitudes with those of American youth generally. And I am here to say that if there is one thing that I do almost constantly is travel throughout this country talking to young people in colleges, universities and high schools. And I can tell you that the vast

majority of the young people I meet today are serious, dedicated, patriotic and well-behaved members of our society.

This isn't to say that I don't have strong views on the activities which have turned many of our seats of learning into virtual battlegrounds. I do have strong opinions but these have been aired many times and I believe that we have, over the recent Commencement period, had an adequate flow of oratory and expression about these events.

In another vein, I realize that public speakers—especially members of the United States Senate—are more or less expected to fashion any remarks they might make on this particular date in our history in a patriotic vein usually referred to as "flag-waving." I hope you will understand well that I am not against such rhetorical exercises on the anniversary date of our freedom. On the contrary, I believe in these days of super-sophistication that we could use much more of the kind of spread-eagle, arm waving appeals to flag and country that marked most observances of July 4 in the earlier years of this century. It has concerned and worried me that many of our young people in the days of liberalism's greatest advances began to feel that appeals to our patriotic senses were somehow outdated and "square." It is my considered opinion that bombast has a very definite purpose to serve when the subject is the celebration of those precious freedoms which were handed down to us on this day in history some 200 years ago.

Today, if I may, I should like to discuss with you the overall situation in which this free nation finds itself today in the world community. This has a very direct bearing on our continued independence. I don't mean to suggest that events are transpiring which might overnight overturn our independence and our freedoms and reduce us to slavery. However, I do want to discuss with you a situation which could easily and in the near future place our own liberty and the independence of the entire free world in more jeopardy than it has ever before known.

I am sure you have all heard the great hue and cry which is presently being raised against the so-called military industrial complex. This campaign has reached such a level of intensity that it becomes more difficult every day to place this nation's security and its defense effort in proper perspective.

The attack on the so-called military-industrial complex is very plainly an attack on the American defense system itself. For none of the critics of the MIC have ever suggested or proposed that it could be replaced. These critics have made a big thing out of semantics. They have given a name to a system of corporations, companies and suppliers and added it to the defense establishment of this nation made up of the Army, Navy and Air Force. They have made every attempt to invest this very necessary system of independently run companies and services with an implied evil. They would have you think that if what they call the military-industrial complex could be abolished there would be no war in Vietnam or threat of war in the future.

Unfortunately, they made no reference to military-industrial complexes that exist in the Soviet Union and Communist China. They rarely mention the fact that without the complex they complain about we would today be a third rate nation at the very best. They don't share with their listeners the plain fact that the MIC is the only thing that enable this nation to maintain a level of strength sufficient to defend western Europe while it rehabilitated itself after World War II. It is the only thing, of course, that enables this nation today to maintain its position of leadership in the free world. You have only to ask yourselves where we would stand "vis-a-vis" the Soviet Union and Red China if President Truman had accepted the advice of the scientific Left Wing in this country and refused to develop the H bomb. It is easy also to understand what a subservient role we could be cast in today if our leaders had failed to go ahead with the development of the Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM). The same goes for almost every advance in military weaponry, from atomic submarines to the M–16 rifle. All of this is true enough and plain enough. Yet the critics of the American military system still believe that if we refuse to go ahead with necessary defense projects, our potential adversaries will somehow be shamed into doing likewise. This is a fine, idealistic concept which has no foundation in reality and is extremely dangerous to the security of this country.

Along these lines we are told, for example, that the way to reach an understanding with the Soviet Union on arms limitations is to refuse President Nixon's request for the Safeguard missile defense system. The argument overlooks the fact that the Russians already have an ABM system which is now in the third phase of deployment. It also ignores the fact that if the Safeguard system is defeated in Congress, the United States will be forced to escalate drastically the international arms race and begin erecting a gigantic nuclear capacity.

In this whole discussion of the ABM only one consideration can possibly be paramount and it is this: *That the safety of 200 million Americans is non-negotiable.*

Whether the ABM opponents and the critics of the MIC like it or not, this government—no matter what the political persuasion of its President may be—is entirely committed to defending the security of its population and the protection of its national strategic interests. If the Congress of the United States refuses to provide a defense for its deterrent capability, the only course left is to build an offensive force of ICBM's and multiple warheads so powerful that it will be able to overcome any type of a first strike attack.

The "doves" in the U.S. Senate will have to understand that they cannot have it both ways. They cannot force the rejection of a missile defense such as Safeguard unless they are willing to accept the concept of an expanded offense based on multiple warheads. If the American people are to enjoy a measure of military security, they must have one system or the other. To reject both Safeguard and MIRV would be an act of unilateral disarmament so stark that any potential enemy would regard it as an open invitation to move against us.

I suggest that the coming Senate battle over the ABM could well determine this nation's future course in world affairs forever. It could also have a drastic, long-term effect on our domestic needs.

Contrary to popular belief, the fact remains that the most expensive course open to the United States government would be guaranteed by Congressional rejection of the ABM. Those people who argue against the ABM by stating that its rejection would make additional billions available for sorely needed projects in our intercity areas are neglecting to consider the alternative. For if we don't have a missile defense, we must have an overpowering missile offense. And I can tell you from my experience on the Armed Services Committee that the cost of a defensive system would be far cheaper in the long run than the other alternative.

The American people have made it abundantly clear that they are in favor of President Nixon's Safeguard proposal. And I can assure you that those who do not favor it, do not base their objection on a desire for no defense. Many of the opponents of the ABM honestly believe that its cost would be prohibitive and its effectiveness would be doubtful. They haven't examined carefully the other side of the coin.

I should like to ask the opponents of the ABM this question: If you are opposed to the ABM and to the MIRV, how do you propose to protect the American people in future years?

I should also like to ask the opponents of ABM if they have any tangible reasons to believe that the Soviet Union is honestly interested in reaching an agreement with us based on a limitation of defensive and offensive military weapon systems?

I should like to call attention to a ten-part series of articles which have just concluded in the *Washington Post*. They are entitled "Russia Turns Back the Clock," and they tell a frightening story of the Soviet Union turning back to the bloody, anti-American policies which characterized the U.S.S.R. during the reign of Stalin.

I want to say to you that every bit of evidence which is coming out of the Soviet Union today—even that reported by such liberal newspapers as the *Washington Post*—tells the story of a different kind of Russia than the one that the ABM opponents and the Senate "doves" would like us to believe exists.

It tells the story of a nation reaching strenuously for world domination in all areas. It tells the story of a nation which has now extended its naval might into every ocean and strategic waterway in the world. It tells the story of a nation rushing expanded production of ICBMs and SS–9 missiles at a capacity rate. It tells the story of a nation which has moved into the power vacuum in the Middle East.

It tells the story of a nation which is planting its feet and preparing to move forcibly into any vacuum which may occur throughout the Western world by the withdrawal of American concern. I believe the masters of the Kremlin are counting heavily on the ABM opponents and the American "doves" to push their new-found policy on neo-isolationism to such an extent that a vast power vacuum will be created.

There can be no doubt that at a time when the U.S. is being urged to pull in its horns the Soviet Union has embarked on a bold gamble to dominate the world politically, militarily and psychologically. At the present time the major feature of this determined Communist thrust is the large and expanding Soviet naval strength. And I should like to take a few minutes here today to explore this one facet of increased Russian military activity. As I have pointed out there are many other phases but the development of naval strength marks a departure of sorts in the policy of the landlocked Soviet Union.

After years of steady buildup, the Soviet fleet is now moving to challenge U.S. supremacy in all major oceans and sea lanes. Its fleet in the Mediterranean is comprised of between 40 and 50 warships and is rapidly approaching the size of the U.S. 6th fleet which at one time held complete domination of this strategic area of the Middle East.

In addition, Soviet naval might has extended into the Indian Ocean where two large task forces have engaged in "showing the flag" while the British fleet makes plans to withdraw.

At the same time, the North Atlantic, the North Sea, the Baltic Sea, the Sea of Japan, the South China Sea, the Bearing Sea and all major sea routes in the Western Pacific have become regular cruising areas for Soviet warships.

The situation has recently led to these developments:

The Joint Atomic Energy Committee has warned President Nixon that unless the Administration speeds up its nuclear shipbuilding program the Soviet Union will soon dominate the seas of the world.

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, the U.S. Chief of Naval Operations, has warned that Soviet ocean operations are becoming "unmistak-

ably more aggressive, more varied and are being conducted at ever increasing distances from their home base."

Admiral George W. Anderson, Jr. (Ret.), former Chief of Naval Operations, warned that the meaning of increased Soviet sea power is an attempt at world domination. He explained that the Russians are striving for a posture which will make the principal nations of the world either accommodate or be subservient to the Soviet Union in matters that they consider of importance to them.

It is increasingly vital to American security to understand that as the Soviet Union becomes dominant on the waterways of the world, the United States will become dominated. In other words, with our present naval strength—which has been described as "the obsolescence, rust and decay of what is basically still a World War II fleet"—we are well on the way to becoming a second rate military power in the world.

The Russians, as Admiral Anderson points out, are not interested in a world of domination that would mean putting troops in New York or Washington or any other specific place around the world. Rather, they are reaching for a level of military and naval supremacy which will have the effect of making other nations accede to their strategic interests without having to resort to force.

For example, a Soviet-inspired Communist coup could threaten a Western power—say France, for the sake of assumption—and the threat of overwhelming Soviet military strength in that area of Europe could easily prevent NATO or other Western nations from coming to the rescue.

By controlling the waterways of the world, Russia could establish a supremacy comparable to that enjoyed by the English during the period known in history as "Pax Britannica." That era was one in which Britain held undisputed world supremacy through the mere maintenance of the most powerful navy ever seen. No nations in that period dared to challenge any policy or extend their own interests if either ran counter to British concerns.

This is the way a world can be dominated through fear—fear of what could happen rather than through the exercise of actual armed conquest.

Every report we receive these days from independent organizations, such as the British Institute for Strategic Studies and Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies, remind us that the hour is late and growing later.

And I want to caution you all on this very important fact: The condition that I have described here today could easily set the stage for the outbreak of World War III. The dynamics of this situation strongly indicate that if the United States pulls in its horns and covers itself in a type of neo-isolationism and the U.S.S.R. continues its policy of military advancement, World War III could easily become a contest between the Soviets and the Red Chinese. Because if we turn inward and default on our commitments the vacuum thus created will quickly be filled by the Soviet Union. She will then be in a position to exert undisputed world leadership. And this is something the Chinese Communists cannot permit to happen. We must begin to understand that Russia fears China more than she does the United States. By the same token China fears Russia more than she does the United States.

The ironic part of this is that if World War III should become a struggle to the death between the Communist governments of Russia and China, the United States could well end up fighting alongside her World War II ally, the Soviet Union.

In any case, unless we take a completely realistic view of the events transpiring today, the world balance of power could shift away from us and leave us in the position of an ineffectual second or third rate power in a world which respects only one type of influence—the influence of military power backed up by a national will to utilize that power to accomplish strategic objectives.

I realize that I have painted a rather disturbing picture of our position in today's world. However, I want you to know that I am convinced that the Nixon Administration will win its fight to keep this nation defended and strong.

THE ABM

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, on June 30, several prominent members of the computer profession held a press conference in New York at which they released the text of a statement drawn up by a group of experts who have banded together as "Computer Professionals Against ABM." Daniel D. McCracken, who has written 10 books on computer programing, is chairman of the group. The members of the executive committee are Paul Armer, director of the computation center at Stanford University and president of the American Federation of Information Processing Societies; Joseph Weizenbaum, professor of electrical engineering at MIT; and Gregory P. Williams, a leader in the application of computers to the solution of problems in industry.

The statement released on June 30, signed by over 200 computer experts, expressed "grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the computer portion of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system" and concluded that "on technical grounds alone the project does not deserve the support of Congress."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the statement of the "Computer Professionals Against ABM" be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS AGAINST ABM

We, the undersigned members of the computing profession, wish to record our professional judgment that there are grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the computer portion of the Safeguard Anti-ballistic Missile system. These doubts range from a profound skepticism that the computing system could be made to work, to a conviction that it could not.

Although no project of precisely this nature has ever been attempted before, the difficulty may be understood in terms of a close analogy. Suppose the task were to design and implement the computer portion of a national air traffic control system, and that it were part of the design requirement that at some unspecified instant the control of the air traffic of the entire nation would be transferred to the computer, without any period of parallel operation, testing under actual operating conditions, or evolutionary development. This, by analogy, is what Safeguard would require. Our experience with large-scale computer systems convinces us that such a pattern of development is highly unlikely to lead to a successful computer system.

Another analogy that may be instructive is the use of computers in predicting and reporting election results. These have been used in presidential elections since 1956 and in many local contests, allowing steady evolutionary development. The task is well defined. Realistic testing is possible and is done. It is known in advance exactly when the system will be required to act.

Despite these favorable factors the election systems often fail. In 1968 the data-gathering computer malfunctioned, delaying results by hours. One computer, because of a programming error, reported a total vote exceeding 100%.

If such systems produce blunders, we must conclude that the Safeguard computer probably could not be made to work at all, since the conditions for it are much less favorable:

1. The computing task is much more complex than those of the examples cited.

2. The precise nature of the computing task cannot be defined. It cannot be known what kinds of electronic and other countermeasures would be used, for example, or what evasive maneuvers the attacker might employ. The offense has more strategic options than the defense in any case, and the defensive reactions have to be programmed and tested well in advance of an attack.

3. Realistic testing is impossible since it would require nuclear explosions in the atmosphere. Only artificial test data could be used.

4. Evolutionary development is out of the question. The computer systems for elections are used every four years or oftener and are improved on the basis of experience. The Safeguard computer would never get a second chance.

It is important to realize that the computer would have virtually all of the decision-making power, because the warning time in a nuclear attack would be so short—minutes at most—that presidential or senior military review would be almost impossible. Our experience with the failures of large computers (not to mention those that send out department store bills) makes us extremely reluctant to place so much life-and-death power in the control of a complex and untested machine.

Worse, the ABM system could by itself initiate a firing sequence without any attack taking place. This could happen through misinterpretation of radar signals from harmless objects, or because of machine malfunction or programming error. Since the defensive missiles themselves would carry nuclear weapons, destruction of American cities might result, or the action might be misinterpreted by other nations as hostile.

Our grave doubts as to the technical feasibility of the Safeguard computer system, coupled with our recognition of the possible consequences of system failure, lead us to the view that the project is a dangerous mistake. Whatever other arguments may be brought to bear, for or against Safeguard, our conviction is that on technical grounds alone the project does not deserve the support of the Congress.

DANIEL D. MCCRACKEN,
Chairman.
PAUL ARMER,
Prof. JOSEPH WEIZENBAUM,
GREGORY P. WILLIAMS,
Executive Committee.

RICHARD NIXON, KIWANIAN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the June issue of the Kiwanis magazine there appeared an interesting and heartwarming article by Doug Coleman that portrayed the activities of an ordinary smalltown lawyer from La Habra, Calif.; whose civic contributions as a citizen and a member of the local Kiwanis chapter is worthy of calling to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

I speak of the article entitled "Richard Nixon, Kiwanian." As a fellow Kiwanian, I am proud to associate myself with this great American and his contributions to his community during his early years as a struggling, practicing young attorney.

I ask unanimous consent to have this moving article printed in the RECORD, as

well as the accompanying list of members of Kiwanis International who are Members of the Congress be included.

There being no objection, the article and list were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follow:

RICHARD NIXON, KIWANIAN

(By Doug Coleman)

It was very much a quiet little country town in the late 1930's. La Habra wouldn't really experience anything resembling a boom for at least a decade. Much of the valley was in citrus, and the business district—what there was of it—extended for only a few blocks along Central Street on either side of Hiatt.

There were some signs of expansion, though. Dr. I. N. Kraushaar set up practice there in the late 1930's, as did Dr. Harold Stone, a dentist. Walter Caplinger bought a local pharmacy right on the corner of Central and Hiatt. J. W. Burch, the local Ford dealer, was situated on Central a block east of Hiatt.

It was a folksy time, when La Habra's small newspaper, *The Star*, could report such events as a family on Erna Street having Sunday dinner with friends on Florence. So when a new attorney moved into town in mid-August of 1939, the announcement was front page news.

"LAWYER LOCATES HERE

"A new law office in La Habra is that of Richard Nixon, a young man well known to many La Habrans, being a member of the family of that name long residents of the Lowell district. Nixon has located in part of the B. J. Roberts real estate office. He is a graduate of the union high school, Whittier college and took his law at Duke university. He began practicing with Wingert & Bewley at Whittier and will continue as a member of that firm. He is also deputy city attorney of Whittier, and has been active in various organizations and civic groups." (*Friday, August 18, 1939*)

The new attorney had considered taking a room in the back of Dr. Stone's office, but he and the doctor—they had been schoolmates—decided against it, figuring that the frightened screams of children echoing from the doctor's section of the building might frighten away potential legal customers. So Nixon rented some space in Roberts' building, which was centrally located in La Habra.

When things were quiet in town, as they often were in those days, schoolmates Stone and Nixon would cross Central Avenue to Caplinger's for a cup of coffee. And when the young attorney, fresh from Duke University's school of law, had a sore tooth, he'd slip out the back door of Roberts' building and down the alley to Stone's office.

The Nixon name was well known in La Habra Valley. The young attorney's parents, Frank and Hanna Nixon, ran a store up on Whittier Avenue and were well thought of.

From the beginning, Dick was a good student. "I remember he finished his final project for trigonometry first in school," says Dr. Stone. "He got an 'A' in that course. Even in those school days people said he would be President. 'He can speak so well,' they said."

"He won every debate he was in," remembers another long-time acquaintance.

Dr. Kraushaar recalls his first meeting with the young man:

"It was early in '38. He was working for his folks making deliveries while going to college. He made a delivery of some meat to a home up on Solejar while I happened to be there, and the lady of the house said that the cut wasn't exactly what she had wanted. Richard asked to borrow the phone, called his dad at the store, went back down the hill, and got exactly the cut of meat the woman wanted and brought it back. He was a very serious young man."

Soon after locating in La Habra, lawyer Nixon took out an ad in *The Star*'s business directory. It was what advertising men call a "one by one," measuring one inch deep and one column wide.

"Richard Nixon, Attorney at Law, 135 West Central, Phone Whittier 81-265."

The ad first appeared in the August 18, 1939, edition, and was to run continuously in the directory for almost two and a half years.

Joining a service club is a good way for an up-and-coming young professional man to get acquainted in town. Nixon became a member of the Kiwanis Club of La Habra shortly after setting up his practice. The Kiwanians held their Wednesday evening meetings in the Legion Hall, which had just been completed a few years earlier. Nixon attended regularly.

On Tuesday, February 20, 1940, the lieutenant governorship of Division 30 changed hands. C. Jack Zinn of La Habra was yielding the office to Dr. H. L. Planette of Whittier at a special inter-club meeting.

"The speaker was Richard Nixon of the local club, whose topic was 'Nine Young Men,' a discussion of the supreme court of the United States," reported *The Star*.

The newspaper also recorded another of the young lawyer's speaking engagements. In 1940 some citizens from the Heights section of La Habra were objecting to Union Oil Company's plans to drill for oil in the hills. Two attorneys, a lawyer named Phelps from Los Angeles and Richard Nixon, were asked to address the Heights Citizens' Oil Committee, an action group, concerning the impending blight.

"Mr. Nixon presented to the meeting a very clear exposition of the fact that there would be no reasonable chance of attacking the Union Oil Company to its mineral rights in the Heights tract, or its present right to drill there," reported *The Star*. Phelps, the attorney from the big city, got about six times the news space.

On Wednesday, June 12, 1940, the paper noted that the La Habra Kiwanians had hosted Boy Scout ceremonies and that member Nixon had presented tenderfoot badges to Gerhard Witt and John Upton.

Later that year, in the traditional month for brides, Nixon traveled to Riverside for a very special event. Reported *The Star:*

"RYAN-NIXON WEDDING SOLEMNIZED IN RIVERSIDE

"The marriage of Miss Patricia Ryan and Richard Nixon of Whittier was solemnized Friday afternoon in the Mission Inn at Riverside. Dr. W. O. Mendenhall, president of Whittier College, officiated at the ceremony.

"Members of the families of the bride and groom were present. Favorite organ selections of the couple were played during the wedding reception, which was held in the Spanish art gallery of the inn.

"Miss Ryan attended Columbia university, New York City, and is a graduate of the University of Southern California.

"Mr. Nixon, who is an attorney at law in La Habra, is a graduate of Whittier college and Duke university law school.

"Mr. and Mrs. Nixon are honeymooning in Mexico City." (*From the society section, Friday, June 28, 1940*)

The "slow days" were becoming few and far between for the up-and-coming attorney; the leisurely walks across to Caplinger's became farther and farther apart.

In September Nixon was named by the Kiwanis nominating committee to serve on the club's board of directors. Also, he was named by the chamber of commerce to head the welcoming committee for La Habra's Pioneer Fiesta in October.

In November he presented a Kiwanis program:

"RARE BOOK COLLECTION SHOWN TO KIWANIANS

Richard Nixon was demonstrator at the showing of a number of rare books and manuscripts, part of the collection of Louis Davenport of the Heights, before the Kiwanis club meeting Wednesday night. Included was one of the earliest King James versions of the Bible, published in 1638, of which only a few are known. Another work by a rather obscure author, published in 1851, is said to be one of two known copies extant, the other being in the British museum. A document signed by Abraham Lincoln also attracted much attention." (*Page one, Friday, November 15, 1940*)

December 11, 1940, saw the installation of "R. M. Nixon" as a director of the Kiwanis Club of La Habra. Glenn Lewis, the new lieutenant governor of the district and a former teacher of Nixon's, installed the new officers.

In May of 1941 Nixon was named to head an Orange County group.

"LA HABRA MAN HEADS CITIES ASSOCIATION

"Richard Nixon, La Habra attorney, will head the Association of Northern Orange County Cities, according to plans made at a meeting of the nominating committee last Friday evening. The committee consisted of one member from each of the nine communities represented in the association." (*Page one, Friday, May 30, 1941.*)

And in the midst of all this activity, Nixon was speaking before as many groups as he could.

"I remember driving back with him from one speaking engagement," recalls a friend. "He talked of having to give up the speeches because he couldn't afford the time or the money for the gasoline they were taking."

The Star carried the following item on August 1, 1941: ". . . The [Kiwanis club] president reported on a visit of some of the members of the club to the San Clemente club Tuesday night, when Richard Nixon of La Habra was the speaker."

Time was becoming more and more scarce. Success—and politics—was cutting into the young attorney's time for service club work. Dr. Stone tells of being a dinner guest at the home of food products magnate Laura Scudder in the Heights one evening. "A Dr. Nixon, Dick's uncle, was there," he recalls. "He told of offering Dick several thousand acres of potato land in Pennsylvania. All Dick had to do was manage the business. But he turned it down. He always wanted to be a politician. I think he saw what lay ahead."

It wasn't long after this that Nixon took his leave of La Habra. Reported *The Star:*

"LOCAL ATTORNEY GOES TO CAPITAL

"Richard M. Nixon, who has maintained a law office in La Habra for the past two years, will leave in a few days for Washington city, where he has been called to take a position on the legal staff of the Office of Price Administration, one of the departments of the OPM. Mr. Nixon does not know definitely how long he will be on duty there, but it is thought probable that it will be for the duration of the emergency.

"Mr. Nixon's La Habra business during his absence will be handled by Thos. Bewley, city attorney of Whittier, with whom Nixon has been associated in the past. Mr. Bewley will not maintain a regular office here, however.

"Mr. Nixon's new job was told of at the Kiwanis club meeting Wednesday, and he was given cordial wishes by his fellow-members." (*Page one, Friday, January 2, 1942.*)

The Nixon office in La Habra was closed that very day in 1942.

Those strolls across Central Avenue for coffee . . . the long drives at night across Orange County's bumpy rural roads to deliver speeches to small groups . . . the trips to the Heights from his father's store to deliver a customer's order . . . Kiwanis club meetings in the Legion Hall—how far away those events must seem today to the President of the United States.

Many years ago a customer entered the Nixon store to buy some pies. As she looked

over the selection in the case she spoke to Frank Nixon.

"That Dick certainly has a way with words," she said. "He might just become President some of these days."

Frank smiled across the counter. "Several folks have said that. And you know what? I think you're right.

The Nixon store is gone now. Caplingers Pharmacy of that day is gone, too. But Ben Roberts' building is still there, though changed considerably. And Dr. Stone continues to thrive, as does Dr. Kraushaar. The Legion Hall still stands as a temporary meeting hall for civic bodies.

The valley really hasn't changed much. While neighboring communities fuss at each other about which is the President's hometown. La Habra takes it all with a grain of Yankee salt.

It's not a lack of pride. Perhaps a note in last weeks Kiwanis club bulletin sums it up:

"Birthdays—Dean Day, January 6, and Richard Nixon, January 9. Lota paid Dean's fine but Dick was not here to pay his."

Richard Nixon is still a part of La Habra.

CONGRATULATIONS GO TO KIWANIANS NIXON, AGNEW

International Secretary R. P. Merridew has sent telegrams of congratulations to President-elect Richard M. Nixon and Vice-President-elect Spiro T. Agnew, both Kiwanians.

In his wires Secretary Reg expressed the pride taken by all Kiwanians in the accomplishments of these two distinguished fellow members and expressed his hope that "God may guide and help you in the discharge of your duties."

President-elect Nixon is an honorary member of the Kiwanis Club of La Habra, California. Joining the club in January of 1940, he held an active membership until December 1941, when he left to join the Navy. He was made an honorary member of the club in 1949.

Vice-President-elect Agnew is an active member of the Kiwanis Club of Loch Raven, Maryland. A Kiwanian for fifteen years, Agnew served as president of his club in 1961 and has been active on many of the club's committees, including Program and International Relations. Sam Kimmel, current president of the Loch Raven club, joined Kiwanis at the urging of Agnew, an old friend and law partner.

KIWANIANS IN THE 91ST CONGRESS

SENATE

Baker, Howard H., Jr., Oneida, Huntsville, Tennessee.[1]
Bellmon, Henry, Oklahoma City, Okla.[1]
Boggs, J. Caleb, Wilmington, Delaware.
Case, Clifford P., Rahway, New Jersey.[2]
Dole, Robert, Russell, Kansas.[1]
Dominick, Peter H., Littleton, Colorado.[2]
Ervin, Sam J., Morgantown, North Carolina.[1]
Fannin, Paul J., Camelback, Phoenix, Arizona.[2]
Goldwater, Barry, Valley of the Sun, Phoenix, Arizona.[2]
Griffin, Robert P., Traverse City, Michigan.[1]
Hansen, Clifford P., Cheyenne, Wyoming.[2]
Harris, Fred R., Lawton, Oklahoma.[2]
Hatfield, Mark O., Salem, Oregon.[2]
Hruska, Roman L., Omaha, Nebraska.[1]
Javits, Jacob K., Manhattan West, New York City, New York.[1]
Mathias, Charles McC., Jr., Frederick, Maryland.[2]
McGovern, George S., Mitchell, South Dakota.[2]
McIntyre, Thomas J., Laconia, New Hampshire.[1]
Mundt, Karl E., Madison, South Dakota.[2]
Pastore, John O., Providence, Rhode Island.[1]
Randolph, Jennings, Elkins, West Virginia.[2]
Russell, Richard B., Winder, Georgia.[2]
Schweiker, Richard S., Lansdale, Pennsylvania.[2]
Sparkman, John J., Huntsville, Alabama.[1]
Talmadge, Herman E., Hampton, Lovejoy, Georgia.[2]
Tower, John G., University, Wichita Falls, Texas.[1]
Young, Milton R., North Dakota.
Holland, Spessard L., Bartow, Florida.[2]

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Adair, E. Ross, Fort Wayne, Indiana.[2]
Addabbo, Joseph P., Ozone Park, New York.[1]
Anderson, Glenn M., Hawthorne, California.[1]
Anderson, William, Tennessee.
Ashbrook, John M., Northwest Licking County, Johnstown, Ohio.[1]
Ayres, William H., West Akron, Ohio.[2]
Baring, Walter S., Nevada.
Bates, William H., Salem, Massachusetts.[2]
Belcher, Page, Tulsa, Oklahoma.[1]
Berry, E. Y., Pierre, South Dakota.[2]
Bevill, Tom, Jasper, Alabama.[2]
Biester, Edward G., Jr., Doylestown, Furlong, Pennsylvania.[1]
Blanton, Ray, Jackson, Tennessee.[1]
Blatnik, John A., Chisholm, Minnesota.[2]
Brinkley, Jack T., Columbus, Georgia.[2]
Broomfield, William S., Royal Oak, Michigan.[2]
Brown, George E., Jr., Lincoln Heights, Los Angeles, Monterey Park, California.[1]
Broyhill, James T., Lenoir, North Carolina.[2]
Buchanan, John H., Birmingham, Alabama.[2]
Burke, J. Herbert, Hollywood Beach, Hollywood, Florida.[1]
Burton, Laurence J., Ogden, Utah.[2]
Chamberlain, Charles E., Lansing, Michigan.[1]
Clausen, Don H., Crescent City, California.[2]
Clawson, Del, Compton, California.[1]
Cleveland, James C., Concord, New Hampshire.[2]
Colmer, William M., Pascagoula, Mississippi.[2]
Conte, Silvo O., Pittsfield, Massachusetts.[2]
Corbett, Robert J., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.[1]
Cramer, William C., Boca Ciega, St. Petersburg, Florida.[2]
Daniel, W. C., Danville, Virginia.[1]
Davis, Glenn R., Waukesha, New Berlin, Wisconsin.[1]
Dellenback, John R., Medford, Oregon.[1]
Derwinski, Edward J., South Holland, Chicago, Illinois.[1]
Devine, Samuel L., Columbus, Ohio.[2]
Dickinson, William L., Montgomery, Alabama.[1]
Duncan, John J., Northside, Knoxville, Tennessee.[1]
Edmondson, Ed, Muskogee, Oklahoma.[1]
Edwards, Jack, West Mobile, Alabama.[2]
Eshleman, Edwin D., Lancaster, Pennsylvania.[2]
Evans, Frank, Pueblo, Colorado.[1]
Fisher, O. Clark, Alamo, San Antonio, Texas.[2]
Flynt, John J., Jr., Griffin, Georgia.[1]
Ford, Gerald R., Grand Rapids-Southkent, Michigan.[2]
Fountain, L. H., Tarboro, North Carolina.[1]
Galifianakis, Nick, Durham, North Carolina.[1]
Gray, Kenneth J., West Frankfort, Illinois.[1]
Halpern, Seymour, Bellerose-Queens Village, Forest Hills, New York.[2]
Hammerschmitt, John Paul, Harrison, Arkansas.[2]
Harsha, William H., Portsmouth, Ohio.[2]
Hébert, F. Edward, Mid-City, New Orleans, Louisiana.[2]
Hicks, Floyd V., Parkland Area, Tacoma, Washington.[1]
Hosmer, Craig, Long Beach, California.[2]
Mungate, William L., Troy, Missouri.[1]
Jarman, John, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.[2]
Keith, Hastings, Brockton, Massachusetts.[2]
Landrum, Phil, Canton, Jasper, Georgia.[2]
Latta, Delbert L., Bowling Green, Ohio.[1]
Leggett, Robert L., Greater Vallejo, California.[1]
Lennon, Alton, Wilmington, North Carolina.[2]
Lipscomb, Glenard P., Los Feliz District, Hollywood, Los Angeles, California.[1]
Lloyd, Sherman P., Salt Lake City, Utah.[2]
Lukens, Donald E., Middletown, Ohio.[2]
Lujan, Manuel, Jr., Albuquerque, New Mexico.[1]
Macdonald, Torbert H., Malden, Massachusetts.[2]
Mahon, George, Lubbock, Texas.[2]
Mann, James R., Greenville, South Carolina.[1]
Marsh, John O., Waynesboro, Strasburg, Virginia.[2]
McClure, James A., Payette, Idaho.[1]
McCulloch, William M., Pique, Ohio.[2]
McEwen, Robert C., Ogdensburg, New York.[2]
McFall, John J., Manteca, California.[2]
Meeds, Lloyd, Everett, Washington.[1]
Miller, Clarence E., Lancaster, Ohio.[2]
Mills, Wilbur D., Searcy, Kensett, Arkansas.[2]
Mosher, Charles A., Oberlin, Ohio.[2]
Natcher, William H., Bowling Green, Kentucky.[1]
Nichols, William, Sylacauga, Alabama.[2]
Patten, Edward J., Perth Amboy, New Jersey.[1]
Pepper, Claude D., Coral Gables, Miami, Florida.[1]
Pollock, Howard W., Anchorage, Alaska.[1]
Preyer, Richardson, Greensboro, North Carolina.[2]
Price, Melvin, East St. Louis, Illinois.[2]
Price, Robert, Texas.
Quillen, James H., Kingsport, Tennessee.[2]
Rhodes, John J., Mesa, Arizona.[2]
Robison, Howard W., Oswego, New York.[2]
Rogers, Paul G., West Palm Beach, Florida.[1]
Rostenkowski, Dan, Northwest Town, Chicago, Illinois.[1]
Roudebush, Richard L., Noblesville, Indiana.[1]
Roybal, Edward R., Boyle Heights, Los Angeles, California.[2]
Satterfield, David E., III, Richmond, Virginia.[1]
Schadeberg, Henry C., Burlington, Wisconsin.[2]
Schneebeli, Herman T., Williamsport, Pennsylvania.[1]
Shriver, Garner E., East Wichita, Kansas.[1]
Sikes, Robert L. F., Crestview, Florida.[2]
Sisk, B. F., North Fresno, California.[1]
Smith, H. Allen, Glendale, California.[2]
Springer, William L., Champaign-Urbana, Illinois.[1]
Staggers, Harley O., Keyser, West Virginia.[2]
Stanton, J. William, Painesville, Ohio.[2]
Steiger, Sam, Mile-Hi, Prescott, Arizona.[1]
Stephens, Robert G., Jr., Athens, Georgia.[2]
Stratton, Samuel S., Amsterdam, New York.[1]
Stubblefield, Frank A., Murray, Kentucky.[2]
Taft, Robert, Jr., Silverton, Ohio.[2]
Van Deerlin, Lionel, Chula Vista, San Diego, California.[2]
White, Richard C., El Paso, Texas.[2]
Wilson, Bob, San Diego, California.[2]
Wilson, Charles H., Inglewood, California.[2]
Wright, Jim, Fort Worth, Texas.[2]
Wylie, Chalmers P., Columbus, Worthington, Ohio.[1]
Young, John, Corpus Christie, Texas.[2]
Zwach, John M., Tracy, Minnesota.[2]

[1] Active.
[2] Honorary.

TEXAS GARDEN CLUBS, INC., SEEK 100,000-ACRE BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Texas Garden Clubs, Inc., adopted a

resolution at the general session of their annual spring convention in Austin, Tex., on May 28, 1969, calling for a 100,000-acre Big Thicket National Park. They recognize the values of this beautiful and unique wilderness in southeast Texas and are doing what they can to preserve them for the use and enjoyment of future generations.

This organization has studied the Big Thicket carefully. Their policy statement makes specific recommendations for areas which should be included in this park.

In addition to the Big Thicket National Park, they recommend:

The establishment of a national wildlife refuge near Dam "B" on the Neches River west of Jasper, Tex.

A State historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, et cetera.

Other State parks to supplement the national reserve.

The Texas Garden Clubs, Inc., are also absolutely opposed to any trading or cession of any national forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Texas Garden Clubs' resolution and policy statement be printed in their entirety at this point in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF TEXAS GARDEN CLUBS, INC., ON THE BIG THICKET NATIONAL AREA

Texas Garden Clubs, Inc., does hereby adopt the Policy Statement on the Big Thicket National Area, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes, and urges the President of the United States, the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Corps of Engineers (as to Dam B), and the appropriate state agencies (as to supplemental state and historic parks) to take appropriate action to implement this policy as soon as possible.

MRS. E. O. BARTON,
President.

MRS. K. C. WARFORD,
Corresponding Secretary.

The above Resolution was adopted by Texas Garden Clubs, Inc. in General Session at the Annual Spring Convention in Austin, Texas, May 28th, 1969.

POLICY STATEMENT ON BIG THICKET NATIONAL AREA

We favor a Big Thicket National Park or area which would include a minimum of the 35,500 acres proposed in the Preliminary Report by the National Park Service study team, with the following modifications and additions:

1. Extend the Pine Island Bayou section southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River.

2. Extend the Neche Bottom Unit to cover a strip, a maximum of three miles, but not less than four hundred feet, wide on both sides of the Neches River from Highway 1746, just below Dam B, down to the confluence of Pine Island Bayou.

3. Extend the Beaumont Unit northward to include all the area between the LNVA Canal and the Neches.

4. Incorporate a Village Creek Unit, comprising a strip up to one mile wide where feasible, and no less than 400 feet wide on each side of Big Sandy-Village Creek from the proposed Profile Unit down to the Neches confluence. Wherever residences have already been constructed, an effort should be made to reach agreement with the owners for scenic easements, limiting further development on such tracts and preserving the natural environment. Pioneer architecture within these areas should also be preserved.

5. Incorporate a squarish area of at least 20,000 acres so that larger species such as black bear, puma and red wolf may survive there. An ideal area for this purpose would be the area southeast of Saratoga, surrounded by Highways 770, 326 and 105. Although there are pipeline crossings in this area, they do not destroy the ecosystem; therefore the National Park Service should revise its standards pertaining to such incumbrances, in this case, leaving them under scenic easement rules instead of acquiring them.

6. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but without new public roads cutting any forests. A portion of Menard Creek would be good for one such corridor.

The entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent for another.

Such additions would form a connected two-looped green belt of about 100,000 acres (there are more than 3 million acres in the overall Big Thicket area) through which widlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than 100 miles.

We recommend that the headwaters be in or near the line of the Profile Unit.

We are absolutely opposed to any training or cession of any National Forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park or Monument.

In addition, but not as a part of the Big Thicket National Monument, we recommend: (a) the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge comprising the lands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers around Dam B, (b) a state historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, etc., such as that between Beech and Theuvenins Creek off Road 1943 in Tyler County, and (c) other state parks to supplement the national reserve.

GAO RECOMMENDATION ON LAND ACQUISITION MERITS ACTION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in February 1962, the Departments of Army and Interior adopted a new joint policy for reservoir land acquisition. Basically this new policy was an all fee policy and meant that the Government would purchase nearly all of the land in the proposed flood pool, despite the fact that much of the land in the flood pool would be flooded on the average of only once every 20, 50, or 100 years.

Under the previous policy, fee title was purchased only for that land in the normal pool and up to the 5- or 10-year average flood level. Flowage easements were purchased on the remainder of the property which best estimates indicated would be flooded at less frequent intervals.

The new land acquisition policy came under the scrutiny of the General Accounting Office—GAO—and in February of this year GAO submitted a report to Congress pointing out what the auditors believed to be errors in the current policies.

The GAO maintains that millions of taxpayer dollars could be saved by employing a combination fee and flowage easement policy for lands needed for water control purposes. This would not necessarily apply, however, if the lands were to be used for recreation, wildlife enhancement, or for some other purpose.

In support of their proposal, the GAO cited the fact that at the present time the corps is successfully operating 52 reservoirs "under a land acquisition policy where flowage easements had been acquired to a far greater degree than they are being acquired under the present policy." Moreover, large tracts of land would not have to be retired from local tax rolls and many families could be spared the hardship of relocating their farming operations.

The Corps of Engineers had stated that they were not necessarily buying this periphery land for flood control purposes, but for recreation and conservation as well. The GAO objected, saying that lands set aside for recreation should be designated as such, and an attempt should be made to arrange purchase on a cost-sharing basis with the local area.

Today, in the fiscal 1970 budget, we are again faced with cutbacks on our badly needed water projects; cutbacks which place in jeopardy water supplies and flood protection needed now and in the future for this Nation's progress and well-being. It is imperative then that we do not waste the limited funds that the Congress appropriates by needlessly purchasing vast tracts of land for flood pools, where in fact we could more economically take these lands under easement.

With the money saved by this change in policy, it would be possible to finance new starts now halted by lack of Federal funds.

Earlier this year I sent a copy of the GAO report to Judge Haysler Poague, chairman of the Missouri Water Resources Board, for his comments.

Judge Poague and the Missouri Water Resources Board reviewed the report and concur with the GAO findings, stating that in their opinion, the present reservoir land acquisition policy being followed by the Corps of Engineers should be modified.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Judge Poague's letter printed in the RECORD.

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

STATE OF MISSOURI,
WATER RESOURCES BOARD,
Jefferson City, Mo., April 11, 1969.

Hon. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of February 5 enclosing the report to Congress by the Comptroller General entitled, "Review of Policies and Practices for Acquisition Land and Reservoir Purposes" B 118-634 dated February 3, 1969, has been carefully reviewed by our Missouri Water Resources Board. I believe that you are familiar with our attitude in respect to land acquisition in this state as indicated by our previous letters, personal conferences, and also the letter of our Governor, Warren E. Hearnes. However, since this matter has now been properly raised by the Accounting Office, our Board in meeting in Jefferson City this 11th day of April 1969 desires to make the following comments for your attention and also in the belief that they will be presented to the General Accounting Office and other interested parties.

As you are aware in Missouri we have tremendous water problems. We have more miles of navigable streams than any other

state and some 17,000 miles of non-navigable flowing streams which range from clear rapid flowing streams of the Ozark area to the sluggish streams of Southeastern, Central, Western, and North Missouri that flow through gently sloping thickly populated areas.

The problems of flooding and management are somewhat similar to those streams irrespective of the terrain. However, we do desire to point out that the land acquisition problem does materially differ in respect to the different areas in which an impoundment is proposed. All of the flood control impoundments in Missouri to this date have been constructed in the mountainous terrain of the Ozark region and in each instance they have been located on streams of narrow bottom lands and precipitous flow. This enables a substantial permanent reservoir with additional impoundment available for flood control without materially extending any distance upstream and resulting in any dislocation of established economy. In the instances of Bull Shoals, Pomme de Terre, Stockton, and Table Rock, we have not been confronted with particular problems on flood pool area acquisition.

However, we are now greatly interested in the development of those much needed impoundments in Southeastern, Central, Western, and Northern Missouri. Actual construction has been commenced on two of these impoundments, the Kaysinger Bluff which has a projected permanent reservoir of 55,000 acres and a flood pool in excess of 200,000 acres, and the Cannon (Joanna) Reservoir which has a permanent reservoir of 18,600 acres and a flood pool of 38,400 acres. There are many other projects which have either been approved or will necessarily be approved. If this program is completed, there will be at least 8 or 10 reservoirs located North of the Missouri River and probably as many South of the River.

In relation to these projects, the majority of them are or will be located on streams that have a gradual fall and flow through gently sloping terrain, heavily populated and of a high degree of agricultural development.

Because of the sloping terrain, it is necessary to extend, as a precautionary measure, the flood pool at a comparatively greater distance above the permanent pool than that found necessary in the more rugged terrain noted above. These valleys are largely occupied by resident owners and there is little tenant farming. They could contain in many instances quite valuable improvements and these improvements are generally situated at levels above the flood pool. However, the area falling below the flood pool is a very vital part of the agricultural operation in connection with the improvements and remainder of the farms. In view of the gentle slope of the terrain, a very large portion of the land estimated to be in the flood pool will be located in those areas where the incidence of flooding is quite remote and to such a slight degree as not to materially affect the continual agricultural operations of the farms on which the same is located.

To use the Kaysinger Project, as an example, it is estimated that approximately 50% of the entire acreage lies above the flood incidence of once in five years. When we consider that the estimated flood pool exceeds the permanent pool by about 150,000 acres, it is obvious that this flood pool extends a great distance above the permanent pool and extends up branches and low lying terrain not considering fingers extending out into the upper reaches in the highly agricultural areas.

It is our position that the present policy of the Corps certainly should be modified for the following reasons:

1. In purchasing easements, the same would follow the contour of the easement elevation. That would limit the acreage necessary for the easement as well as reducing the cost as distinguished from fee purchase of that lying in the upper portion of the basin.

2. In connection with the purchase of easements, it would not be necessary to go above the flood pool line at government expense to acquire additional lands. If the fee purchase is projected within the upper elevations of the flood pool then it is necessary to block along section or fractional section lines. This extends the amount of land necessary to be acquired in fee to those lines above the flood pool. This necessitates the purchase by the federal government of a very large amount of land not lying within the flood pool and not necessary in the operation of the project. This increases the cost of the project by many million dollars.

3. The economic effect on the fee purchase area is quite disturbing. The landowners can continue in operation of its lands under the easement program without dislocation, and with compensation for the incidence of flooding, which in many cases, will probably never occur. But to purchase in fee with blocking and the additional land severed from the whole tract, and the effect of dislocation will result in the removal of this land, will result in loss to the economy of the area, and will result in damages to their improvements for which, of course, the government would be compelled to reimburse them.

4. The only argument that has been presented has been that these areas would be acquired in the upper reaches of the flood pools which could be used for fish and wildlife. In that respect it is obvious that it could not be used for fish because that land would not be within or near the permanent pool. As with the wildlife, in this category of impoundments, the only wildlife now existing or which would exist would be small game and which now are being produced and probably as plentiful as would exist under the acquisition of these tracts by the federal government and would certainly not afford recreational possibilities consistent with the cost.

5. The acquisition by the federal government of the areas of land in the upper reaches of the flood pool and additional lands by blocking would be difficult of administration since those tracts would not be contiguous but would extend in fingers radiating from the upper portion of the flood pool and bounded and separated by privately owned areas.

6. For those who would propose areas for fish and wildlife, it might be suggested that the program of acquisition with blocking around the permanent reservoir will not be disputed unless it is found that the blocking is excessive and acquires land some distance from the permanent pool. But as to game and recreational areas, a far greater service could be performed by an expenditure much less in funds by the acquisition of reservations of contiguous areas in terrain of both scenic and general game management adaptability.

The Board agrees generally with the findings contained in the report. We would point out, however, that any land acquired in fee in the flood pool adjacent to or reasonably near the permanent pool to permit the recreation and fish and wildlife use and access to permanent water should be borne by the federal government since joint or multi-purpose use of land is involved.

Sincerely,

HAYSLER A. POAGUE,
Chairman.

VOTING RIGHTS AND SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the 1965 Voting Rights Act is a commitment to full participation in our electoral process which must not be broken or diluted.

For one brief moment last week, it appeared as if that commitment would have the backing of the administration.

That moment came when a Washington newspaper reported that the administration had switched positions and would back extension of that 1965 act.

My reaction was: "Great. Now, let's extend it."

Unhappily, the next day another Washington newspaper carried a story which reported the President's continued support for the voting legislation outlined by the Attorney General before a House committee—a proposal which I fear would seriously weaken the commitment embodied in the 1965 act.

Mr. President, I realize that a Chief Executive does not like to undercut a Cabinet officer, but if the President could do that on behalf of the AMA, he ought to be able to do it on behalf of the 800,000 Negroes who have been registered to vote since 1965 in Southern States.

He ought to be able to do that on behalf of the Negroes yet to be registered, on behalf of Negroes who will reach voting age within the next 5 years.

I have no quarrel with the proposed additions the administration seeks to insure fuller participation in elections across the Nation.

I must take exception, however, to any proposal which dilutes the effectiveness of a law under which more than 800,000 persons have registered to vote.

That figure indicates the effectiveness of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and I believe the effectiveness was due in large part to the automatic triggering of the act's provisions.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights reported that not one black candidate running in a local primary last month in one of the States affected by the act "believed the election would have been run in an honest manner were it not for the presence" of Federal observers required by the Voting Rights Act.

Many of the laws used to discriminate against black voters before 1965 are still on the books in many of the affected States.

They could easily become the law of a State once the 1965 act expires.

Even if the U.S. Justice Department moved as quickly as possible, under the administration's proposed bill, it could not move fast enough to prevent the return of all possible discrimination practices.

It makes no sense to weaken an act which has worked in the name of broadening its coverage.

It makes no sense at a time when persons of all ages and races are questioning the strength of the Nation's commitment to its democratic ideals to dilute one of the strongest commitments this Nation has made to insure full participation in the electoral process.

Let us get on with extending this commitment, for at least 5 more years.

Mr. President, shortly after the administration spelled out its position on voting rights legislation, it made public its pol-

icy on enforcing school desegregation guidelines.

Different persons give different interpretations of what that announcement means:

For one interpretation—an interpretation I share—I ask unanimous consent that an article in yesterday's Washington Post by Prof. Gary Orfield of the University of Virginia, a student of education in the South, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PRESIDENT KEEPS PROMISE OF HIS "SOUTHERN STRATEGY"

(By Gary Orfield)

(NOTE.—Orfield is a professor in the Department of Government and Foreign Affairs at the University of Virginia and author of "The Reconstruction of Southern Education.")

During his campaign and since his inauguration, President Nixon has been engaged in elaborate and sensitive diplomacy with the Deep South. Conducted in the code words of Southern conservatives, its full significance has escaped much of the rest of the country.

Southerners who secured Mr. Nixon's nomination and delivered electoral votes in November were convinced that his Southern speeches contained implied promises about civil rights policy. The policy change announced Thursday confirmed this interpretation. The President has decided to allow Southern whites to defy the 1954 Supreme Court decision and the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

The President's "Southern strategy" succeeded in Miami and in November, but the bill has now come due. After months of uncertainty, the President has made his first great civil rights decision, and its outcome will profoundly affect the future of Southern education.

After 15 years, unnumbered court battles, legislative victory in 1964 and success in fighting off repeated ambushes by congressional conservatives, the Federal desegregation effort was near success in the South. Nine-tenths of Southern and border state school districts have eliminated the separate school systems found unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

If Mr. Nixon had unambiguously supported the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the task would have been largely completed during the coming school year. Since the President has changed the rules, however, progress is likely to stop in the Deep South. The whole question will be reopened in hundreds of communities which earlier agreed to comply.

U.S. FUNDS AT STAKE

HEW announced in October, 1967, that Southern school systems, with few exceptions, would have to complete desegregation by next fall. This clear deadline has been the principal bargaining tool of HEW enforcement officials. The realization that urgently needed Federal funds would be lost forced local leaders to think the unthinkable and seriously begin the transition. The more ambiguous, uncertain and politicized the enforcement program, the more likely that local schoolmen will refuse to take the risks involved in preparing plans.

Administration officials, talking about granting additional time to the South, speak of "arbitrary deadlines" and the need for "conciliation" and for greater efforts to understand local conditions. This sounds fine until one considers that they are talking about further delays in implementing legal principles laid down when next year's high school seniors were two years old. School districts still holding out after a decade and a half are not willing to integrate voluntarily.

Southern hopes generated by campaign statements and Administration vacillation have already increased the number of communities openly defying the guidelines. A number of Texas school districts, spurred by an organization called Freedom Inc., have gone so far as to withdraw desegregation plans. Political resistance to racial change is most intense when change seems possible but not inevitable.

When the GOP presidential nominee attacked Federal bureaucrats and told a Southern television audience last September that withholding funds was "going too far," resistance was encouraged. In spite of later attempts at clarification, the impression stuck, and after the inauguration, the Administration was bombarded with thousands of letters from Dixie asking an end to civil rights enforcement.

Months passed without a clear response to Southern pressure. Contradictory tendencies, mixing some aggressive civil rights litigation with spotty enforcement activities and confusing changes of regulations, suggested indecision.

Attention focused on HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch, but he proved hard to pin down. His many statements gave him room to move in any direction he wished.

LENIENT FROM OUTSET

From the outset, Finch made known his unhappiness at the prospect of cutting off funds. Days after taking office, he granted two-month delays to five districts scheduled to lose funds. One of the five was a South Carolina school system 93 per cent segregated and in open violation of the HEW requirements. Another was a Mississippi district almost 96 per cent segregated, with black students lacking the curriculum, the library facilities and the accreditation enjoyed by the white schools.

In still another of the districts, Martin County, N.C., HEW's general counsel approved a desegregation plan attacked as unsound and inadequate by the head of the education branch of HEW's Office for Civil Rights. The plan's acceptance was announced by the county GOP chairman, who said he had been informed from "within the White House."

Finch charged his predecessors with overzealous enforcement and announced that HEW files showed they had sacrificed education to push integration. In a U.S. News and World Report interview, he accepted the Southern view that Federal law required only an end to overt obvious discrimination rather than actual integration. He suggested that HEW would concentrate less on integration and more on making sure that separate schools were actually equal, something the Supreme Court concluded was impossible 15 years ago.

At the same time, Finch managed to encourage liberals. A delegation from the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights went away from a March 16 meeting convinced that the law would be enforced. In early April, he reassured a group of worried GOP Senators, and after a mid-April session with the President, he said that there would be no policy changes.

HEW's actions were ambiguous. When the HEW civil rights chief resigned with an expression of worry, Finch replaced her with Leon Panetta, a strong civil rights supporter. The appointment was balanced, however, by the choice of a stanch conservative, Robert Mardian, as HEW's chief legal adviser. Mardian advised Finch to scuttle the desegregation deadline and argued that a 1968 Supreme Court decision ordering school boards to act now to convert to a "unitary, nonracial school system" only required a prompt beginning by local authorities.

FINANCIAL LEVER APPLIED

HEW avoided collapse of the enforcement program by finally withholding funds from three of the original five districts which remained recalcitrant. In mid-February, three other districts were threatened with immediate loss of Federal aid. Under pressure from the Tennessee GOP, however, Finch stretched the guidelines considerably to negotiate a last minute arrangement with Chester County, Tenn.

HEW officials talked hopefully of shifting the enforcement burden to the Federal courts. A Federal court opened this possibility when it directed 21 South Carolina districts to negotiate plans with HEW. These plans would then be enforced by court order rather than through the fund-withholding machinery.

HEW experts were called into South Carolina. They drafted desegregation plans which generally called for completely unified school systems next fall. When the great majority of the districts resisted the HEW proposals, the department's civil rights staff was overruled. HEW allowed 18 of the 21 districts another year of delay and suspended the normal requirement of substantial interim progress.

The South Carolina decision set a precedent of intense interest to some 400 other districts under court orders. HEW is now involved in a similar case involving 42 Louisiana districts. It would be extremely difficult to make more stringent standards stick in other similar districts.

The news of the South Carolina actions was soon followed by multiple leaks from HEW indicating that the desegregation deadline would be eliminated. Jerris Leonard, head of the Justice Department's Civil Rights Division, explained that "it's wrong to set an arbitrary deadline we can't meet." When Panetta issued a statement opposing any weakening of the guidelines, he was critized by Justice officials.

Roy Wilkins issued a statement for the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights accusing the Administration of "helping to thwart implementation of the Supreme Court's school decisions." Wilkins said that extending the deadline would be "evasion of the law" and he threatened a lawsuit against renewal of Federal subsidies to local governments violating the Constitution.

A RECONSTRUCTION PARALLEL

The President's decision on the Southern school issue is immensely important for the future of Southern race relations. It could signal the beginning of a new period paralleling the gradual erosion in the 1870s and 1880s of the rights granted to freedmen during Reconstruction. Since most enforcement policies are based on interpretations of broad statutes, it is quite possible that they could be quietly nullified by gradual reinterpretation and executive inaction.

The first step, destruction of the clarity and credibility of enforcement standards, has begun. From the perspective of the black man told to wait indefinitely for his constitutional rights, there is a disturbing similarity between current actions ending to turn power back to Deep South politicians and President Hayes' famous 1877 talk to Atlanta Negroes assuring them that their "rights and interests would be safer" in the hands of Southern whites than with the national Government.

Gutting the school guidelines is the clearest possible notice to Southern segregationists that they can ignore the rights of black children. The Federal backdown rewards resisters. Schoolmen who have staked their careers on developing sound desegregation plans will be denounced as "race mixers" doing more than even Federal bureaucrats really want. Strom Thurmond has another victory and Southern progressives a very serious defeat.

The fragile fabric of integrated education, woven at immense cost during the past 15 years, will begin to unravel. Schools that the Supreme Court found "inherently unequal" and damaging to the "hearts and minds" of black children will receive a new lease on life. The overwhelming 8-to-1 majority of black parents who, according to a national survey in Newsweek, desire integrated schools for their children will again be frustrated the momentum of change will be lost at a time when just a few months of firm enforcement could largely finish the task.

President Nixon's concessions to the South have stalled one of the most successful movements toward racial justice in American history.

ANNIVERSARY OF POZNAN WORKERS' REVOLT SHOULD REMIND US OF IMPORTANCE OF RATIFYING HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, all too often we as Americans are accused of having big hearts but short memories. I hope that all of us have not forgotten the historic date of June 28, 1956, when thousands of workers in Poznan, Poland, summoned courage to defy a dictatorial Communist regime. The news of their revolt thrilled every freedom-loving person throughout the world. Most of us felt a strong bond of sympathy for these brave workers. All of us were saddened to read of the Soviet action to throttle the revolt through the speedy use of troops. All of us felt deep sorrow when we read of the deaths and the punishment suffered by those who defied Communist rule.

Today we can recognize that the Poznan workers made a lasting contribution not only to the improvement of the lot of themselves and their fellow countrymen, but to the situation of the people of other countries similarly living under Communist domination. We rejoice that the courageous acts of the workers in Poznan have led to some lessening of the indignities which people living under the shadow of the Kremlin have had to suffer. We rejoice that the revolt spawned increasing pressures for a lessening of Communist control. We look back over the span of 13 years since the workers defied their bosses and we realize the extent to which the Soviet Union is meeting increased acts of resistance by peoples striving for free institutions.

Mr. President, it is essential that we keep alive our memory of the totalitarianism of the Soviet Union. We must never forget that even today millions of people are denied even a semblance of self-determination. It seems easier for us to remember the thousands upon thousands of refugees who still wander the face of the globe in search of a place to call home—men and women along with their children who fled oppression and tyranny in the hopes of finding a place to live and breathe in freedom.

I am proud of the way we have lived up to our reputation of having a big heart. We have fed the hungry. We have clothed the naked. We have granted sanctuary to more than a fair share of the homeless. But we must not forget. We must continue to deny recognition of the illegal claims of the Russians to the countries they overran with military might and the countries which fell victim to their political machinations.

We must remember and we must show our friends in these subjugated countries that we do remember. Their belief in us and their hope in our help is all too often the only straw which they can grasp to keep from sinking into utter despair.

One immediate reassurance we could give them would be to ratify at once the Human Rights Conventions. An immediate move on the part of this powerful Nation to join the host of other nations who have already ratified the conventions would do much to dispel the notion that our memories are too short. I hope that this body will give serious consideration to an early ratification. It is one more way to convince a doubting world that we are sincere in wanting freedom for all people—the kind of freedom for which the Poznan workers rose in revolt.

THE CONCERT CHOIR AND MADRIGAL CHORUS OF ALBERT S. JOHNSTON HIGH SCHOOL, AUSTIN, TEX.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the concert choir and madrigal chorus of Albert S. Johnston High School in Austin, Tex., have had the wonderful opportunity this month of touring and performing in several Mexican cities as the guests of the Mexican Government. This is the second such tour for this group under the direction of Mr. Josemaria Gonzales.

Initially planned as a short tour to Mexico City, the visit was expanded to include several other cities through the efforts of the Honorable Miguel Alvarez Acosta, Cultural Ambassador of the Republic of Mexico and his assistant, Gabriel Saldivar Osorio. The tour was largely sponsored by the Mexican Government.

Included in the intinerary were 7 days in Mexico City, 2 days in Acapulco, and 1 day each in Cuenavaca and San Luis Potosi. The group was scheduled to perform all but 2 nights of the tour in theaters and auditoriums as well as at a service at the Episcopal Cathedral in Mexico City. Faculty members accompanying the group were Miss Jacquelyn McGee, Miss Naomi Martinez, Mr. Robert Newell, and Mr. and Mrs. Douglas Wright. Also traveling with the group were Mr. Stephen Dunlap, as pianist, and Miss Marlene Anglin, as bassist and percussion instructor.

I am certain that this tour was a most enjoyable and worthwhile experience for this excellent group of young people. Such tours as this are invaluable in the promotion of international good will, and I feel that Mr. Gonzales and his choir are to be congratulated.

THE LINCOLN CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently in the New York Times, there appeared an account of the final status of the funding of the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts. During the 13-year campaign for capital funds, the sponsors raised $184 million from 11,474 individuals, foundations, corporations, and governments. Compared to the Kennedy Center for which it has taken 10 years to raise something over $60 million, more than half of which was contributed by the Federal Government, this is an outstanding achievement by the sponsors of the Lincoln Center.

Through this entire period, Mr. John D. Rockefeller III has been one of the most important sponsors. Recently, he and Mr. Lawrence A. Wien made the final contribution to complete the capital fund drive.

I wish to call attention to the fact that this center has not been solely for the rich and aristocratic. During the past year, as a part of the student program, 1,200 performances were given in schools, and more than 100,000 students attended performances at the center.

Recently, a local columnist attacked the concept of the Kennedy Center on the ground that it was dedicated solely to the rich and powerful, and to the perpetuation of ancient and outmoded artistic concepts. He was, I think, greatly offended by the local authorities' closing of some centers for young people in Washington, and with his position on this I thoroughly agree. But I do not agree that the Kennedy Center need be, or is intended to be, or will be dedicated solely to the entertainment of the plutocratic oligarchy. On the contrary, it is intended to be, and it will be, a place where students, young people, and any artists with imagination and originality will be welcomed and given an opportunity to demonstrate their talents.

I wish to congratulate the sponsors of the Lincoln Center and also all of those who have participated in the building of the Kennedy Center. Both of these great institutions will help our country return to its traditional role of a humane and civilizing influence in the world, after we have finally concluded this tragic era of military intervention and preoccupation with irrelevant, ideological fantasies.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the article in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, July 2, 1969]

LINCOLN CENTER ENDS ITS CAPITAL FUND DRIVE

(By Howard Taubman)

Gifts of $1.25-million each by John D. Rockefeller 3d and Lawrence A. Wien yesterday enabled the Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts to successfully end its 13-year campaign for capital funds of $184-million.

Although the Juilliard School and its theaters and concert halls will not be opened formally until September, the campaign's completion signals the physical completion of the center. Almost a decade has been required to build it.

Mr. Rockefeller, chairman of the center's board and the man who has led in creation of the project, and Mr. Wien, lawyer, real estate man and a board member, made their gifts because they wished to free the cultural complex to concentrate entirely on its mission—the service of the performing arts.

Under the leadership of Amyas Ames, the chairman of Lincoln Center's executive com-

mittee, Mr. Rockefeller said, "the center's serious financial problems have been realistically faced and order has been brought out of impending chaos."

WORK FOR THE ARTIST

"With our capital needs finally met, we are now in a position to devote our time and energy to the attainment of the center's full potential. The validity of our efforts will be determined by the use that is made of our several stages and many classrooms. In the years ahead only the artist and his art can fulfill the aspirations of the planners and justify the confidence of the donors."

"I thought it was time for the center to finish its capital requirements," said Mr. Wien, "so that it could go forward to do things for the benefit of New York. I have lived all my life in the city and its vicinity, and I have substantial holdings in it. I think the completion of Lincoln Center provides the city with the third of its three outstanding centers. The other two are the United Nations complex and Rockefeller Center."

Mr. Wien heads the syndicate that owns the Empire State Building and owns major office buildings.

To complete the capital campaign, the center needed not only Mr. Rockefeller and Mr. Wien's gifts, but also the elimination of about $4-million of planned capital expenditures.

One of the largest items cut was $500,000 for an administration building. The officers and staff of Lincoln Center for the Performing Arts, Inc., the entity that built and administers the cultural complex, have been working out of rented quarters in a building south of the center. It has been decided that they will remain in these offices.

Another item that went was projection equipment for Alice Tully Hall, one of the four auditoriums in the new Juilliard School. This equipment would have cost $75,000. Center officials found that the City Center, which occupies the New York State Theater in the cultural complex, had almost comparable equipment and decided that it could be borrowed when needed for a Tully Hall production.

For a time the Lincoln Center executive committee thought of borrowing $6.5-million needed to pay for the completion and equipment of the complex. But it faced the prospect of paying interest of 8 per cent or more than $500,000 a year on such a loan. In view of the large operating deficit the center had incurred in the last few years, it was decided that such interest payments would have posed a grave obstacle in the way of balancing the budget and allowing the center to make significant artistic contributions.

Mr. Ames called the closing of the center's building fund drive "a most important event in its history."

"Ironically," he said, "one of the problems of Lincoln Center arose from its drive for capital funds. Although this fund-raising greatly benefited the constituent companies, since it paid for their new homes, it finally became competitive with their own fund-raising."

Mr. Ames said that 11,474 individuals, foundations, corporations and governments had given $184-million.

"Ten years ago," he said, "President Eisenhower broke ground for Lincoln Center. Over this decade six new homes have been built and given to the performing arts companies of New York—the Metropolitan Opera, New York Philharmonic, New York City Opera and Ballet, Music Theater, Juilliard School and the Repertory Theater. In addition, we have the Library and Museum of the Performing Arts. The 11 theaters and halls in these buildings contain over 12,000 seats, which attract over 3.5 million people each year.

TAX BENEFITS FOR CITY

"Two aspects of this building record are often overlooked. The 35 million cubic feet of space that make up the center cost only 20 per cent more than the 1960 estimate. This occurred in a period when building costs rose 38 per cent. Also, the building of Lincoln Center has revitalized its environs, with the result that close to $20-millions more in taxes are coming to the City of New York each year."

Another aspect of Lincoln Center that, in Mr. Ames's view, does not get the attention and credit it deserves is the educational program.

"This past year," he said, "as a part of the Lincoln Center student program, 1,200 performances were given in the schools before an estimated total attendance of 1.2 million. In addition, 100,000 students attended performances at the center.

"To help teachers prepare their students for these performances, the center and the New York State Department of Education have developed a new curriculum centering around the performing arts. At the heart of this effort is a cooperative endeavor with the constituent companies of Lincoln Center."

DEATH OF FORMER GOVERNOR PERCIVAL P. BAXTER OF MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague from Maine, Senator SMITH, joins me in paying respects to the memory of former Maine Gov. Percival P. Baxter, who died recently at the age of 92.

Governor Baxter was an outstanding citizen of Maine and the Nation. His philanthropies and his leadership in the area of conservation are living memories to this public servant. His contributions to the people of his State were described by many citizens of Maine at the time of his death, and were reported in the Maine papers. These reports give an insight into the quality of the character of Governor Baxter, and I ask, on behalf of myself and Senator SMITH, that they be included in the RECORD at this time.

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

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, June 13, 1969]

EX-GOVERNOR PERCIVAL BAXTER DIES AFTER BRIEF ILLNESS

Former Maine Governor Percival P. Baxter, financier, conservationist and philanthropist, died Thursday evening at his home at 92 West St. after a brief illness. He was 92.

He had requested that he have no funeral, no flowers or no memorial services. The family will respect his wishes.

Called Maine's foremost benefactor, the millionaire bachelor has his name attached to a variety of gifts. They include the Baxter School for the Deaf and Mackworth Island, Falmouth, paintings and historic documents at Bowdoin, funds for the Baxter Library at Gorham, a wildlife sanctuary in Portland and other land preserves.

His chief work of a lifetime of giving, however, is the 200,000-acre wilderness reserve in north central Maine, including Mount Katahdin, now Baxter State Park. An ardent conservationist, the former governor anxiously followed five sessions in which the state legislature failed to set aside the Katahdin area as a state park. He then began purchase of the tracts which he deeded over to the state.

He specified that the park was to be "kept forever in its natural wild state" and gave a half million dollar trust fund for its care and operation. His action in acquiring the vast unspoiled area has been called an example of conservationist foresight not duplicated anywhere else in this country by one man.

The park is criss-crossed by well-marked foot trails but there are no automobile roads. Outboard motors are banned from its streams and ponds.

Gov. Baxter thought of his creation of the park as "my life work." He was saluted for it in 1962 with a Department of Interior conservation service award.

"The governor," as he came to be known for almost a half century after he had left the Blaine House, was born Nov. 22, 1876, in Portland, the son of wealthy James Phinney Baxter, businessman who served six terms as mayor of Portland, and Mehetabel Cummings Proctor Baxter.

Gov. Baxter attended Portland public schools and was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Bowdoin in 1898. He graduated from Harvard Law School in 1901, and came back to his hometown to practice law. His chores also included management of family properties.

The governor's political apprenticeship included three terms (1905, 1917 and 1919) in the State House of Representatives and two (1909 and 1921) in the State Senate.

He was president of the Senate in 1921 when Frederick Parkhurst died a few weeks after becoming governor. Baxter automatically advanced to the governorship for the remainder of Parkhurst's term, then was reelected in his own right in 1923. He served another term as governor, leaving office in 1925. He run unsuccessfully for the U.S. Senate in 1926 and never again tried for public office.

His influence in the councils of the Republican party in the state, however, were felt for more than half a century, and he was generally thought of as the party's elder statesman.

The governor was devoted throughout his life to animals and in his younger years had a succession of Irish setters.

When one of these pets, a setter named Garry, died while Baxter was governor, he stirred a storm of protest from veterans' organizations by ordering the capital flag lowered to half staff. The governor retorted to claims that his gesture was an "insult to our flag" with a passionate defense of dogs and a chronicle of their roles in war and peace.

The incident apparently was of no concern to the U.S. Flag Association, for Baxter the next year was elected to its national council.

Gov. Baxter had an animal cemetery on Mackworth Island, the former family summer home, where a number of his dogs and horses are buried. The burial plot is unique in this section of the country.

Though he left political office in 1925, he maintained his interest in politics, and was a delegate to three Republican conventions, the last in 1928. As late as 1948, Gov. Baxter was being urged to become once again an active campaigner for public office. He put aside the suggestion gently.

In 1958, however, he lent his influence to Republican forces within the state by backing the successful candidacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower against the late Sen. Robert A. Taft for the GOP presidential nomination. Gov. Baxter served as honorary chairman of the Maine for Eisenhower Committee.

In his middle and later years, Gov. Baxter traveled widely.

He was a big man, standing more that six feet in height, with broad shoulders, white hair and a ruddy complexion and enjoyed a vigorous old age. In his 70s, he continued his travels, especially in the Caribbean area, and became an air travel enthusiast during a flying trip to Europe when he was 77.

One of Gov. Baxter's close companions in his later years was the late Guy P. Gannett, Maine newspaper publisher.

In his 70s, the governor bore a striking resemblance to the General of the Armies George C. Marshall, and was often amused to be mistaken for the general during his travels.

Gov. Baxter won numerous honors and awards during his long career, among them the Cumberland County American Legion award for humanitarianism and child welfare work, the Amvets community service award and the National Disabled American Veterans award for work in rehabilitation. He was a former member of the College of Electors to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans.

He was a member of Delta Kappa Epsilon the Bowdoin Alumni Association, the Harvard Clubs of Boston and New York, and the Cumberland Club. He was a 32nd degree Mason.

[From the Portland (Maine) Press Herald, June 14, 1969]

MAINE MOURNS BAXTER'S DEATH

The flags on state buildings will fly at half staff for one week in honor of former Gov. Percival P. Baxter, the millionaire and philanthropist who endeared himself to Maine through his selfless generosity.

Upon issuing the executive order Friday, the day after Gov. Baxter died at the age of 92, Gov. Curtis called the former chief executive "a man who practiced humility and never spent any time seeking the credit he so often deserved for his many great works of charity."

State forestry Commission Austin H. Wilkins said he was awaiting word from the family regarding Baxter's wish that his body be laid to rest on mile-high Mt. Katahdin. No decision on funeral plans is expected until Sunday night.

In the hall of flags in the State House, the bronze burst of Baxter and surrounding rail were draped in black and a wreath of flowers was laid alongside.

Senate President Kenneth P. MacLeod, R-Brewer, said he will propose a joint memorial convention of the Senate and House Monday for the reading and adoption of a memorial resolution.

The Senate, of which Baxter was president in 1921, adjourned Friday without mention of Baxter's death. A House resolution was being prepared, but was not introduced in view of the fact that the Senate already had adjourned.

Maine's political leaders joined in expressing sorrow over the former governor's death and praising him as a person.

Maine's senior Sen. Margaret Chase Smith noted that ". . . while he will be remembered for his magnificent gifts to the state, countless individuals have benefited by his kindnesses."

Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, vacationing at Kennebunk Beach, called Baxter a "friend and a wise counselor," and a man with a commitment to conservation "unparalleled in Maine's history."

First District Rep. Peter N. Kyros said Baxter had proved that "the best effort of any man is to cherish the life of his fellow man."

Rep. William D. Hathaway of Maine's 2nd District said, "It is difficult to think of anyone who has contributed more to the state of Maine."

Former Gov. Horace A. Hildreth Sr. said, "All Maine citizens will feel a deep loss at the death of this great citizen of Maine and the Nation."

Robert Hale, a long-time GOP congressman from Maine, commented, "No one will ever surpass him in love for the state, and I doubt if the state ever had a greater benefactor."

Former Maine Gov. John H. Reed, now chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board in Washington, said:

"I am deeply saddened to learn of the passing of former Gov. Percival P. Baxter. He was one of Maine's greatest citizens. His generous gift of Baxter State Park will forever stand as a monument to his genuine concern for conservation and the preservation of our great natural resources. As a warm, compassionate human being, he had no peer.

"Percy Baxter gave Maine an outstanding administration during his tenure as governor. I know of no person more admired and revered by the people of Maine. His memory and good works will never be forgotten."

Most prominent on the list of gifts from Gov. Baxter is the 200,000-acre Baxter State Park in the north central part of the state. With mile-high Mount Katahdin in the middle, the ardent conservationist deeded the land to the state with only one string—that the park "be kept forever in its natural wild state . . ."

Baxter once commented that man is born to die and material things eventually vanish, "but Katahdin in all its glory forever shall remain the mountain of the people of Maine."

The former governor also gave the state Mackworth Island, off Falmouth, and donated $675,000 to help build the Maine School for the Deaf there.

Besides this, he gave a park to his native city of Portland, and financed a lighting system around the city's Baxter Boulevard, named for this father.

Baxter was a 1898 graduate of Bowdoin College and Harvard Law School in 1901.

He was elected to the Maine House in 1905 and later served in the Senate.

Gov. Baxter is survived by two nephews, John L. Baxter, Brunswick, and James P. Baxter III, Williamstown, Mass.; six nieces, Mrs. Ellen B. Moyer, Cape Elizabeth; Mrs. Mary B. White, Brunswick; Mrs. Lydia B. Durney, Bath; Mrs. Nellie B. Bruce, Tucson, Ariz.; Mrs. Emily W. Holmes, Topsham, and Mrs. Ellen B. Morrell, Brunswick, and several grandnieces and grandnephews.

[From the Portland (Maine) Evening Express, June 13, 1969]

EX-GOVERNOR BAXTER MAY BE BURIED ATOP MOUNT KATAHDIN

(By Maxwell Wiesenthal)

Former Gov. Percival P. Baxter may be buried atop mile-high Mount Katahdin overlooking the 200,000-acre wilderness preserve in north central Maine which is his memorial.

Gov. Baxter died last night in his home at 92 West St., after a brief illness. He was 92.

Members of his family were to meet late this afternoon to make arrangements for the governor's burial. He had requested that there be no funeral, no flowers or no memorial service.

Maine citizens, led by Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis, mourned the loss of the state's foremost benefactor.

Gov. Curtis ordered that flags on state buildings be flown at half staff for a week and the bronze bust of Baxter in the State House Hall of Flags be suitably draped.

Said Gov. Curtis:

"All Maine citizens are saddened by the death of former Gov. Percival P. Baxter. His selfless devotion to our state for more than six decades has enriched all our lives.

"His gift to Maine—the Mackworth Island School for the Deaf in Casco Bay, his series of gifts that created to 200,000-acre Baxter State Park and his $1.5 million trust fund to administer the park—are but a few of the many gifts for which he was responsible.

"Gov. Baxter was a man who practiced humility and never spent any time seeking the credit he so often deserved for his many great works of charity. Nevertheless, he has been signally honored on numerous occasions, including a tribute from the Maine Legislature, and from the national government with its "outstanding conservation award of the year" for his gift to the people of Baxter State Park. The area has become a national monument recognized by the United States of America as one of a few in the nation.

"He served his state in the legislature and as its governor and he leaves a legacy for all. It can be epitomized by his own words:

" 'Man is born to die, his works are short-lived,

'Buildings crumble, monuments decay, wealth vanishes.

'But Katahdin in all its glory forever shall remain the mountain of the people of Maine.' "

Maine's senior U.S. Sen. Margaret Chase Smith said:

"Percival P. Baxter has been one of the outstanding private citizens and one of her greatest governors. While he will be remembered for his magnificent gifts to the state, countless individuals have benefited by his kindnesses."

U.S. Sen. Edmund S. Muskie, vacationing at Kennebunk Beach, expressed his sorrow at Gov. Baxter's passing.

"I am deeply saddened by the death of Gov. Baxter. He was a friend and a wise counselor.

"Gov. Baxter was an extraordinary human being, committed to public service, and generous and compassionate in that service. His commitment to conservation was unparalleled in Maine's history. His gift to Maine of Baxter State Park, encompassing 201,018 acres, will provide generations of Maine people with the opportunity to enjoy unspoiled timber land as well as Mt. Katahdin, our highest mountain.

"Gov. Baxter recognized long ago that Maine's natural beauty and resources were not without limits and could be spoiled if not protected.

"His gift of Baxter School for the Deaf was another example of his generosity and concern for the needs of people.

"Mr. Baxter was a progressive governor of Maine. His intelligence and integrity set a moral tone in Maine public life long after he retired from it.

"He was a thoroughly decent man who we all will miss. Maine is a far better place in which to live and work because he chose to live here and help guide it."

U.S. Rep. William Hathaway said:

"Gov. Baxter had lived a long and useful life and his contributions to the state will always be remembered and appreciated. It's difficult to think of anyone who has contributed more to the State of Maine."

U.S. Rep. Peter N. Kyros eulogized Gov. Baxter as follows:

"I deeply regret the death of Gov. Baxter. I think the memorial that he left to us is his complete understanding of the dignity of human life. In his efforts for conservation, where he was an early pioneer, in his concern for children, in his love of animals, in his gifts to the state that he loved, he proved forever that the best effort of any man is to cherish the life of his fellow man. We will miss him."

Former U.S. Rep. Robert Hale, a personal friend, said:

"In the death of Percival P. Baxter, Maine loses one of its most distinguished citizens. No one ever surpassed him in love for the state and I doubt if the state ever had a greater benefactor. I served in the legislature when he was governor and I have valued his friendship ever since. I shall miss him and I honor his memory."

Dr. Roger Howell Jr., president of Bowdoin College said: "Bowdoin mourns with the state and the nation the loss of a distinguished son and elder statesman. Gov. Baxter's concern for his native state and all his

fellows has distinguished his career from the time of his Bowdoin days throughout his long life of public service."

Federal Maritime Commissioner James V. Day said in Washington:

"Our State and nation have just lost a great and significant citizen, a man whose sense of the public interest was so well exemplified by his service as governor and his many philanthropies on behalf of the public. I, of course, have also a deep sense of personal loss upon the passing of such a true friend and advisor but I recognize foremost what Gov. Baxter has meant, and what his having lived will continue to mean to the people of Maine."

Former Gov. John H. Reed, chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, was conducting a hearing and was unavailable for comment.

Called Maine's foremost benefactor, the millionaire bachelor has his name attached to a variety of gifts. They include the Baxter School for the Deaf and Mackworth Island, Falmouth, paintings and historic documents at Bowdoin, funds for the Baxter Library at Gorham, a wildlife sanctuary in Portland and other land preserves.

His chief work of a lifetime of giving, however, is the 200,000-acre wilderness reserve in north central Maine, including Mount Katahdin, now Baxter State Park. An ardent conservationist, the former governor anxiously followed five sessions in which the state legislature failed to set aside the Katahdin area as a state park. He then began purchase of the tracts which he deeded over to the state.

He specified that the park was to be "kept forever in its natural wild state" and gave a half million dollar trust fund for its care and operation. His action in acquiring the vast unspoiled area has been called an example of conservationist foresight not duplicated anywhere else in this country by one man.

The park is criss-crossed by well-marked foot trails but there are no automobile roads. Outboard motors are banned from its streams and ponds.

Gov. Baxter thought of his creation of the park as "my life work." He was saluted for it in 1962 with a Department of Interior conservation service award.

"The governor," as he came to be known for almost a half century after he had left the Blaine House, was born Nov. 22, 1876, in Portland, the son of wealthy James Phinney Baxter, businessman who served six terms as mayor of Portland, and Mehetabel Cummings Proctor Baxter.

Gov. Baxter attended Portland public schools and was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Bowdoin in 1898. He graduated from Harvard Law School in 1901, and came back to his hometown to practice law. His chores also included management of family properties.

The governor's political apprenticeship included three terms (1905, 1917 and 1919) in the State House of Representatives and two (1909 and 1921) in the State Senate.

He was president of the Senate in 1921 when Frederick Parkhurst died a few weeks after becoming governor. Baxter automatically advanced to the governorship for the remainder of Parkhurst's term, then was reelected in his own right in 1923. He served another term as governor, leaving office in 1925. He ran unsuccessfully for the U.S. Senate in 1926 and never again tried for public office.

His influence in the councils of the Republican party in the state, however, were felt for more than half a century, and he was generally thought of as the party's elder statesman.

The Governor was devoted throughout his life to animals and in his younger years had a succession of Irish setters.

When one of these pets, a setter named Garry, died while Baxter was governor, he stirred a storm of protest from veterans' organizations by ordering the capital flag lowered to half staff. The governor retorted to claims that his gesture was an "insult to our flag" with a passionate defense of dogs and a chronicle of their roles in war and peace.

The incident apparently was of no concern to the U.S. Flag Association, for Baxter the next year was elected to its national council.

Gov. Baxter had an animal cemetery on Mackworth Island, the former family summer home; where a number of his dogs and horses are buried. The burial plot is unique in this section of the country.

As a young state lawmaker he authored the nation's first antivivisection law.

Though he left political office in 1925, he maintained his interest in politics, and was a delegate to three Republican conventions, the last in 1928. As late as 1948, Gov. Baxter was being urged to become once again an active campaigner for public office. He put aside the suggestion gently.

In 1958, however, he lent his influence to Republican forces within the state by backing the successful candidacy of Dwight D. Eisenhower against the late Sen. Robert A. Taft for the GOP presidential nomination. Gov. Baxter served as honorary chairman of the Maine for Eisenhower Committee.

In his middle and later years, Gov. Baxter traveled widely.

He was a big man, standing more than six feet in height, with broad shoulders, white hair and a ruddy complexion and enjoyed a vigorous old age. In his 70s, he continued his travels, especially in the Caribbean area, and became an air travel enthusiast during a flying trip to Europe when he was 77.

One of Gov. Baxter's close companions in his later years was the late Guy P. Gannett, Maine newspaper publisher.

In his 70s, the governor bore a striking resemblance to General of the Armies George C. Marshall, and was often amused to be mistaken for the general during his travels.

Gov. Baxter won numerous honors and awards during his long career, among them the Cumberland County American Legion award for humanitarianism and child welware work, the Amvets community service award and the National Disabled American Veterans award for work in rehabilitation. He was a former member of the College of Electors to the Hall of Fame for Great Americans.

Gov. Baxter also gave a park to his native city of Portland and financed a brilliant lighting system similar to that in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, around Baxter Boulevard. named after his father.

He was a member of Delta Kappa Epsilon, the Bowdoin Alumni Association, the Harvard Clubs of Boston and New York, the Cumberland Club, the Portland Club and an honorary member of the Rotary Club. He was a 32nd degree Mason.

Gov. Baxter is survived by two nephews, John L. Baxter, Brunswick, and James P. Baxter III, Williamstown, Mass.; six nieces, Mrs. Ellen B. Moyer, Cape Elizabeth; Mrs. Mary B. White, Brunswick; Mrs. Lydia B. Durney, Bath; Mrs. Nelly B. Bruce, Tucson, Ariz.; Mrs. Emily W. Holmes, Topsham, and Mrs. Ellen B. Morrell, Brunswick, and several grandnieces and grandnephews.

[From the Waterville (Maine) Sunday Telegram, June 22, 1969]

11-Year-Old Column Tells Gov. Baxter Story Best

(By Gene Letourneau)

Waterville.—A Sportsmen Say column written 11 years ago when the late former Governor Percival P. Baxter was 81 years old became "privileged" material upon his recent death.

The column concerns an eight-pound Eastern Brook Trout caught by Mr. Baxter in the Rangeley region when he was seven years old. At the time, he related the story to the writer he requested that publication be withheld until after his death.

The man who made more than 200,000 acres of wilderness a paradise for outdoors and wildlife enthusiasts must have been gifted with wisdom at an early age. He made Baxter State Park possible. His trophy trout could well become the foundation of a fund to finance production of such fish for the same area from which his prize was taken.

Following is that column:

"Percival P. Baxter, fish account." So reads the title of one of the savings accounts at a Portland bank. Behind it is a 73-year-old story of sound management, thrift and good sportsmanship.

The account was opened in 1884, when the former governor of Maine was seven years of age.

The account actually was started at Toothacher Cove, Cupsuptic Lake, in the Rangeley region, where young Baxter accompanied his father on many fishing trips.

On this particular occasion, the fish weren't biting too well. As it does with any active youngster, time weighed heavily on the boy who was eventually destined to become one of Maine's outstanding benefactors. Only the swish of the oars pulled by the guide disturbed the surroundings. The sun was beaming upon the still, motionless water.

Young Baxter was contemplating asking to return to camp when his father beat him to the punch. An enthusiastic and tireless angler, the elder Baxter told his son that if he should catch a trout weighing five pounds or more on this day he would honor the trophy by giving him ten dollars for each pound.

The offer, appealing but little under the circumstances to young Baxter, had hardly been made when the rod in the lad's hands almost was ripped from from his grasp. A huge fish had struck.

The boy now was all enthusiasm and action. Following carefully the advice of his father, and their guide, he played the great fish until his arms became weary.

The guide, undoubtedly more excited than either of his sports, felt sure this was a great trout, as it kept lunging for deep water and battling under the surface. As it kept calling for line, the boy played it out reluctantly, regaining it whenever the tension slackened.

It was a memorable fight, one that a boy would recall many times. Eventually, the speckled beauty, rolling on the surface near the boat, was netted by the guide. the fish was a trophy, an Eastern Brook Trout that weighed exactly eight pounds. It was the largest Mr. Baxter ever caught.

That evening, at the community dining room of the sporting camp, the trout was the center of attraction. Word had spread about the fund it had brought to young Baxter. One of the sportsmen asked the lad what he planned to do with his newly acquired "Fortune" of eighty dollars.

"When I get back home," young Baxter replied, "I am going to open a savings account in the bank." And that is exactly what he did.

Today (1958) the Percival P. Baxter fish account has grown to almost $1,100 as the interest accumulated. The former governor, donor of the famous Baxter Park in the Katahdin region, feels it should be used for the purpose his father originally must have had in mind.

The Baxters have been successful business people. They also have championed many things for others to enjoy. The former governor's contributions have been myriad, many directly affecting the life and the natural beauty of his beloved state.

Mr. Baxter lives quietly at his home in Portland. One of the pictures on the walls before which he frequently pauses, shows him holding his great catch. It represents more than an ordinary trophy in the den of an unusual personality.

Some day, Maine will benefit by that trophy. The money it raises, Mr. Baxter sincerely hopes, will be used for the protection of wildlife, possibly for the propagation of several comparable trout that will benefit others as did his own trophy. (End Baxter column written 11 years ago.)

THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, later this week the Senate will begin consideration of the fiscal 1970 Department of Defense procurement authorization bill. Although there are many important items in that piece of legislation, it is no secret that the proposed Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system will be the focus of the most intensive debate and controversy.

This morning I received a letter from two eminent proponents of the Safeguard system. The letter is jointly signed by James C. Bresee, Director of Civil Defense at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Eugene P. Wigner, professor of mathematical physics at Princeton University, Nobel laureate, and unquestionably one of the great scientific figures of our time.

Mr. President, this letter simply but powerfully makes the case of many of us who support deployment of the Safeguard system. It speaks directly and unemotionally to objections raised in good faith by opponents of the system, and I strongly urge each of my colleagues to give this letter the careful attention that I feel it deserves.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Messrs. Bresee and Wigner dated July 3 be printed in the RECORD.

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

JULY 3, 1969.

Hon. HOWARD H. BAKER, Jr.,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BAKER: We strongly prefer defense of our people against an attack to retaliation for such an attack. However, quite disregarding this preference, we feel that the arguments in favor of ballistic missile defense, and in particular in favor of the Safeguard system, are strong, and many arguments against it are fallacious. Some examples to support these claims follow:

1. The strongest argument against the Safeguard system is that it will be provocative and will make it necessary for the USSR to further strengthen its defenses and retaliatory power. Since the Safeguard is designed primarily to protect our own retaliatory power, and since its principal effectiveness is in this area, its installation can affect the USSR only if it wishes to eliminate our retaliatory power. If it has no such intentions, the installation of Safeguard will be irrelevant from its point of view.

2. The second argument against the Safeguard system is that it will make arms control negotiations more difficult.

According to Dr. Wiesner in congressional testimony last March, the ability of either the U.S. or the Soviets to destroy approximately ten major cities (or even fewer) in the other country would deter that country. Less than 1 per cent of the USSR missile strength would be needed. No plan acceptable to the Soviets has been proposed which could assure the elimination of more than 99 per cent of USSR missile strength. Less assurance might be mutually acceptable if both sides could provide protection for their population. Admittedly, the Safeguard system does not provide significant protection of the U.S. population against a Soviet attack; its installation would provide, however, a pilot plant for the possible later development of such protection.

It is curious that opponents of ABM automatically assume that a massive buildup of offense must occur if either side seeks to reduce its enormous vulnerability to missile attack, and yet freely admit that much lower vulnerability would still be adequate for deterrence.

3. On the contrary, it appears to us that the reluctance on our part to take the steps which would strengthen our defenses might encourage the most aggressive part of the USSR leadership and would provide a temptation for all that leadership, thus delaying efforts toward mutual accommodation.

4. It is claimed that our ABM will be inefficient because it has to be in readiness for years but then be fired at the correct time after only a few minutes' warning. The same argument could be used against our ICBM's. Both arguments are inaccurate. Our present missile systems are continually tested and Safeguard would be also.

5. Dr. York claims that our deployment of missile defense would lead to more steps in that awesome direction of placing greater reliance on automatic devices. However, the harm done by the unnecessary use of these devices would be entirely negligible as compared with the harm resulting from the unavailability of these devices should the need for their use arise.

6. Some opponents advocate, instead of the missile defense, a superhardening of our missile bases. It is entirely unclear why this would be preferable to defending our present bases. It surely is less practicable, since improved accuracy can reduce the effectiveness of the former more rapidly than the latter. Others advocate multiplying our retaliatory power—a measure more provocative because more likely to threaten a first strike.

7. Some opponents doubt the technical effectiveness of Safeguard. However, Dr. Kistiakowsky, in another context, admits that defense is essentially successful if its functioning appears probable or at least possible to the opponent. The way such statements are made in one context, but forgotten when they strengthen the case for Safeguard, is very disturbing.

8. Dr. Panofsky admits, with some approval, that we had and have a first strike capability against communist China but have chosen not to use it. Similarly, we do not believe that the USSR is afraid of a first strike by us. The most convincing proof of the lack of fear of our malevolent intent is the character of the Soviet civil defense program. Although some blast protection is being installed in their major cities—in particular, in their new subway systems—most urban dwellers will be protected by evacuation during a crisis. Since it is particularly vulnerable to a first strike, the U.S. (we think, properly) has decided *not* to base its civil defense on evacuation. The lack of symmetry is obvious.

9. A final and perhaps less obvious reason for the deployment of missile defense is the ineffectiveness of the retaliatory capability if, as will be increasingly possible, the identity of the attacker is uncertain. It would be immoral to punish people on the mere suspicion of an attack instituted by their leadership. Some opponents of ABM protection favor "launch-on-warning" (that is, firing all our missiles as soon as enemy missiles appear on our radar). ABM allows us to ride out an attack without the need for precipitous action, surely a stabilizing factor in an increasing unstable world.

Sincerely,

EUGENE P. WIGNER.
JAMES C. BRESEE.

THE BIAFRAN CRISIS: A TIME FOR FREE WORLD ACTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the moral philosophy of all civilized peoples recognizes the fact that there are crimes of omission as well as crimes of commission.

Not so many years ago, every newspaper in our country reacted with horror to the story of Kitty Genovese, the Queens, N.Y., woman who was attacked on the street and repeatedly stabbed, while some 30 people who saw the attack or heard the woman's cries did not lift a finger to help her, and, for that matter, did not even trouble to notify the police.

The neighbors who saw Kitty Genovese being attacked or heard her cries but did nothing, disobeyed no law, and were guilty of no crime. But their silence and inaction, nevertheless, made them moral abettors of the criminal.

I believe that we are now confronted in Biafra with a situation that resembles the ghastly story of Kitty Genovese, multiplied a million times over.

According to the International Red Cross, more than 1,500,000 civilians, the majority of them women and children, have already perished in this cruel and genocidal conflict.

Millions more would have died had it not been for the emergency relief operations of the International Red Cross and of the various religious agencies operating through Joint Church Aid.

But now tragedy threatens on an even more horrifying scale than the tragedy of the past.

On June 6, the Nigerian air force shot down a Red Cross DC–7 transport plane ferrying relief supplies to Biafra. In consequence of this incident, the Red Cross suspended all mercy flights into Biafra.

The Red Cross hoped that a new agreement could be worked out with the Nigerian authorities. But this morning it was announecd from Lagos that the Nigerian Government would permit no outside relief activities in Biafra, unless the efforts were channeled through the official Nigerian Government agency.

What this means is that the Nigerian Government has now committed itself to the total blockade of Biafra in an effort to starve the Biafran people into submission. That this is so was underscored by the recent statement of Chief Awolowo, a high-ranking Nigerian official, who said publicly that starvation was a legitimate means of war.

It has been estimated that if all food shipments to Biafra are cut off, the death rate from starvation may go as high as 500,000 or one million a month.

In this situation, there are only two options open to our own country and to the other countries of the free world.

Either we can stand idly by, watching this horrifying massacre of the innocents and rationalizing our inaction with much the same kind of self-justification that Kitty Genovese' neighbors used to justify their own inaction; or else we accept our moral responsibility and do what must be done to prevent the murder through starvation of millions of Biafran civilians.

I say that we cannot stand idly by, that our moral responsibility in this situation is clear and imperative.

If the Nigerian Government refuses to permit the International Red Cross and Joint Church Aid to continue their mercy flights into Biafra, then there is only one way to deal with the situation.

Concretely, I would propose that the United States take the initiative in inviting other free world nations to join in an emergency mercy airlift, operated under international supervision.

All of the participating nations would contribute cargo aircraft, either commercial aircraft, or unarmed military transports.

To satisfy the Nigerian authorities that the airlift was being used to transport food only, the Nigerian Government would be invited to participate in an international inspection unit, operating either under United Nations or Red Cross auspices. But whether the Nigerian Government agrees or refuses to agree to this proposal, it should be advised that we plan to go ahead with it, in concert with other free nations.

I am convinced that such a proposal would meet an immediate affirmative response from countries like Britain, Ireland, France, West Germany, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Switzerland, Italy, and other free world countries.

It is still my hope that the coming days will bring news of a renewed agreement between the Nigerian Government and the Red Cross and church agencies.

But if such an agreement does not emerge by the end of this week, I believe that our Government should move immediately on the proposal I have here outlined.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 1969 TEXAS YOUNG REPUBLICAN FEDERATION CONVENTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, at their recent convention, the Texas Young Republican Federation passed several resolutions concerning subjects which are being very seriously discussed by the youth of Texas, as well as by the youth of the entire Nation. I believe that their analyses of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system and the chaotic situation on many of our college campuses are both rational and correct.

It is my belief that it is most important that the voice of such a viable youth-oriented political group as the Texas Young Republican Federation be heard. It occurs too often that the only young voice that reaches the public forum is that of the unlawful and violent minority whose access to the communications media is due to their continued civil disobedience.

I feel that the Texas Young Republican Federation is in many ways representative of the "silent majority" of American youth who believe in free and nonviolent expression of both sides of a particular issue. The opinion of such a group as this one will aid my colleagues in the Congress in measuring the opinion of the youth of America. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to insert into the RECORD the text of these resolutions passed at the 1969 Texas Young Republican Convention.

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

RESOLUTIONS—1969

Whereas the United States has no effective anti-ballistic missile defense system, and

Whereas the Soviet Union possesses a highly-sophisticated anti-ballistic missile system, and

Whereas the Nixon administration has proposed installing an anti-ballistic missile defense in the United States, and

Whereas the Soviet-Chinese nuclear threat shows no evidence of dissipating in the future, and

Whereas the U.S.S.R. and China are actively improving and enlarging their offensive and defensive nuclear systems, and

Whereas Red China will soon have the nuclear capability to destroy the United States, and

Whereas the Soviet Union has given no indication of keeping their side of nuclear treaties, and

Whereas the avowed object of communist world activities is to conquer the United States,

Therefore be it resolved, that the Texas Young Republican Federation supports President Nixon's stand on the installment of the anti-ballistic missile defense system and the continuance of military defense research for more sophisticated defense equipment to insure the security of the United States.

Whereas college campuses across the nation have been besieged by disorders, and

Whereas such disorders have assumed the nature of force and violence, and

Whereas constructive, lasting change can better be accomplished in a stable, peaceful atmosphere, and

Whereas President Nixon has stated, "A fundamental governing principle of any great university is that the will of reason and not the will of force prevail."

Whereas the flagrant violation of existing laws and rules is essential and inevitable for such violent disorders to occur, and

Whereas the enforcement of rules is the most effective means of preventing such disorders before they occur,

Therefore be it resolved, that the Texas Young Republican Federation urge that student groups, recognized and unrecognized, that flagrantly violate university rules and disregard the rights of the student majority to a peaceful and orderly education be held responsible for their illegal actions and be dealt with according to the law. We further commend the positions taken by Governor Reagan of California and Dr. S. I. Hayakawa.

THE ABM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Daily Oklahoman recently carried an editorial, entitled "The ABM Questions," which is typical of the sound and concerned questions being raised by more and more thoughtful citizens throughout the country about this very serious subject.

The editorial calls attention to the continued controversy surrounding this proposed defense system. It points out:

Unfortunately, we know that defense estimates are always too low and the actual cost might be $15 billion.

The central question raised by the editorial is in regard to the length of time that may be required to get the proposed ABM system into operation, and the concluding paragraph of the editorial states:

The Defense Department ought to advise the public as to how many years it will take to install the ABM systems and give us some assurance that it really would be effecitve in preventing the destruction of our Minuteman missiles.

Because this editorial raises some very serious questions which need asking—and answering, I wanted to call it to the attention of Senators, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ABM QUESTIONS

There is a persistent controversy about the attempt to build an ABM defense system. By a close vote, a congressional committee has recommended the undertaking.

The United States has never built an ABM system and some scientists say it would work and others are doubtful. It might require a year to develop plans and specifications before beginning construction of the necessary machinery.

The first estimates of cost varied from $4 billion to $9 billion and recently a figure of $7 billion seems to be a more definite estimate. Unfortunately, we know that defense estimates are always too low and the actual cost might be $15 billion.

Perhaps the most important element has never been publicly discussed. That is the number of years that may be required to construct the defense machinery. It must be assumed that a large number of installations would be required, scattered perhaps in many states.

The device would be intended to shoot down nuclear missiles which were already in space or in the air, and there is no certainty that the ABM's could shoot down even as much as half the incoming nuclear missiles. The ABM's would be of no damage to Russia other than perhaps destroying half of the ammunition which they aimed at this country. The ABM is not an offensive weapon.

It would be fine if we already had such devices, properly placed, to intercept as many as possible of Russian warheads, but if it requires four or five years or longer to create the ABM machinery it may be too late.

We know how to make Polaris submarines, but Admiral Rickover says none is being made or planned. Senator Symington says we are woefully lacking in attack submarines, but Russia is making three to our one and we can't catch up with them that way. Russia is manning its surface ships with guided nuclear missiles with a range of from 100 to 300 miles. We are not putting guided missiles on any of our surface ships.

Russia would have concern about our offensive ability, but they could ignore purely defensive weapons.

The Defense Department ought to advise the public as to how many years it will take to install the ABM systems and give us some assurance that it really would be effective in preventing the destruction of our Minuteman missiles.

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION POLICY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I urge the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to clarify its desegregation policy regarding intransigent school districts. I do not support a relaxation of the guidelines which have done more to bring educational equality to students within the past 4 years than in all the years since the 1954 Supreme Court decision.

HEW should move quickly to clarify its new statement on school desegregation guidelines so that all will understand the general requirement that all school districts are to abolish segregation by September 1969, and in a few cases September 1970, is still in effect. HEW should make clear to school superintendents that already desegregated districts or those with plans to desegregate by September of this year must live up to their commitments.

It is hard to understand that after 15 years there is still delay in providing equal education to all American students. I am not opposed to the use of reason in enforcing desegregation guidelines. It may be necessary to grant a few districts—and emphasis must be on the few which I understand is about 10—an additional short extension of time because of a lack of facilities or teachers to accomplish integration. In this instance, perhaps the Federal Government should provide funds to the district in order to speed up the acquisition of classrooms and teachers.

DEATH OF TOM MBOYA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it is with a great sense of sorrow that I note the untimely death, last Saturday, of Tom Mboya, the Minister of Planning and Economic Development in the Government of Kenya. I had the privilege of knowing Mr. Mboya personally and greatly admired his ability as a leader in a troubled land and his dedication to his country.

Ideologically it would be hard to place Tom Mboya. On some issues he was on the left, on others he was on the right, and sometimes he was in the middle; but he always did what he thought best for Kenya without regard to personal philosophy—his country was his belief. His unmatched ability to distil the fine points of African politics, blending them with democratic ideals and then through his influential post in the Government bringing about a basis of democratic stability, was among his many contributions to the birth of the nation.

His rejection of tribalism in an area where it had been a way of life for countless decades was a progressive step that has made the survival of Kenya possible and has set an example for other African statesmen to follow.

In an age when other second-generation African leaders are turning to radicalism as a method for solving the ills of their nation, Mr. Mboya stressed hard work and far-sighted planning. In his important Ministry of Planning and Economic Development, he laid the groundwork for Kenya's future growth while helping to stabilize the economic situation of the newly independent nation. His rejection of dialectics made the Ministry function well and again set an example for other ministries.

In the final analysis, Tom Mboya, who was assassinated at the early age of 38, will best be remembered for his dedication to honesty, integrity, and efficiency that made him a standard, not only for his nation and Africa, but for the rest of the world as well. His accomplishments will guide others as they seek to emulate him. As Tom Mboya joins the pantheon of Kenyan heroes, I have lost a friend, Kenya a great leader, and the world a fine statesman.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, for the past 3 months, I have been giving a great deal of thought to President Nixon's proposal for the development of an anti-ballistic-missile defense system.

I have listened to a great deal of testimony by outstanding scientists, both those who favor deployment of ABM and those who oppose it.

The scientific community is sharply divided, with the majority of the scientists opposing it.

Our professional military leaders strongly favor an ABM system.

The amount of money involved in the 1970 budget for President Nixon's Safeguard system is $891.5 million. The total system over a period of 6 years is estimated by the Defense Department to cost approximately $7 billion. The total cost, in my judgment, will be substantially greater than the Defense Department estimate.

The program represents 13 years of intense research and development effort at a cost of more than $3 billion. The question now is whether this 13 years of research and development shall be put to use?

First, we must consider what the proposed system will and will not do.

The missile defense system is not an offensive weapon; it is purely a defensive one.

It is not a warmaking weapon—it's only use is to protect the United States in the event of an attack.

It does not add to our Nation's offensive potential—but it does add to our Nation's protection.

President Nixon believes that the Safeguard system will strengthen the hand of the United States in any arms control talks with the Soviet Union—and I believe that history teaches us that the Russians respect strength and despise weakness.

Before it is completed, this system will be a costly one. Balanced against the cost is this: In this imperfect world of international violence and instability, can we afford not to develop some defense against nuclear attack?

Most witnesses testifying either for an ABM system or against one, agree that the Soviet Union has been, and is, substantially increasing its offensive capability.

The evidence seems conclusive that the Soviets, with the SS–9, have the capability to knock out land-based strategic U.S. missiles. Basically, the United States is relying on a strong offensive capability as the best deterrent against aggression. But if U.S. missile sites are knocked out, then U.S. retaliatory power is reduced.

Those who oppose deployment of ABM seem to put considerable faith in the possibility of arms control talks. Most of those who oppose deployment of ABM feel that the Soviet Union has no intention of using its giant SS–9 to attack U.S. missile sites.

No one really knows what Russia's intentions are; most seem agreed, however, as to the magnitude of Russia's growing capability.

To me, this is the most significant evidence obtained from the multitude of testimony regarding the ABM. Opposition witnesses admitted that an increase in our offensive capability may, at a future date, be necessary.

Another fact recognized by all scientists is that a long leadtime is required for the deployment of a defensive system. There is a difference of opinion as to the precise number of years, but all scientists agree that the leadtime is substantial.

So, if the United States is to have an anti-ballistic-missile defense system by 1975, then deployment must be begun now.

None can say whether world conditions will be better or worse 6 years from now.

All of us hope that somehow the statesmen of the world will find a formula for world peace, but there is no evidence to suggest that such a formula is in sight.

Last year, I voted for substantial reductions in non-Vietnam defense costs—and probably will do so again this year.

I have reached the conclusion, however, that it would be unwise to eliminate construction and procurement funds for development of a system to protect the United States in the event of nuclear attack.

Frankly, for the past 4 years, I have had doubts about an ABM program. Two years ago, however, I concluded to support it as a result of the strong recommendation of the Commander in Chief, President Johnson, and his Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara.

Since the Johnson-McNamara recommendation, deployment of an ABM system has been endorsed by President Nixon and by two other Secretaries of Defense, Clark M. Clifford and Melvin R. Laird.

They have differed about details, but each of these men has strongly urged the importance of developing a defensive capability against foreign missiles.

The Soviet Union has deployed a missile defense system.

The military and civilian leaders of the U.S. Government—those charged with the responsibility of the defense of our Nation—are firm in their belief that the United States likewise must develop a defense against foreign missiles.

The deployment of an ABM system would give to the President of the United States, whoever he may be in 1976, an additional option in meeting a reported missile attack.

The scientists are in general agreement that were the President to receive electronic warning that Soviet missiles had been launched against the United States, he would have about 20 minutes to decide whether to fire our intercontinental ballistic missiles.

If the report of enemy firing proved to be an error—not likely, but possible—and the President on the best available information concluded to fire our missiles, then a thermonuclear war would unnecessarily have been started.

But if an ABM system is developed, the President could exercise the option of firing the ABM's as a protection against our missile sites—and if the re-

port proved to be in error, no harm would have been done. The defensive missiles would have deteriorated in the atmosphere and would not hit any other nation.

So while I have doubts concerning the ABM proposal, I have decided to resolve the doubts in favor of defense.

In the light of world developments, I have concluded it would be wise to support the Commander in Chief in his firm belief that our missile bases must be protected against foreign attack.

In recent years, the world has made great strides in almost every line of endeavor—in medicine, in scientific achievements, in space.

But in learning to live in peace with one another, the nations have made little progress. During the past quarter of a century, the United States has been involved in three major wars.

Until a more peaceful world is at hand, it seems to me we have little choice but to spend the necessary funds in an effort to deter an attack on the two hundred million people in the United States.

In such complex and technical matters as the ABM deployment question, it is not possible to be certain, but it is possible to be prudent. I support prudence.

THE 7-PERCENT INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, in the near future the question of repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit will be before us as part of the surtax extension package. I recently solicited the views of businessmen on this question. Responses have come from both large and small businesses in Illinois as well as from other States.

Eighty-four percent of all those who responded are against suspension or repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit, feeling in the main that repeal would adversely affect their need to modernize and expand plant and equipment.

So that Senators can see a representative sample of thinking on this issue for and against repeal, I ask unanimous consent to place a number of these responses in the RECORD along with the original letter I sent out asking for advice on this issue.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., June 16, 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: I am writing to seek your advice on the investment tax credit. As you are aware, the proposal to repeal the 7% credit will be coming up on the Senate floor for a vote in the near future.

Each year, the Joint Economic Committee, of which I am a member, submits a report on the Annual Economic Report of the President. This year, the Republican members of the committee stated, "We believe that the very nature of the 7-percent investment tax credit makes it an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization and oppose its suspension in 1969." A copy of our full statement is enclosed for your information.

I strongly believe that we must have ways to insure that plant modernization and purchases of productive equipment can be more feasibly made. Unit cost must be held down in order for U.S.. industry to better compete with industries of other nations.

American industry also needs more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules. The Adminstration shares this view, and is studying the desirability of implementing accelerated write-offs to encourage modernization programs.

More consideration should be given to the possibility of using the Federal corporate income tax structure to enable small and growing companies to utilize more of their internally generated earnings for expansion. In this connection, I am investigating the desirability and feasibility of expanding the investment tax credit to include depreciable property, inventory, and accounts receivable.

I wish to actively support every reasonable step being taken by the Administration to hold down inflation and keep interest rates in line, but want to be certain that action taken does not injure the long range competitive position of American industry.

Your advice would assist me greatly in arriving at the best possible decisions on these important matters. Incidentally, I would appreciate your indicating whether you would give me permission to print your reply in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

REPUBLICAN VIEWS ON THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC REPORT

THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

In view of the inflationary increase in business capital investment projected for this year, some have advocated suspending the 7-percent investment tax credit for machinery and equipment. We believe, however, that the very nature of the 7-percent investment tax credit makes it an inappropriate tool for short-run economic stabilization, and oppose its suspension in 1969.

The investment tax credit was originally designed to stimulate business modernization and expansion of capital equipment. The Kennedy administration's objective in proposing it in 1962 was to improve American business competitiveness in international markets, and increase the growth of the economy's productive potential.

The business community originally opposed the tax credit on the grounds that it would be used as an anticyclical device, to be turned off or on depending on the destabilizing pressures in the economy. They felt such manipulations of the tax treatment of investment would play havoc with investment planning, which by nature is based on long-run considerations and involves a great deal of uncertainty.

Business objections, however, were quieted by the Democratic administration's promise that, once enacted, the 7-percent investment tax credit would never be tampered with. This pledge was, of course, broken in September 1966 when the Johnson administration recommended suspension of the credit to fight a "capital goods boom".

Removal of the investment tax credit would operate to reduce investment demand only after a substantial period of time. The immediate impact is small because of the substantial lag between an original capital authorization or appropriation by business and the completion of the productive facilities, when the credit can actually be applied against the business income tax liability. A business firm will not, and indeed in many cases cannot, reduce its capital spending immediately because it has already committed funds to long-term investment projects. This means that inflationary investment demand will not be reduced immediately as is required for stabilization this year. Further, the restrictive effect of suspending the credit may not be felt until a later period when the economy may actually require stimulus, rather than restraint.

BERGSTROM, ROHDE, DAHLGREN & OLSON,
June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Thank you for your letter of June 16 asking my views with regard to the 7 percent investment tax credit and as to depreciation of capital equipment. There is a central issue here as to the essential nature of our free, competitive, open-market economy which I believe has been missed by (1) the Kennedy administration in proposing the investment credit in the first place; (2) the report of the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee in referring to the investment tax credit as a "tool" and discussing merely its "suspension" as a part of "stabilization"; and (3) your letter, in classing as the same or similar issues, the granting of freedom of decision as to depreciation rates, on the one hand, and the expansion of the investment tax credit to other types of business property, on the other hand.

In explanation, let me make three basic points:

1. In a free economy, the purpose of taxes should simply be to raise revenue in a manner that will neither "discourage" nor "encourage" specific business decisions to be made for tax-saving reasons alone.

The Russian economic system is based upon the premise that government planners can most suitably determine from the top how resources of the country shall be allocated. The competitive free market system of the United States, on the contrary, is based on the theory that the economic votes of consumers, expressed in their dollars through the price system, will cause the channeling of materials and capital investment through the most efficient companies and workers by reason of their competition to be the most efficient suppliers, rendering what is needed at the lowest possible price.

Tampering with the tax system to persuade someone to use investment or natural resources in some specific manner just because he receives a rebate on taxes—instead of because it is the most economical and efficient thing to do in the competitive market—erodes our economic efficiency and moves it one step closer to the "government-planned" allocation of resources such as is practised in Eastern Europe, and one step away from our free market economy, in which economic decisions as to investment are determined by those stern umpires, competitive efficiency and consumer demand.

Because our tax laws have been drafted without full comprehension of the workings of this competitive market economy which has made the United States the industrial giant of the world, the tax laws contain many provisions which influence investment decisions for the sake of obtaining a tax rebate or allowance, without regard to whether they add to the efficiency of our economy. The tax-free status of municipal bonds, the proceeds of which are then lent to induce plants to located within a specific area, induces investments to be made in areas for mere tax-saving reasons, without regard to whether the productive facilities might be more efficient and more productive if such a factory were somewhere else. The heavy impact of the progressive income tax upon earned income as contrasted with taxes upon capital gains and other investments tends to discourage individuals from working hard in productive occupations, and to encourage them instead to turn their attention to stock market and real estate sales, in which their dollar will be taxed less than if they had earned it by producing what they are most capable of producing. The distorting effect of this upon the stock market, and hence upon our country's entire investment program, can only be guessed.

Enclosed for your information is a copy of my articles from the *Illinois Bar Journal* for May 1967, entitled "Marxism, Senator Sherman, and our Economic System", together with a copy of the editorial from the *Chicago Tribune* for July 3, 1967 summarizing my article. At pages 8–11 of that article I set forth some of the distortions in our economy created by governmental policies which "discourage" or "encourage" economic decisions without regard to their productivity and efficiency.

2. The 7 percent tax credit is a rebate of taxes to induce investment in capital equipment, without regard to whether a free market would determine that it is best for the economy to divert those resources into that particular investment.

The 7 percent investment tax credit is nothing more nor less than a rebate directly from taxes which is given to a certain type of taxpayer and not to others. It gives him this rebate if he decides to invest money in certain capital equipment, regardless of whether the proper economic decision in his case might be to invest that money in research or in sales. Thus it changes the tax structure from that of a simple money-raising activity to that of tinkering with the economy to give special rewards to those who invest in capital equipment whether those investments are in fact economically desirable or not. As I have said, if investments are economically desirable the demand created by consumers should bring the correct amount of investment money into this sector without the aid of this artificial shot in the arm.

3. However, owners of capital equipment should be given the right to determine their own depreciation write-off periods.

There is, however, a reform which would aid investors in capital equipment and which would be fair and would make economic sense. This reform would grant to investors more flexibility in their depreciation rates and in determining the depreciable life of their equipment.

An undesirable side-effect of our heavy income tax rate is that it makes the government feel that it is a proprietor or partner in the business and has the right to control business decisions without regard to their efficiency, in order to protect its tax revenue slice of gross profits. Thus the Internal Revenue Service has set up detailed depreciation schedules, determining that certain machines can be written off under depreciation expense in ten years, other items in fifteen years, and so forth.

This tends to depress initiative, innovations, and the right to make mistakes in new ventures which have helped to make our economy great. There is no real reason why a manufacturer should not be allowed to determine that he will write off certain equipment in three years or one year if he sees fit, as long as the total depreciation allowance he receives does not exceed the cost of the equipment. Any premature write-off by him would be compensated for in the succeeding tax year in which he would have no depreciation deduction as to that equipment. He would thus be allowed the freedom to make his own business judgments as to investment and replacement.

This is a totally different creature from the 7 percent investment credit. The investment credit gives the manufacturer an actual subsidy in the form of a tax rebate that others do not receive. The proposal to allow the manufacturer to determine his own depreciation schedule simply allows him to deduct as his expense, at his own speed, the money he has actually paid out in expenses; and it is deducted only from gross income and not from taxes.

There are scholarly discussions documenting the advisability of this reform. Its initial introduction might require more complexity than I have indicated, because of the necessity of guarding against too large an unpredicted variation in the government's tax income in the first year in which such a reform went into effect (and one would also have to provide against a loophole permitting a sale at capital gains rates to create instantly a new depreciation base for the fully-depreciated equipment); but it is obvious that such a reform is consonant with the freedom envisaged in the American system and does not represent a subsidy to anyone. It represents only the freedom to make business judgments and to make one's own mistakes, in an effort to compete efficiently for the purpose of supplying to Americans the most and best goods and services at the lowest possible prices.

Yours sincerely,

ROBERT W. BERGSTROM.

INLAND STEEL CO.,
June 9, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: I appreciate very much your painstaking letter commenting on the letter which I had written to Congressman Wilbur Mills on the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit.

I would certainly have no objection if you would want to insert it in the Congressional Record.

After you have completed your deliberations, I do hope that you will oppose the repeal.

With kind personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

PHIL.

INLAND STEEL CO.,
May 19, 1969.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Inland Steel Company strongly opposes the proposed repeal of the 7% investment credit, not only from the standpoint of the damaging effects such repeal would have on the necessary maintenance and modernization of the country's industrial plant, but also because of the inflationary effect of such an action.

The investment tax credit was conceived, proposed, and adopted as a permanent feature of our tax structure. The credit and accompanying reforms in depreciation rules were adopted as a joint program to insure the continuous growth and modernization of industrial production and to provide a more equitable competitive position for producers of our nation with those of foreign nations. The credit has been productive, stimulating a steady investment for the improvement of plant and equipment in the United States. But, the needs for this stimulus remain as compelling today as when the credit was originally enacted.

The steel industry provides a prime example of these needs. Since 1962, spurred by the investment tax credit, annual capital expenditures of domestic steel companies have more than doubled. As important as these expenditures have been in modernizing this country's steel facilities, much more remains to be done in order to place the domestic steel industry in a more favorable position with respect to its foreign competitors. In 1962, steel imports into the United States totaled 4,100,000 tons or 5.6% of domestic steel consumption; since 1962 steel imports have been steadily rising, reaching an all-time high in 1968 of 17,960,000 tons or 16.7% of domestic steel consumption. In this latter year, steel imports exceeded exports by 15,790,000 tons. The severe adverse effects of this situation upon the United States' balance of payments and upon the job opportunities for the work force of the United States are obvious.

While there are a number of factors contributing to the steel trade deficit, it is clear that any solution must include continued modernization of domestic facilities in order to further increase production efficiency and reduce costs. While it might be argued that an even larger percentage of investment tax credit than the 7% is required to assist the steel industry, we believe that continuation of at least the present 7% investment tax credit is vital in this competitive struggle.

Proposals for repeal of the investment credit have been advanced on the grounds that it is required by governmental efforts to control the present inflationary forces. We believe this argument to be erroneous. In the first place, the investment tax credit encourages new investment in productive machinery and equipment, thus causing either improvement of existing capacity or expansion of capacity or both. The results are an expanded stock of goods and lower unit costs, both of which are clearly deflationary in nature, not inflationary. And secondly, we do not believe that repeal would provide an immediate general slowing down of business spending because of the necessity to complete existing committed projects. The earlier temporary suspension of the credit demonstrated that it is not an apt tool for "fine-tuning" the economy. For both of these reasons, therefore, we believe that repeal of the credit would be not helpful but rather would be harmful with respect to the laudable governmental efforts to combat current domestic inflation.

Regardless of the disposition of the investment tax credit *generally*, we urge that the investment credit should be retained for certain important domestic industries whose vitality is now threatened by competition from industries of foreign countries, many of which are subsidized in these competitive efforts by their governments. Among the special "trade-deficit" industries which merit this treatment is the steel industry of the United States. Further, there should be special consideration given to investments in facilities for the abatement of air and water pollution, such as were exempted from the recent investment credit suspension. These investments provide particular social benefits without offerinig any return whatsoever to the investor.

We appreciate this opportunity to present our views to you.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP D. BLOCK, Jr.

NATIONAL LOCK FASTENERS,
Rockford, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: Thank you very much for including me in your letter of June 16, 1969, regarding the appeal to 7% investment tax credit. We, at National Lock, must forecast our machinery and equipment requirements six years out into the future in order that we may have sufficient floor space with a two year lead time, machinery with eight months to eighteen months lead time, and man-power with one and one-half years training time.

Whether or not we get a 7% credit has little bearing on whether or not we order equipment. The equipment is ordered to meet our forecasted customer requirements and the 7% investment credit has only a bearing on the price we have to charge for our product, not whether or not we make it.

I hope this is helpful in your fight against the repeal of this. You are welcome to use this information and my name in any way you see fit, including recording in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

R. W. ERKERT.

NATIONWIDE LEASING CO.,
June 24, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: We are pleased to respond to your inquiry of June 16, 1969, with regard to the repeal of the investment tax credit.

In our opinion, the 7% investment tax credit carries such a substantial impact for investment planning that the necessity for its use as an anticyclical device is inescapable.

If we could be certain that the economic stabilization required could be accomplished in a "short-run" it might be possible to avoid the use of the credit as a tool for economic stabilization. However, at the present time, as has been the case before and will so in the future be, no one can assume that the economic stabilization required can be accomplished in the "short-run". Therefore, we must conclude that the credit should be repealed in order to foster stabilization at the earliest possible time.

If the investment tax credit should ever be reenacted, it should be done upon the admission that its use as a tool for anticyclical corrections is unavoidable.

Generally, we agree with the need for more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules, and also with the use of the Federal corporate income tax structure to facilitate the expansion of small and growing companies.

You are more than welcome to print our reply in the Congressional Record.

Respectfully yours,

NORMAN M. BROWN,
President.

LIBERTY TRUCKING CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Re 7-percent investment tax credit allowance
Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: In answer to your letter of recent date with respect to the above matter, we can only state briefly that continuation of the 7% tax credit is a dire necessity in many businesses, particularly in the trucking industry in which practically 90% or more of our assets are in rolling stock that must be replaced for various reasons periodically and our net earnings are not sufficient to adequately keep up with the necessary replacements. We could submit several pages of illustrations and good reasons for this need. However, we are confident you know what we mean from a business standpoint.

We respectfully urge you Senator Percy, to retain this 7% tax credit in the same manner and for the same purpose that it was originally intended because the trucking industry and particularly the short line carriers such as ourselves need it as much and perhaps more than any other industry that we know of.

Thanking you kindly in advance for utmost consideration, remain

Respectfully yours,

WM. S. BARRANCO,
President.

USM CORP.,
Boston, Mass., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Thank you for your note of June 16 requesting our views on the repeal of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

I am enclosing copy of a letter which our President, Mr. Herbert W. Jarvis, sent to the Honorable Wilbur D. Mills on May 21 on behalf of the Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce. These views also represent this Corporation's and my own feeling on this very important measure.

We have no objection to having this appear in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM S. BREWSTER,
Chairman of the Board.

May 21, 1969.

Hon. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, U.S. House Ways and Means Committee, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Since the high ratio of capital investment seems to be one of the most significant factors in the United States' position as a world leader in economic production, a continuation of a policy to stimulate and expand plant improvement should be encouraged to further economic growth and, in the long run, combat inflation. The Greater Boston Chamber of Commerce, therefore, urges the Congress, as it contemplates the repeal of investment credit recommended by the Administration, to give consideration to related matters bearing directly on the issue of economic expansion and equitable tax credit and liability.

Legislation modifying the investment credit should include a liberalization of the existing tax laws with regard to the deduction for depreciation and a specific provision for triple declining balance. Special consideration should be given to the air and rail commuter industries, including the possibility of retaining the investment credit for those industries.

If the Congress finds it necessary to make any changes in investment credit, the changes should include provisions for an orderly and fair transition. An abrupt retroactive repeal would disrupt the orderly flow of business—specifically in the capital goods industry and for many other small businesses.

Changes should be made on a gradual or prospective basis, perhaps on a schedule of decreasing percentages over a period of time, or timed to coincide with a reduction of the surcharge. Such action would allow for orderly planning and would minimize the imposition of any resulting hardships on certain classes of taxpayers.

We believe that no change should be undertaken in the method of utilizing presently existing or pre cut-off carryover. Changes in these provisions would have unconscionable discriminatory effect against those taxpayers who have made substantial capital expenditures but have not yet enjoyed sufficient earnings to enable them to use the full amount of the credit as compared with other taxpayers who have made expenditures at the same time, but have already realized the benefit of the credit.

We respectfully request that our views on the investment credit, as expressed in this letter, be made a part of the permanent record.

Sincerely,

HERBERT W. JARVIS,
Chairman, National Affairs Committee.

CHICAGO-LATROBE,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: This is in reply to your letter of June 16th specifically referring to the investment tax credit and the proposal to suspend it.

As a manufacturing firm with over 400 employees located in the city of Chicago, we are sure that you can recognize the necessity for continuation of support of investment credit. Quite obviously, with the continuation of increased wage rates, real estate, and personal property taxes, we must modernize our facilities if we are to remain competitive with imports of our type of product.

We sincerely hope that you will make a decision to support the continuance of the 7% Investment Tax Program.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT G. BURSON,
Vice President, General Manager.

P.S.—If you desire, you have our permission to place this letter on record.

ROSS FLOWER SHOP,
Centralia, Ill., June 23, 1969.

CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senator.

MR. SENATOR: I am indeed in favor of retaining the 7 percent investment tax credit. Being a small business man myself with limited amount of money to spend on modernization and replacement of equipment the investment tax credit is an inducement to replace old and worn equipment rather than continue on with the old.

I believe that both small and larger businesses will spend more on modernization and equipment if the investment tax credit is retained.

You most certainly have my permission to use this reply in the Congressional Record and in any way that may help to retain the 7 percent investment tax credit.

Sincerely,

CARL THALMAN.

CONTINENTAL MACHINE CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I whole heartedly support your thinking regarding the 7% investment tax credit. You are undoubtedly aware of the fact that over 50% of the corporations located in Illinois employ less than 20 people and some 70% employ less than 50 employees.

Continental Machine Company falls in this category and it is most difficult for small companies such as ours to retain enough earnings for expansion just to keep up with the competition. If a company wishes to keep their top potential talent, as well as attract new creative blood to their corporation, they must grow even at a faster rate, expanding into the new technical fields of numerical and computer controls.

Even a company with a million dollar sales that can realize a profit of 10% has only about fifty thousand dollars left in retained earnings after taxes. The new sophisticated equipment required in today's manufacturing plants begin at $50,000.00 and go up from there. With the 7% investment credit we have had the incentive *and* the capital to make a major investment every year since this program was initiated in 1962. This tax program and consequent capital investment on our part has allowed Continental to increase its production by 400%, created 100% more jobs, and produced a greater dollar profit, so that this year we were finally able to step into the numerical control production field.

If the 7% investment tax credit is to be repealed, our management feels it will cause at least a 20% drop in our sales next year because we build capital investment machinery. This will force us to lay-off a corresponding number of employees. It would also cause us to defer our plans for capital investments in the near future. The effect of eliminating the 7% investment tax credit would have a much greater reaction to business in our field and Illinois than just acting as a deterrent to further inflation. It will mean a recession and unemployment to the machinery manufacturers in the United States.

Finally, Senator Percy, you are more than welcome to use this letter or any part thereof in your fight to keep this desirable law

on the books. Your statement refers to the undesirable use of the investment tax credit as an inflationary control, as it affects larger businesses with committed funds and long term projects, but it will have even a greater effect on the smaller corporations such as ours.

Yours very truly,

H. O. BARTEN,
President.

CARSON PIRIE SCOTT & CO.,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I am flattered that you would seek my advice on such an important issue as the repeal of the 7% Investment Tax Credit, which will be coming to the Senate floor for a vote in the near future.

I am in full accord with your views on this issue and, as an advocate of the Keynesian view on economic growth, I would like to submit the following for the Congressional Record.

In these times of uncertainty, I believe that a growing economy in proper proportion is of highest priority. The percentage of total investment must increase in greater proportion than the total percentage increase in gross national product, in order to maintain this growth. Any incentive for investment granted by the Government to business is a stimulus for the total economy and tampering with the 7% Investment Tax Credit could be disastrous in the long run. I agree with the view that, in the short run, the repeal of the 7% Credit would have little effect, However, in the long run it could be detrimental to the economy, as actual investment often tends to lag behind the opening of new business opportunities.

With, hopefully, an end to the Viet Nam crisis in view, many businesses will have to turn to other investment opportunities and, in order to maintain healthy growth, any stimulus for investment would be most helpful.

I strongly urge that you and your colleagues actively support the maintenance of the 7% Investment Tax Credit.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT A. PROCKNOW,
Corporate Import Manager.

THE EDWARD GRAY CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Re Investment credit.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Member of the U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I think every necessary step should be taken to stop inflation. If economists were in agreement on removal of the investment credit as one of these necessary steps, I would accept that. However, the evidence is otherwise. Much better alternatives for dealing with the problem are available.

American industry is in an adverse position internationally, and no wonder when you look at our wage rates compared to the rest of the world. According to recently published figures, wages in our steel industry are nearly four times those of workers in the Japanese steel industry. In my industry (construction) some journeymen now earn more annually than the superintendents responsible for the projects on which these men work. A correction of the imbalance at the bargaining table would yield far better results in dealing with inflation than removal of the investment credit.

Fantastic wage increases have become so widespread in the construction industry that we scarcely notice when contracts are "negotiated" with increases of 25% per year and more. In Denver the bricklayers just settled (after a 42-day strike) for an increase of $4.00 per hour in wages and fringe benefits over a three-year period. The previous wage-fringe total was $5.25. That's a 76% increase! Obviously these increases are reflected in the cost of new homes and factories.

Industry needs every possible incentive to invest in new technology, because we can hope to bridge the wage gap only through greater efficiency than is attained by competing economies. The investment credit is such an incentive and should not be removed when other more immediate and effective measures can be taken to stem inflation.

You are free to print this reply in the Congressional Record if you so desire.

Your very truly,

MELVIN GRAY.

SOCAR TRADING CO., INC.,
Greenville, S.C., June 21, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I have today received your letter relative your stand on the 7% investment tax credit proposal. Never before have I ever written to my Senator or anyone relative transactions in our Government. However, in view of very coincidental happening thought it might be timely for me to write you, particularly since I wear "two shoes" in this program, but more since, this is vital to my own and many, many other Americans who are trying to do whatever they can to strengthen our countries financial position and trade abroad.

For eighteen years up until March 31, 1969 the writer was the District Sales Manager for the South Carolina State Ports Authority of Charleston, South Carolina and headquarters for sixteen of those years were in his home of his birth Chicago and coverage of seven midsection states and Canada. Two of those years were just completed in Greenville, South Carolina, my new home. It should be particularly interesting to note that I resigned from a sound position with excellent fringe and retirement privileges to do something more direct relative promoting export and foreign trade to help in some little way on our Balance of Trade deficit position etc.

In two years of contacting some 971 different manufacturers in this Southeast area, I learned that most of these firms would not engage in doing business abroad with their products due to their unfamiliarity and inability from lack of exposure to take on the, as they put it, "mysteries of doing business in foreign markets".

I formed a trading company, to help these firms wherein, they merely are dealing with another American firm and we do all the foreign marketing and selling etc., for them, without their having to become involved in something they refuse to try to overcome on their own.

Now as a small corporation, naturally I do not relish further increase in corporate structures, but even more so I oppose the elimination of the tax investment credit. These smaller industries, will have all of their incentive for expansion and growth destroyed without some way of predicting what capital expenditures they can bear for expansion on a far ahead projected basis.

More closely am I opposed, since I have done what most individuals are afraid of, that is to recognize a situation, make a decision and then have enough guts and confidence to put the shoulder to the wheel and do it on your own. Money and earnings have always been and always become secondary to me. I am not wealthy by any means, but the opportunity to do something is here and that is the impetus for my present status. status. Now, since. I am 100% exclusively in the export field, and have many years experience in this international picture, it is apparent that daily we are being eked out of markets by foreign high tariffs, even with the Kennedy Round Table adjustments, by individual hardship rulings on their importers, and many other obstacles. The suspension of the investment credit will only place another mountain to climb to overcome the many blockades now in effect to stop our getting our foreign balance of trade picture in its rightful position. It will have impact on everyone, directly or indirectly engaged in trying to help this situation. Airlines, steamship lines, foreign freight forwarders, exporters, agents firms etc., as less goods will be shipped in free commercial selling markets as opposed to AID and Government subsidized food programs which of course would not be materially affected.

In my opinion the effect of suspension of the investment credit is so far reaching in its disadvantages, that it would be much better to continue it and not upset all of the earning corporations from their increased tax obligations by increased business, which would certainly in the long run of suspension completely reverse the tax earnings picture and then the entire situation would be many times worse, than it presently is.

Please feel free to reprint any part of my letter you may believe is worthy to your crusade to stop this non-thinking stratagem that someone is trying to blanket over the eyes of the American Citizens.

Respectfully,

RALPH R. HIGGINS,
President.

POULTER IMPLEMENT CO., INC.,
Belvidere, Ill., June 21, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for your letter asking for opinions on the 7% investment credit. I look at the investment tax credit from two different points of view. First, as a small businessman, and secondly, from the point of view of the farmers in our immediate area.

As a businessman, I have used the investment credit to help to update our line of delivery equipment, shop equipment and office equipment. Without the investment credit, much of this modernization would not be possible. I certainly hope that the investment credit remains in tact, and not stopped and started at random. Accelerated write-offs would encourage this modernization even more, however, I do feel that the investment credit has an even greater effect to the average small business operation.

If the investment credit is discontinued, I feel that we definitely need an exception for agricultural purchases. The trend in farming is towards larger, more economical operations, with the necessity to spread expenses over a larger number of acres. Heavy investment in equipment goes along with this trend, and without the investment credit, much of this would not be possible. While we are asking the farmers to produce more food, by maintaining a low level of prices for farm produce, we are telling them to buy less machinery.

But most important of all—the investment tax program must either be in the plan indefinitely, or be out completely, so there would be no hedging and waiting for it to be reinstated. I personally believe that getting into and out of the program at random, does more harm than either being completely in the program, or having no such program available. An expansion of the existing program which might include inventory and accounts receivable would be an added boost for our business and others like it.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. POULTER.

BISHOP FREEMAN CO.,
Evanston, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Re your letter of June 16, Re Investment Tax Credit.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to have the opportunity to give you my views on the discussions presently taking place in the Senate on the possible repeal of the 7% investment tax credit.

As I view this question, the decision to repeal has to be viewed with the overall budget in mind. While I feel that the 7% investment tax credit does serve as an incentive to industry to encourage modernization programs, I am inclined to feel that the modernization programs will be entered into regardless whether the 7% credit is extended or repealed.

As a businessman and as a private taxpayer, I am more concerned with the inflation that has affected the value of the American dollar. Personally, I would rather have the corporations pay more taxes than the individuals and would not oppose the repeal of the 7% credit.

If you wish to print this reply in any Congressional Records, you have my permission to do so.

Yours very truly,

BISHOP FREEMAN CO.,
HARVEY L. DAVIS.

THE MENDOTA REPORTER,
Mendota, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Senator CHARLES PERCY,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I urge you to vote to retain the 7% investment tax credit. The repeal of this tax would be a "blow" to small businesses such as The Mendota Reporter, a weekly newspaper already hit hard by need of modern machinery, rising costs and continuous labor increases. Just as other businesses have to hold down the cost of their products to be competitive, so do the small newspapers which are losing much of their advertising revenue to radio, television and shoppers.

While I am in favor of taking steps to curb inflation, I am also interested in preventing the elimination of small businesses, the backbone of our nation. If we hope to maintain private ownership of small businesses, our government will have to make the prospect more attractive and profitable to encourage our younger generation to participate.

Feel free to use this reply any way you wish.

Sincerely,

DICK LEISER.

THE PUBLIC RELATIONS BOARD, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: In response to your June 16 letter, I would like to go on record as supporting the Republican members of the Joint Economic Committee in opposing the suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit.

As an individual involved with foreign trade, I am aware of the need for American industry to modernize its facilities in order to compete in the world marketplace. It is imperative, too, in my view, that more realistic and rapid depreciation schedules be studied to encourage modernization programs.

Anything which will make the U.S. more competitive internationally seems to me to be a must. To do less will substantially injure our country's foreign trade position. Quotas and higher tariffs are not the answer. Plant modernization is. And, if the 7-percent investment tax credit is one technique, then I believe it should be continued.

You have my permission to publish this reply in the Congressional Record.

Cordially,

IVAN FULDAUER,
Senior Vice President.

PAIN & SUTHERLIN, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: It is my sincere belief that the repeal of the 7% investment credit would hinder the real estate business to a great extent and that in both the long and short run, it would be a very poor attempt to a solution to a portion of our country's overall economic problem.

Industry must be allowed certain benefits to give them the incentive to modernize and continue our pattern of growth throughout the country.

As you may or may not be aware, large real estate investors have been considering pulling out of the real estate market in favor of other investment opportunities because the benefits accruing to the real estate investor have gradually been diminishing. Any steps along the line of repealing the investment credit would place further pressure on the investor market going to other greener pastures.

I am a member of the Society of Industrial Realtors and have been in the real estate business for over ten years and I am positive that many people in my industry share the same beliefs.

I certainly would feel it a privilege if you felt that you wanted this letter printed in your Congressional Record.

Very truly yours,

C. ROBERT SUTHERLIN.

PAIN & SUTHERLIN, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: It is my sincere belief that the repeal of the 7% investment credit would hinder the real estate business to a great extent and that in both the long and short run, it would be a very poor attempt at a solution to a portion of our country's overall economic problem.

Industry must be allowed certain benefits to give them the incentive to modernize and continue our pattern of growth throughout the country.

As you may or may not be aware, large real estate investors have been considering pulling out of the real estate market in favor of other investment opportunities because the benefits accruing to the real estate investor have gradually been diminishing. Any steps along the line of repealing the investment credit would place further pressure on the investor market going to other greener pastures.

I have been an active member of the Society of Industrial Realtors for four years and a real estate broker for over eleven years and I am positive that many people in my industry share the same beliefs.

I certainly would feel it a privilege if you felt that you wanted this letter printed in your Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. PAIN,
Member, Society of Industrial Relations.

LPM PARTS AND SERVICE,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1969..

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
Committee on Banking & Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: LPM is one of the many small businesses in the United States. The 7% investment tax credit is a very important part of our capital goods acquistion program. Once we set up a program and acquire the equipment we lack the flexibility of larger firms to alter our programs.

For instance we recently decided to enter a market supplementary to our main effort. To effect this we spent $10,000.00 on capital equipment subject to the 7% credit and another $10,000.00 on inventory. This will constitute about 15% of our business. We do not have the freedom to abandon this program as such a decision would soon bankrupt us.

The effect of our entry into a new market will increase competition and tend to bring a downward pressure on prices. Seems to us this is what you want and this is the long term effect of increased capacity.

Of course you may enter these thoughts in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

R. D. GOLDEN,
President.

MYERS-SHERMAN CO.,
Streator, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I am in accord with your letter of June 16th and oppose the suspension of the 7 per cent investment tax credit and agree that it is ridiculous to try to use this phase of the tax structure for controlling the economy.

The 7 per cent investment tax credit was established as an incentive to industry to modernize their productive equipment and many particularly small companies take this into consideration when studying the cost of modernization.

To turn it off and on, to speed up and slow down the economy negates the purpose for which it was intended. If any thing, it should be extended to include other depreciable property of companies.

I fully recognize that we must hold down inflation and get the government back on the pay as you go basis, but I believe there are many other areas where much greater savings can be realized. I personally have witnessed some of the terrific waste that is inherent in our foreign aid program. The only solace in this mess is that approximately 80 per cent of the money lent to foreign countries is returned to the United States through purchases of equipment and services. Now, of course, they are talking about eliminating the necessity of foreign borrowers of U.S. foreign aid buying United States products. If and when this happens, the United States will simply be giving money to foreign governments and foreign firms to buy from our competitors in other nations and completely eliminate U.S. producers as competitors in the export market.

Yours truly,

C. ROBERT MYERS,
President.

WALGREEN DRUG STORES,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Having listened to you speak at some of the U. of C. Management Conference sessions, I know you do not need the advice you asked for in your June 16 letter, but here goes. I leave it to you to decide whether it deserves Congressional Recording.

You will recall that when the investment credit was first proposed in 1961, many businessmen opposed it, preferring a drastic liberalization of depreciation policy, and fearing that such a credit which does not enter into the computation of net income, would become a political football.

The suspension in Oct. 1966, and quick restoration in March 1967 indicate that either the business men were right. . . . that the credit had become a political football, or that the planners were wrong. . . . that the suspension was ill-advised.

My reading makes me doubtful that the investment credit or any other specific pro-

vision in the federal tax structure can or should be used to prevent or moderate short-term economic disturbances. I know that our company would prefer more permanency in the tax structure. . . . it makes for better long-range planning.

I would retain the credit because I do not believe it has been in long enough to do the job it was intended to do, which is to enable producers to modernize their plants and catch up, in lowering production costs, with their counterparts in foreign countries, who are taking away from us the foreign trade which we should expect from our vast industrial complex.

The credit is needed more than ever right now, in view of the tight money situation threatening the capital goods industry.

Sincerely,

W. K. MISKE,
Tax Department Manager.

GREAT LAKES MORTGAGE CORP.,
Chicago, Ill., June 23, 1969.

Senator CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I disagree that insuring plant modernization and purchases of productive equipment depends on the investment credit. From the announced backlog of industrial commitments, it is clear that we are at the threshold of rampant, runaway inflation. Therefore, if inflation does persist, unit costs are going to a level completely pricing the United States out of foreign markets.

When enacted, there was need for the investment credit. However, with demand at an all-time high, it should now be repealed. Gauging impact on both industry and the economy would best be served through depreciation schedules as suggested in your letter of June 16th.

You may print my reply in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WILLIAMS,
Vice President.

REMPERT, SIM & SCHMITT,
Chicago, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: We are happy to respond to your request for our advice on the investment tax credit.

As a relatively small Certified Public Accounting firm, we serve relatively small business organizations, the bulk of which are incorporated. We believe that such small corporations represent a significant factor in the private enterprise system of our country.

As with large publicly held corporations, our clients must plan plant modernization well in advance. In such planning, reliance upon the investment credit becomes a necessary part of the decision for modernization, quite often representing the means of providing the initial funds with which to finance such modernization. While the elimination of the investment credit would undoubtedly create hardship in the entire business community, in our opinion, such elimination would be particularly detrimental to the small or medium size business organization. The publicly held corporations would have various means of securing the funds necessary to finance plant improvements in the event of the elimination of the credit. Our clients, with less available sources of credit, could be financially embarrassed upon elimination of the investment credit on committed improvements. We believe that the views of the Joint Economic Committee are correct. The confidence of the business community is essential in any long range growth and would suffer considerably if the investment tax credit were employed for short-run economic stabilization.

We believe that an extension or revision of the tax surcharge is a more appropriate tool for short range action if one is required. It bears upon the entire public, and thus would have a more immediate effect upon curbing or promoting spending, one of the prime factors in inflation and deflation. It appears unreasonable to expect that one factor of the economy, that being the business community in its acquisitions for plant modernization, should be singled out as a primary cause of inflation or deflation.

If specific sections of the income tax code are to be investigated for factors influencing economic stabilization, we believe that Section 531 warrants some consideration. This is a particularly burdensome section preventing small corporations from financing their expansion from retained funds generated from operations without fear of drastic "penalty" tax exposure. While the intention of the section to prevent retention of earnings by a corporation to prevent imposition of surtax on its shareholders has merit, in our experience, it frequently acts to promote unnecessary evpenditures by such corporations in the desire to find a use for retained earnings rather than distribute them to the shareholders. Even the distribution is in itself inflationary, by furnishing spendable dividends to shareholders that should be retained unspent in the corporation for future expansion.

If you believe that our views have merit and would aid your cause, you have our permission to print them in the Congressional Record.

Respectfully submitted,

REMPERT, SIM & SCHMITT,
Certified Public Accountants.

E. A. ESTERL & ASSOCIATES,
Chicago, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PERCY: I strongly urge that you oppose the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit. It is my opinion that this method of attempting to reduce our country's inflationary spiral is ineffective for short-term economic stabilization of the economy.

My opinion has been formed by an analysis of the real estate activity which I have garnered in the appraisal of real estate for over 23 years.

My experience indicates that the only segments of the industry that the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit will hurt is the medium and small business organizations who contribute very little to our spiraling inflation. It is also my opinion that the suspension of the 7% investment tax credit would not affect big business one iota as their capital spending programs are projected for from 1 to 3 years in advance. These opinions may be easily verified by an analysis of current projected spending programs for multimillion dollar business concerns as well as by discussions with medium and small businesses.

I also believe that the repeal of the 7% investment tax credit would reduce the competitiveness of medium and small businesses with large business concerns at a time when our government is very much concerned about the merger of large corporations.

The parallels I have used (big business versus small business) are definitely not an indictment of big business as I also believe that government controls also "hamstring" big business in general and specifically in dealing with foreign competition. These comparisons merely indicate that small and medium businesses will suffer the most and some may not survive.

I am also extremely concerned about why our representatives in Washington have done nothing about the current prime interest rate. This high prime rate has affected only the medium and small business concerns as the large corporations are well able to afford the new high rates. If this high prime rate continues, it is my opinion that it will put small businessmen out of business and add to the need of large business corporations to merge with other large concerns or "gobble up" small businesses who cannot afford to pay these costs.

Sincerely,

ERNEST A. ESTERL.

P.S.—You have my permission to print this letter in the Congressional Record.

U-DO-IT RENTAL CO.,
Urbana, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: In answer to your letter of June 16, on the investment tax credit, please be advised that I am in accord with your opinion that this tax should not be repealed.

I feel that small business men such as myself could feel the pinch from such a move much more rapidly than the larger firms, and I can see not noticeable effect on inflation.

All reasonable business men know that our runaway economy must be checked, and restraint does not always come easy, however, business seems to be bearing the brunt of actions intended to curb inflation.

It would seem to me it is time for government to become reasonable in its views on what it will take in order to slow down our inflationary trend of the last several years, before it topples business altogether.

A view such as yours is not only refreshing in today's hubbub of misguided economists in government but deserves support of every rational minded business man in the country, and you have mine.

Sincerely,

MAC D. DRYSDALE.

P.S.—Permission to reprint granted.

IDEAL INDUSTRIES, INC.,
June 24, 1969.

Re your letter of June 16 regarding the 7% Investment Tax Credit.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: Whereas the 7% investment tax credit does have certain beneficial effects on the United States economy, I favor the abolition of the tax credit. However, I would favor a modified version of allowing up to $25,000 to $50,000 of investment in capital goods subject to the 7% credit.

To encourage exports, a part of the money remitted to corporations on the 7% tax credit could be returned to them as a percentage of the tariffs they pay for exporting products to foreign countries. This would directly attack the manufacture-for-export problem.

I further strongly feel that corporation and all business taxes should be decreased and personal income taxes increased accordingly. Basically, a corporate tax of any kind is purely and simply a sales tax wherein either the people buying the product pay the tax in increased prices or employees pay the tax in decreased wages, or both.

High corporate taxes encourage no end of financial manipulation to save taxes and considering the vast amount of detailed work required to fill out such taxes, much waste is incurred in non-productive activity on the part of all business.

Individual income taxes should be increased to compensate for the loss incorporate income taxes. By this move all of us would be made to realize the true cost of running our government. It is, in my opinion, wrong to delude the people into thinking that some abstract corporation is paying

the taxes instead of individuals. Perhaps we would get more efficient government if people not only paid the bill as they do now but more clearly saw the amount of that bill.

The ups and downs of the economy might well be partially controlled through varying corporate and personal income taxes. However, the corporate taxes should be varied from a lower base than the present level.

You may use this letter or any part of it for whatever purpose you see fit.

Again, I urge you to do whatever you can to stop deceiving people as to who are the final payers of the cost of government!

Yours very truly,

IDEAL INDUSTRIES, INC.,
E. T. JUDAY, *President.*

CONTINENTAL ILLINOIS NATIONAL BANK AND TRUST CO. OF CHICAGO,
Chicago, Ill., June 25, 1969.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I am writing in reply to your letter of June 16, 1969, with regard to the 7-percent investment tax credit and its proposed suspension in 1969.

I feel that a suspension would be a step in the wrong direction. It is my impression that this tax credit was designed to assist industry to expand its production capability in order to produce more products at a lower unit cost. Such a concept certainly appears to be anti-inflationary, since it helps to increase the supply of goods while satisfying overall demand at lower prices. I believe that increased production, and more importantly, increased productivity, are vital factors in the war against inflation and the rising cost of doing business. Therefore, I am not in favor of suspending the 7-percent investment tax credit.

I further agree that more consideration should be given to alternate measures of tax exemption, particularly for small and growing firms, which would help to encourage expansion of this important segment of industry.

I do believe that when restraints are necessary to combat inflation, they should be in the form of uniform restraints, which apply to the major part of the economy rather than to only a relatively small sector of it. I also feel that the best example of financial restraint can be provided by the government itself, restraining its own operations, through the more judicious use of tax revenues and a long-overdue trend away from deficit spending. So long as governmental bodies, from federal down to local, continue the modern trend of spending for the sake of spending, whether the economy can afford it or not, all in the face of waste and mismanagement, I feel that the tax-paying public is far from convinced of the sincerity of the government and the compatibility of what it says and what it does.

I would be happy to have my reply printed in the Congressional Record, if you so desire.

Sincerely,

ROBERT G. LOVELL,
Area Development Officer.

MONTGOMERY WARD,
Chicago, Ill., June 24, 1969.

Re repeal of investment tax credit.

Hon. CHARLES H. PERCY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PERCY: I received your request dated June 16, 1969, for my views on the proposed repeal of the investment tax credit. Your support of every reasonable program to restrain inflation is highly commendable. The question is how best to achieve the stability of the dollar. We can pursue policies of either decreasing demand or alternatively increasing productivity.

One of the major causes of inflation has been the imbalance produced by policies that tend to manipulate demand in the consumer economy without stimulating a corresponding increase in the volume of goods and services. The investment tax credit has served as a powerful incentive to achieve increased productivity with greater efficiency through implementing improved technology. Any superficial program undertaken to curtail inflation but which in fact impedes genuine growth could likely produce the result that the program was designed to prevent.

The offsetting loss of productivity presents a more serious threat, in my opinion, than the benefit of the selective reduction in demand that removal of the investment tax credit would produce.

You may feel free to use this statement.

Very truly yours,

PHILLIP LIPSCHULTZ,
Vice President, Taxes.

TRIBUTE TO TOM MBOYA

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, once again I rise in this body for the sad purpose of paying tribute to a great leader who has been ripped from our midst in a most untimely and unnatural way.

Tom Mboya loved life and lived it fully. Only 38 years old, he had been Secretary General of Kenya's ruling party, the Kenya African National Union, since its founding in 1960. He had served in his country's Cabinet since Kenya gained its independence in 1963. As Minister of Economic Development, a post he had held since 1964, he put the people of Kenya to work in local development projects, and sent hundreds of young Kenyans to study in the West so that they might return and be of service to their nation. It was Tom Mboya who helped spur the creation of the East African Community, who represented his nation at numerous Pan-African and world development conferences. He was among the first to warn the world of the alarming rise in capital outflow from the developing countries, to plead for "trade, not aid," and to urge the creation of a world food bank to meet both the emergency and long-range needs of an increasingly underfed world.

Tom Mboya was too young to participate in Kenya's revolutionary struggle. He did not participate in all the pains of a people striving to be free in the manner of its venerable President Jomo Kenyatta or his loyal companion in arms, Vice President Daniel Arap Moi.

For many Westerners he was a key contact with an emerging continent and came to represent for them the dynamism and the promise of that giant and complex land.

Tom Mboya, in many ways, represented the best that is young and vigorous in Kenya and in Africa. Within his own country he was able to transcend tribal lines, to become a truly national leader where a lesser man might so easily have fallen into the dead-end road of representing only his minority tribesmen. Within Africa itself he argued long and strongly for putting aside political differences and pursuing the immediate goal of economic progress through international cooperation. And within the world at large, where he moved with ease and grace and joy seldom seen in men of any culture, he saw the dangers inherent in a divided world and pleaded with all people to recognize the needs of their brothers and to help them to fuller achievement.

Mr. President, Tom Mboya was a man I was proud to call "friend." I do not know the specific cause of his death; the general cause is all too clear—by his leadership he placed himself in the exposed position which all such people risk. And a smaller mind, beseiged by hate or conflict of ideas, used the only method it knew to silence him forever.

Tom Mboya left a rich legacy to Kenya, to Africa, and to the world. To his family and multitude of friends I offer my deep condolences. To the people of Kenya I can find no finer words that those of President Kenyatta, the national slogan of Kenya itself so often used by Tom Mboya himself: "Harambee"—"Let's Pull Together."

And finally, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a number of perceptive articles and editorials which appears this week in the Washington Post and New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MBOYA IS SLAIN IN KENYA—KILLER FLEES AFTER ATTACK IN NAIROBI

(By Stanley Meisler)

NAIROBI, July 5—Tom Mboya, the African politician who seemed to represent all that was modern in Africa to the rest of the world, was shot and killed today on a busy shopping street in Nairobi.

Mboya, 38, Minister of Economic Planning and Development in the Kenya government, had just stepped out of a drugstore on Government Road. The street was crowded with shoppers trying to make their last purchases before stores closed for the weekend. The road was clogged with cars caught in the Saturday lunchtime traffic jam.

Eyewitnesses said an assassin sitting in a black car parked near the drugstore fired at Mboya three times. He was hit in the chest.

Mrs. Mohini Sehmi, wife of the drug store owner, said Mboya snapped back from the impact of the bullets. "I pulled him back into the shop," she said. "He staggered and fell down. He did not utter a word. It was a very terrible end."

Eyewitnesses said the black car then sped out of sight. It was not clear how the assassin managed to get away so quickly in such heavy traffic.

Mboya was rushed to Nairobi Hospital, but he was dead on arrival. Doctors said he died from bleeding of the chest wounds.

News of Mboya's death provoked some disturbances. In Kisumu on Lake Victoria in Western Kenya, some members of Mboya's Luo tribe stoned shops owned by Kikuyu businessmen.

The Kikuyus the dominant tribe of Kenya, are the tribe of President Jomo Kenyatta.

In Nairobi, Africans stoned the cars of motorists passing Nairobi Hospital. The Africans were evidently angered because the hospital refused to let them enter and see Mboya's body.

["This was no political killing," said Achieng Oneko, spokesman of the opposition Kenya People's Union, UPI reported. "There is no question of parties . . . Mboya belonged to us all."]

Foreigners admired Mboya. He was one of the few politicians in Africa who never appealed to tribal chauvinism. He tried to rise above tribal politics and to organize support across the nation. He was so successful that some members of his own tribe, the Luos, looked on him as a traitor.

Mboya also won respect as an administrator An American adviser to his ministry once said Mboya was the only minister in Kenya who had the ability to fill a cabinet post in Washington. He also had a shrewd sense of politics and a flair for meaningful oratory.

This admiration from foreigners, however, did not help Mboy at home. Other African politicians resented his popularity abroad. To them, it seemed the rest of the world looked on Mboya as the magazine cover boy of Africa. They were jealous and annoyed.

Mboya also lost political friends because of his arrogant manner. He was well-dressed, almost dapper, making clear to others that he felt superior. He was cold and tough and seemed to frighten or enrage his colleagues.

Outsiders in Narobi often played a game that could be called "Is Tom Up or Down" The game centered on guessing whether Mboya had the inside track to sucede President Kenyatta, 76, or had lost it.

PERSONAL ENEMIES

Logically, Mboya never seemed to have a chance. Too many politicians seemed ready to gang up to him. Too many could appeal to tribal sentiments and set them against Mboya—the man who always was a tribal outsider.

Yet he had advantages in the constant jostling for succession. His organizational nerve and drive outclassed anyone else's. Politicians, even if they did not like him, needed him to run their campaigns. Ministers, even when drafting legislation aimed at hurting him, often needed his skills to push the legislation through parliament.

Because he stood above tribes, Mboya might have been the only politician capable of uniting the country in the dislocation expected to follow the end of Kenyatta's reign.

The test of Mboya's chances was to come sometime within the next year. Kenyatta had promised the country general elections before the spring of 1970. No one doubted the government party would win. But the primary elections before the general vote were to reveal whether Mboya or his opponents in the government party would control the succession. The assassin's bullet ended the guessing.

Mboya was born in 1930 on a small island in Lake Victoria and educated in Catholic mission schools. He was a 22-year-old health inspector in Nairobi when the Mau Mau rebellion disrupted colonial Kenya in 1952. During the four-year war that followed, the British banned all Kikuyu from taking part in politics, for they were the main force behind Mau Mau.

Political leadership fell to members of other tribes. In 1953, Mboya, a Luo, became head of the Kenya Federation of Labor. Since all political parties had been banned, trade union leaderships gave Mboya one of the few avenues to political power left in Kenya.

RESENTED BY KIKUYU

Because of this background, the Kikuyu who languished in jails during Mau Mau and its aftermath or studied in exile in American and British schools saw Mboya as an usurper.

After the British allowed political parties again, Mboya led the African National Union to victory. The election, however, was fought with all African candidates demanding Kenyatta's release from detention. When Kenyatta was released. Mboya had to step aside and let him take the presidency of the party.

In 1963, when Kenya became independent, Kenyatta became the first Prime Minister and then President of the new country. Mboya was named Minister for Justice, then Minister for Economic Planning and Development.

Mboya had many friends in the United States. The AFL–CIO supported his trade union financially. This support later proved embarrassing. Rivals believed the AFL–CIO kept sending money to Mboya long after he left the trade union movement. Mboya denied this, however.

Mboya is likely to stand in modern African history as one of the first politicians to reject tribalism.

Yet, the immediate legacy of his death is likely to be more tribal conflict in Kenya. Luo tribesmen, who were annoyed by his nontribal sentiments when he was alive, now seem to view his death as a tribal slaying.

The Kenya police in Luo areas have decided to put Kikuyu tribesmen in custody for their own protection.

[From the Washington Post]

MBOYA ENVISIONED A GREATER AFRICA

(By Anthony Astrachan)

LONDON, July 5.—The assassination of Tom Mboya is a tragedy for Kenya and for Africa in ways far beyond his association with the West, where he was one of the continent's best-known public figures.

It is a tragedy because it strikes a note of individual violence that has left upheaval in its echoes every time it has been heard in Africa—as in the assassination of Patrice Lumumba in the Congo in 1961 and four of Nigeria's civilian leaders in 1966.

It is a tragedy because it deprives the country and the continent, new to modern statehood, of a leader young enough to provide continuity when the elder generation of nationalists passes from the scene. Mboya at 38 was a leading contender for the succession to elderly, ailing President Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya, who is 76. It is a rare country in Africa whose second generation of leaders shows promise of improving on the first.

BUILT INSTITUTIONS

Mboya's death is a tragedy because, in a continent where politics is usually personal and tribal, he was one of the few leaders with a well-articulated concept of the need for building institutions in the state that would outlast any individual or generation—that would provide at least the chance of viability for countries that need every chance they can get.

His friends in the West will mourn his supposed attachment to Western style democracy. His understanding of the uses of power and of African politics made many observers doubt the depth of the attachment.

Others will mourn the death of the man whose vital Ministry—economic development—often seemed one of only two or three in Kenya to function with anything remotely approaching efficiency.

Others will wonder about and perhaps shudder at, the prospects of Kenya's future without Mboya. None of his allies in Kenya's faction-fighting seems strong enough to fight for an institution-building regime without him. None of his enemies has shown the capacity to do as much for the country as he could.

IRONIC LEGACY

Mboya knew that, and the way he showed his knowledge made him more enemies. Still, if his assassin is found and turns out to be politically motivated, the bitterness could poison Kenya's already troubled air for years.

That would be an ironic legacy from the man who first made Kenya's trade unions an irritant, but a feared irritant, to the British colonial rulers—i.e., made them an African national force: from a man who organized an airlift of hundreds of students to America in a crash attempt to provide the trained manpower Kenya lacked for the independence she received in 1963: from a man who deferred his own vast ambition in devotion to Kenyatta, the prime leader brought from prison to power.

There is also something personal to regret about Mboya apart from the tragic violence of his death. He was a man who enjoyed life in both African and Western styles, who could combine serious talk with cocktail chat, who moved from quasi-revolutionary to realist-reformist with a minimum of trauma and maximum of vibrancy.

[From the New York Times]

GUNMAN KILLS TOM MBOYA, KENYAN LEADER, IN NAIROBI—ASSASSIN FLEES IN AUTO AFTER ATTACK ON BUSY DOWNTOWN STREET

NAIROBI, KENYA, July 5.—Tom Mboya, Kenya's Minister of Economic Affairs, was shot and killed by an unidentified assassin today as he emerged from a drugstore on a busy downtown street.

As Mr. Mboya appeared in the doorway, an auto pulled up in front of him, three men jumped out and one of them fired three shots, two of which are believed to have struck the Kenyan leader.

The three men then got back into their car and sped away. Mr. Mboya was rushed to Nairobi Hospital, where he was pronounced dead.

Mr. Mboya, who was 38 years old, was also Secretary General of the governing Kenyan African National Union (KANU), and was regarded as the third most powerful man in the Government behind President Jomo-Kenyatta and Vice President Daniel Arap Moi.

When the shots were fired, there were hundreds of shoppers in the area, many of whom fled. Mr. Mboya's bodyguard, who had preceded him through the doorway, crouched over his body weeping.

The police quickly put a cordon around the area and began questioning passersby. A widespread search for the three men was launched.

There were fears among Kenya's political leaders that the assassination might be regarded as the work of Mr. Mboya's political enemies and that the murder might spark reprisals.

The death of Tom, as he was known to thousands of his supporters, was greeted with sorrow throughout the nation, where he was regarded by many as Kenya's greatest hope for the future.

He had been active recently in organizing his party's campaign for general elections scheduled to be held in the next few months.

Mr. Mboya returned yesterday from Addis Abbaba, Ethiopia, where he had attended a meeting of the Economic Commission for Africa, a group sponsored by the United Nations.

His assassination was the first in Kenya since 1966, when Pio Gama Pinto, a supporter of Oginga Odinga, the opposition leader, was shot down at his home in Nairobi.

Mr. Mboya was a Luo tribesman, and bystanders told the police that the three assassins appeared to be Luos also.

CROWDS COME TO HOSPITAL

NAIROBI, July 5.—After the shooting, policemen ringed Nairobi Hospital to keep out grieving crowds trying to force their way into the casualty ward where Mr. Mboya's body lay. Some were cleared away by policemen wielding clubs.

Shocked leaders of the Kenyan African National Union also arrived at the hospital to see the body.

Joseph Ouma Nisa, Mr. Mboya's bodyguard, arrived and collapsed in the road crying: "It's not true! It's not true!"

Achieng Oneko, publicity secretary of the opposition party, the Kenya People's Union, arrived at the hospital in tears, saying: "This is not a political assassination. There is no question of parties here. He belonged to us all."

WIFE IS TAKEN TO HOSPITAL

NAIROBI, July 5.—News of Mr. Mboya's death was broken to his wife, Pamela, by an assistant in the drugstore who drove to the Mboya home in a borrowed car with a police officer. They accompanied her to the Nairobi Hospital.

Mrs. Mboya attended Western College for women at Oxford, Ohio.

TOM MBOYA

Tom Mboya was one of the most intelligent and attractive of the New Africa's leaders. He also had unusual capacity for hard work and especially for the tough political slogging necessary to win Kenya's independence and then to build a nation.

It was to Mr. Mboya that President Kenyatta invariably turned for the most taxing tasks: Shaping Kenya's republican Constitution, writing of what may prove a historic blueprint for "African Socialism," planning economic development, the removal of Oginga Odinga as Vice President of the country and the KANU party.

Mr. Mboya probably would never have become President. He was a Luo—and one without substantial tribal strength—in a country where Mr. Kenyatta's Kikuyus are likely to remain the dominant political factor. His early ties with the A.F.L.–C.I.O. unfairly gave him the political liability of the "American" label. His arrogance offended lesser politicians unnecessarily.

But his murder at 38 is a staggering loss for Kenya and will be felt around the world, particularly in new nations struggling for economic and political viability.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA OPPOSES UTILITY TAX LOOPHOLE

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a recent press release from the Consumer Federation of America. The release includes the text of the excellent statement submitted to the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees by Mrs. Erma Angevine, executive director of the organization, in opposition to the tax loophole permitting utilities to issue tax-free dividends to stockholders.

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

NEWS FROM THE CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA, JUNE 26, 1969

WASHINGTON, D.C.—A national consumer organization has urged Congress to close a tax law loophole which permits private utilities to pay stockholders tax-free dividends.

In a statement to members of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, Mrs. Erma Angevine, Executive Director of the Consumer Federation of America, said that "continuation of provisions . . . which permit tax avoidance can only feed consumer discontent and disillusionment—and create, inevitably, a lack of faith in the fairness and credibility of government."

CFA documented its appeal with a new study showing that 36 private power companies paid their stockholders $259 million in tax-free dividends in 1968. The study also showed that private power companies have paid a total of $1.6 *billion* in tax-free dividends since Congress passed the 1954 tax law which made such payments possible.

CFA described the tax-free dividend practice as "legalized financial legerdemain and double bookkeeping."

It said the practice "deprives the federal treasury of revenue which it would receive if these dividends were subject to normal taxation" and also results in the payment of "phantom taxes" by consumers in their utility bills.

The text of the CFA statement sent to members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee follows:

"The Consumer Federation of America, a voluntary federation of national, regional, state, and local consumer organizations, respectfully submits for your consideration the results of a new study. We believe that study shows that tax reform legislation is long overdue. We believe the study provides additional evidence of inequities in the tax code which permit some corporations and some individuals to avoid paying their fair share of income taxes.

"The new CFA study reveals that 36 private power companies paid their stockholders $259,328,287 in tax-free dividends in 1968. This means that more than one-quarter of a *billion* dollars in income received by the stockholders of these utilities escaped taxation. Since the enactment of the 1954 tax law—which makes this windfall possible—the total of such tax-free dividend payments to stockholders of private power companies has been $1,558,754,138.

"Stockholders enjoy these tax-free windfalls primarily as a result of the use by utilities of the rapid depreciation provisions of the 1954 tax law. Companies subject to federal or state regulation often are permitted to compute net income two different ways—once for tax purposes and once for regulatory purposes. When regulatory income exceeds tax income, the difference, if the company sees fit, may be paid to shareholders as a tax-free return of capital. The Internal Revenue Code considers any distribution in excess of accumulated or current earnings as a return of capital. Hence, payments made from sources other than profits are tax-free.

"Barron's, a weekly financial publication, headlined a story on this practice in these words as long ago as 1963: 'Foiling the IRS.' That was and still is all too true, for this practice deprives the federal treasury of revenue which it would receive if these dividends were subject to normal taxation.

"But consumers are also 'foiled,' for consumers are the ones who supply the money which power companies use to pay taxes and dividends. Specifically, power companies are really tax *collectors*, not tax payers. By long established regulatory principle, utility rates are designed to provide enough revenue to cover all operating expenses, including taxes, plus a supposedly reasonable return on investment. However, inconsistencies between the tax law and the interpretations of utility regulatory agencies permit utilities to charge consumers for more income taxes than they, the utilities, actually relay to the government. The power companies keep the difference and it is this difference between taxes actually paid, and funds collected from consumers—supposedly for taxes—which is distributed each year as tax-free dividends to stockholders.

"Consumers thus pay 'phantom taxes' to utilities. Utilities use this 'phantom tax' accumulation to benefit stockholders. The losers are both the federal treasury and consumers.

"The Consumer Federation of America believes the tax law should be reformed to eliminate this and other inequities which permit corporations and individuals to escape paying their full share of taxes. These forms of legalized financial legerdemain and double bookkeeping should be ended. Continuation of provisions in the law which permit tax avoidance can only feed consumer discontent and disillusionment—and create, inevitably, a lack of faith in the fairness and credibility of government.

"A list of power companies which paid tax-free dividends in 1968, and a company by company breakdown of such tax-free dividend payments since 1954, is attached. We will be pleased to provide additional documentation at your request."

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA STUDY OF TAX-FREE DIVIDENDS PAID BY PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES IN 1968

	Tax-free dividends paid in 1968	Percent of total dividends tax free in 1968	Total tax-free dividends since 1954 [1]
Arizona Public Service	$5,100,000	60.0	$36,996,989
Atlantic City Electric	3,663,038	46.0	31,518,668
Black Hills Power & Light Co	86,223	[2]	245,227
Brockton Edison			2,074,694
Central Hudson Gas & Electric	1,439,250	28.8	9,758,873
Central Lousiana Electric	2,302,324	44.1	13,965,621
Central Maine Power			4,812,492
Central Vermont Public Service	1,124,092	71.0	1,124,092
Consolidated Edison (C)	67,102,000	100.0	300,596,974
Consolidated Edison (5¼ B)	3,071,250	78.0	3,071,250
Detroit Edison	4,643,106	[3]	91,131,507
Duquesne Light	7,598,286	34.68	27,300,321
El Paso Electric			2,958,458
Exeter & Hampton Electric			7,565
Fall River Electric Light			1,022,110
Fitchburg Gas & Electric Light	59,412	13.79	737,955
Florida Power			760,396
Florida Public Utilities			222,724
Green Mountain Power	575,575	65.0	1,313,179
Gulf States Utilities			8,535,997
Hawaiian Electric Co	346,894	7.9	3,761,771
Idaho Power	3,580,505	35.0	23,657,249
Illinois Power (C)			3,201,000
Illinois Power (P)			1,877,064
Interstate Power			2,404,220
Long Island Lighting	6,982,510	31.0	11,621,740
Maine Public Service	149,124	20.0	1,572,922
Missouri Public Service			339,300
New England Electric System	9,738,855	45.0	58,754,431
New England Power (P)			$347,568
Niagara Mohawk	$22,208,200	70.0	135,987,831
Northeast Utilities	18,108,537	59.0	28,124,392
Northern States Power (Minnesota)	14,525,840	56.0	14,525,840
Oklahoma Gas & Electric			10,161,303
Orange & Rockland Utilities	3,809,416	81.93	12,598,021
Pacific Gas & Electric	13,243,724	[4]	68,841,977
Pacific Power & Light (C)	11,797,760	64.0	121,924,916
Pacific Power & Light (P)			8,788,658
Portland General Electric	3,539,200	[5]	38,615,471
Potomac Electric Power Co	11,077,369	53.0	40,410,000
Public Service Electric & Gas Co	14,875,266	29.8	47,415,002
Public Service of Indiana			25,340,454
Public Service of New Hampshire			13,456,472
Puget Sound Power & Light (C)	3,310,248	51.0	29,627,896
Puget Sound Power & Light (P)			1,910,019
Rochester Gas & Electric	4,577,100	66.0	4,577,100
Savannah Electric & Power	305,531	15.0	2,410,500
Sierra Pacific Power Co	2,229,920	77.0	9,124,035
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co			1,244,431
Southwestern Electric Service Co	205,083	[6]	2,741,998
Southwestern Public Service Co	2,394,110	[7]	20,049,161
Union Electric	12,397,474	43.0	112,220,664
Upper Peninsula Power	81,736	[8]	81,736
Utah Power & Light	1,652,846	[9]	9,148,337
Virginia Electric & Power			4,062,107
Washington Water Power	1,426,483	20.29	42,939,399
Total	259,328,287		1,452,020,077

Footnotes at end of table.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA STUDY OF TAX-FREE DIVIDENDS PAID BY PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES IN 1968—Continued

	Tax-free dividends paid in 1968	Percent of total dividends tax free in 1968	Total tax-free dividends since 1954 [1]
The following power companies have been merged into other utility systems:			
California Electric Power [10]			$15,345,062
California Oregon Power [11]			18,333,924
Connecticut Light & Power [12]			26,348,153
Connecticut Power [13]			1,340,731
Essex County Electric [14]			565,796
Hartford Electric Light [13]			30,977,031
Haverhill Electric [15]			176,474
Lawrence Electric [15]			466,917
Lowell Electric Light [15]			522,886
The following power companies have been mereged—Continued			
Merrimack-Essex Electric [16]			$2,649,636
Rockland Light & Power [17]			2,783,439
Southern Berkshire Power & Electric [18]			190,646
Suburban Electric [16]			1,480,291
Weymouth Light & Power [18]			435,990
Worcester County Electric [18]			5,117,085
Total			106,734,061
Total tax-free dividends since 1954			1,558,754,138

[1] Not all companies paid tax-free dividends in all years from 1954 through 1968. For year-by-year breakdown, see Nov. 30, 1961, Jan. 7, 1963, Oct. 21, 1963, July 20, 1964, July 23, 1965, ECIC Newsletters; Oct. 25, 1966, and July 25, 1967, CIC Newsletters; and CFA "Consumers, Taxes, and Utilities," Sept. 16, 1968.
[2] 12.3 percent of Mar. 1, June 1, and Sept. 1 dividends only.
[3] 21 percent of July dividend; 25 percent of October dividend.
[4] 3.4 percent of January dividend; 19.6 percent of April, July, and October dividends.
[5] Estimated 40 to 45 percent; for purposes of this study, 40 percent has been used.
[6] 51.37 percent of Mar. 15 and June 15 dividends; 49.86 percent of Sept. 15 and Dec. 15 dividends.
[7] 22.12 percent of Mar. 1, June 1, and Sept. 1 dividends; 13.5 percent of Dec. 1 dividend.
[8] 14 percent of August dividend; 21 percent of November dividend.
[9] 16.71 percent of January dividend; 21.62 percent of April, July, and October dividends.
[10] Merged with Southern California Edison Co., 1963.
[11] Merged with Pacific Power and Light, 1961.
[12] Subsidiary of Northeast Utilities, 1967.
[13] Merged with Hartford Electric Light, 1956.
[14] Name changed to Merrimack-Essex, 1957.
[15] Merged with Merrimack-Essex, 1957.
[16] Merged with Massachusetts Electric Co. (part of New England Electric System), 1962.
[17] Name changed to Orange & Rockland Utilities, 1958.
[18] Merged with Massachusetts Electric Co. (part of New England Electric System), 1961.

Sources: For percent of divident payments considered tax free by companies, Prentice-Hall's "Capital Adjustments" and Moody's "Public Utilities" and "Divident Record" services. For total divident payments, company reports to FPC and Moody's services. Computations by Consumer Federation of America, Inc. Dividend payments are those made on common stock, except where noted. Where company paid tax-free dividends on both common and preferred, each is identified: (C) on common stock; (P) on preferred stock.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11612) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 2 o'clock a vote be taken on the committee amendment relating to the $20,000 limitation on farm payments.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think the Senator's request also should cover the matter of taking up the committee amendment on limitations now, out of order, because in the regular order it would come after some other amendments, inasmuch as there are several amendments which we have not approved which precede that amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Mr. President, I amend my unanimous-consent request accordingly.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the time until 2 o'clock be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. There should be added to the unanimous consent agreement that beginning at 2 o'clock there will be a live quorum.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suggest the live quorum be called now.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well; the vote at 2 o'clock and the time divided.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. Attachés should notify Senators that it will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TALMADGE in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 52 Leg.]

Aiken	Goldwater	Murphy
Allen	Goodell	Pastore
Baker	Hansen	Pell
Boggs	Hart	Randolph
Burdick	Holland	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Sparkman
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Stennis
Cook	Inouye	Talmadge
Curtis	Javits	Williams, N.J.
Dirksen	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Young, N. Dak.
Eagleton	Mansfield	Young, Ohio
Ellender	McGee	
Fannin	Moss	

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator of New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator of Florida (Mr. GURNEY), and the Senator of Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) are detained on official business.

The PRESDIING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). A quorum is not present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the presence of absent Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana. The motion is agreed to, and the Sergeant at Arms will carry out the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Allott	Harris	Mundt
Bayh	Hartke	Muskie
Bellmon	Hatfield	Packwood
Bennett	Hughes	Pearson
Bible	Jackson	Percy
Case	Kennedy	Proxmire
Church	Long	Russell
Cooper	Mathias	Scott
Cranston	McCarthy	Smith
Dodd	McClellan	Spong
Dole	McGovern	Stevens
Eastland	McIntyre	Symington
Ervin	Metcalf	Thurmond
Fong	Miller	Tower
Fulbright	Mondale	Yarborough
Gore	Montoya	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Chair lays before the Senate the committee amendment having to do with the limitation on payments which the clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 14, after the word "regulations", strike out the colon and *"Provided further,* That no part of the funds appropriated by this act shall be used to formulate or

carry out any price support program (other than for sugar) under which payments aggregating more than $20,000 under all such programs are made to any producer on any crop planted in the fiscal year 1970.".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the vote on this amendment will occur at the hour of 2 o'clock p.m. today, the time between now and 2 p.m. to be equally divided between the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I first yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK).

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, some of us have been rather disturbed by the fact that there is now the largest backlog of REA applications in history; estimated at $714 million; yet the House Appropriations Committee appropriated only $320 million for this purpose. The Senate committee raised that figure by $20 million, for which we are grateful. I wish to call your attention to the language in the committee report on page 35 which reads as follows:

> The committee takes note of the large backlog of loan applications pending at the agency and has provided the additional authorization to meet a part of this backlog. It requests that the REA Administrator file with the committee, not later than next January 31, a full report on the exact situation in terms of firm loan applications on hand as of December 31, 1969, together with the best estimate of additional applications to be received during the balance of fiscal 1970.

That seems to suggest that as of that time, January 31 of next year, after the report has been filed by the administrator of the agency, the committee will give further consideration to this backlog in connection with the next supplemental appropriation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, replying to the distinguished Senator's question, I wish to say that there is no commitment of the committee, of course, as to what it will do at that time; but the committee felt that we should have information available at that time as to the size of the backlog, so that we would be free, if it seemed wise, to consider it in connection with the supplemental bill or in any other way that we felt it should be considered.

I might say that the committee bill added $20 million over the House amount, making a total $340 million. In addition, there is a $25 million carryover, making $365 million available for the fiscal year 1970 electrification program.

Mr. BURDICK. I thank the Senator. Those of us who are concerned can expect that the committee will give serious consideration to this backlog at that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is correct.

Mr. BURDICK. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the committee report (No. 91-277) under the subheading "Loan Authorization for Electrification Loans," on page 35 of the report, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Loan authorization for electrification loans

1969 new budget (obligational) authority to date	$329,000,000
1970 budget estimates—New (obligational) authority	320,000,000
House bill—New (obligational) authority	320,000,000
Committee recommendation—new (obligational) authority	340,000,000

The committee recommends a loan authorization of $340 million for the electrification program in fiscal year 1970. The new authorization, plus an estimated carryover of $25 million will provide a lending program of $365 million, which is $20 million over the current year level. The new authorization is thus $20 million over the budget estimate and the House bill and $11 million over the amount authorized a year ago.

The committee takes note of the large backlog of loan applications pending at the agency and has provided the additional authorization to meet a part of this backlog. It requests that the REA Administrator file with the committee, not later than next January 31, a full report on the exact situation in terms of firm loan applications on hand as of December 31, 1969, together with the best estimate of additional applications to be received during the balance of fiscal 1970. This report should also indicate clearly the sufficiency of loan authorization to meet the orderly requirements of the electrification program for the entire fiscal year.

The committee concurs in the statement in the House report that in view of the urgent need for "heavying-up" distribution facilities, that first consideration shall be given to the critical needs of distribution-type loans, and that generation and transmission loans be held to a minimum in the coming fiscal year.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on page 35 of the committee report, under loan authorization for electrification loans the committee requests that the REA Administrator "file with the committee not later than next January 31 a full report on the exact situation in terms of farm loan applications on and as of December 31, 1969, together with the best estimate of additional applications to be received during the balance of fiscal year 1970." I am glad the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), indicated that the committee will give consideration to a supplemental appropriation if loan demands as stated in the report of the REA Administrator filed with the committee on January 31 warrant it. Rural Electric Cooperatives both distribution and G. & T. have done an outstanding job of providing central station electric power to rural America. Demands for electricity in rural America continue to grow and both distribution and G. & T. cooperatives are faced with the need to heavy-up and expand their systems in order to fulfill the provisions of the REA Act for complete area coverage and to meet the growing demands of their consumers.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I next yield such time as he may require—which I understand will be approximately 7 minutes—to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I want to express my strong opposition to the current proposal to place a $20,000 limitation on payments to any producer under our farm programs for crops planted during fiscal year 1970.

To the average person, particularly those not familiar with the operation of our present farm programs, a $20,000 payment limitation might seem reasonable. A close study of the problems of agriculture and of the need to maintain a sound agriculture should reveal that such a limit would be a cripling blow to the American agricultural economy.

The stated purposes of our Federal farm programs are to assist in maintaining and improving farm income, to assure abundant supplies of low cost, high-quality food and fiber, and to preserve and protect the soil resources of the Nation.

In seeking to improve farm income Congress has enacted our present farm price support programs. Under them producers voluntarily limit their plantings and, in return, receive income protection in the form of low-level price support loans and production payments in the case of feed grants and cotton and wheat certificate payments in the case of wheat.

All of the payments made to farmers, large and small, are either for some service they have performed or are in lieu of price support in another form. For years prior to the enactment of our current programs, we maintained a system of high price supports. With all of their shortcomings, these were successful in maintaining farm prices at reasonable levels.

Cash market prices for most commodities have fallen as price support loan levels under the new programs have been reduced. Wheat, for example, is now bringing the farmer an average of $1.27 per bushel. This is practically the same as we sold wheat for back in the 1920's.

Even with voluntary production control programs, we are faced with the prospect of big surpluses. In the case of some commodities, we must rely heavily on the export market as an outlet for a large part of our production. Almost two out of every three bushels of wheat produced in this country, for example, must be exported.

Even with voluntary production control programs, we are faced with the prospect of big surpluses. Farmers have cut back their crop acreages and are still faced with further planting reductions. Next year wheat producers will be asked to reduce plantings by another 10 to 15 percent in order to be eligible for diversion and certificate payments.

This proposal would limit total payments to a producer under all of these programs. A sizable wheat producer, who may also be a participant in the feed grain or cotton program, faced with the prospect of a payments limitation, would be presented with an impossible choice. His alternative to program participation would be to stay out of the program altogether and try to greatly increase his production in order to meet his costs and provide a living for his family. The result of such action would be to add to the already burdensome surpluses and further depress farm prices.

It is necessary for all farmers to participate in these programs if they are to be successful in securing decent farm

prices in the marketplace. Price depressing surpluses must be avoided if we are to maintain farm income, hold down Government costs, and prevent a collapse of the agricultural economy.

If the proposed limitation is approved, the present cotton program would cease to be in effect and, under the so-called "snap back" provision, would be replaced by a program requiring price support loans at levels between 65 and 90 percent of parity. The present loan level on cotton is about 45 percent of parity. Under this, most, if not all, of the savings claimed by the proponents of the limitation would be lost. Worse than this, however, would be critical damage that would be done to the cotton industry. This would inevitably place cotton at a price disadvantage and would mean further loss of markets to synthetics.

As I have indicated, our farm programs are also aimed at preserving our soil resources and providing abundant food at reasonable prices. The conservation of our soil is something of utmost concern, not only to farmers, but to all of us. In fact, it would seem that any effort to maintain soil fertility and productivity would be more important to nonfarm people. This is the surest way for us to assure the availability of adequate food supplies for years to come.

Throughout history, there are examples of great nations that have declined and fallen simply because they failed to conserve their soil and could no longer provide the most basic needs of their people.

Mr. President, one of the better discussions of the question of the payments limitation that has come to my attention is an editorial that appeared in the June 1, 1969, issue of the Fargo Forum, North Dakota's largest daily newspaper. This editorial was written by the paper's editor, Mr. John Paulson. I would like to read part of that editorial and I ask unanimous consent that it appear in its entirety at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the editorial in part reads as follows:

What the politically minded congressmen who vote for such a curb don't seem to realize is that the farm payments are not a subsidy; they are a payment by the government for specific performance by the farmers. If Congress did not believe that the price support programs and the conservation programs were necessary to the sound economic health of the United States itself, they should not have been approved in the first place.

The purpose of the farm programs is to keep the total crop production under control, so that the market place will bring to the farmer a sufficient cash return to keep the farmer and his family on the farm, instead of forcing them off the farm into the big cities as potential relief clients.

If the farm programs were a relief program, then the top payment should be limited to $3,000, the federal government's dividing line between the poor and the not-so-poor.

When the federal government attempts to limit production, it must limit the production on all land, not just on those lands owned by the average family farmer.

But if the $20,000 ceiling were successfully imposed, next year the ceiling would be cut to $15,000 and then to $10,000 and probably even lower.

This would be one effective way of killing all farm programs, and offer no substitutes. As a result there would be a threat of a potential glut on the market of some of the crops now under the control programs, and the net result would be the elimination of more and more family farmers who simply could not stand the economic pressure.

The big farms would grab up more and more land, and the United States would find itself with a massive farm-tenant operation calling for massive land reforms.

I firmly feel that the time and place to deal with the question of payments limitation is when general farm legislation is considered by Congress. Our present farm programs expire at the end of the 1970 crop year. That means that we must write new legislation either late this session or early next year.

Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin has been working on this and I understand that he will be making some proposals for establishing reasonable and workable limitations without crippling the programs themselves.

In 1968, only 46 North Dakota farmers received payments under these programs in excess of $20,000. Only three of these received more than $50,000. The largest payment in my State was only $72,504. It would be the popular thing in my State for me to vote for this limitation. I would do so if I could disassociate myself from the feeling that it is not in the bset interest of farmers and farm programs and all people in this country who are concerned over the need for abundant food at reasonable prices now and for years to come.

Mr. President, I shall support the deletion of the limitation of payments.

EXHIBIT 1

CURB ON FARM PROGRAMS POLITICALLY INSPIRED

Once again the U.S. House of Representatives has approved a politically-inspired proposal to put a ceiling of $20,000 a year on the amount any one farmer may receive from the federal farm price support program, the Agricultural Conservation program, the Croplands Adjustment program and the old Soil Bank program.

We call the proposal politically-inspired because the attempt to curb the U.S. Department of Agriculture programs comes primarily from the big city congressmen who delight in singling out the very few farmers who have received payment of $100,000 to over $1 million from the USDA, and complain at the same time that the poor in the big city ghettoes are being denied food for the hungry by the same Department of Agriculture.

What the politically minded congressmen who vote for such a curb don't seem to realize is that the farm payments are not a subsidy; they are a payment by the government for specific performance by the farmers. If Congress did not believe that the price support programs and the conservation programs were necessary to the sound economic health of the United States itself, they should not have been approved in the first place.

The purpose of the farm program is to keep the total crop production under control, so that the market place will bring to the farmer a sufficient cash return to keep the farmer and his family on the farm, instead of forcing them off the farm into the big cities as potential relief clients.

If the farm programs were a relief program, then the top payment should be limited to $3,000, the federal government's dividing line between the poor and the not-so-poor.

When the federal government attempts to limit production, it must limit the production on all land, not just on those lands owned by the average family farmer.

The same congressmen who tried to limit farmers' income will turn around and vote for minimum wage laws and other labor legislation which act to give the transportation agency, the processor and the retailers a greater and greater share of the consumer dollar.

Fortunately, the new secretary of Agriculture appointed by President Richard M. Nixon, Clifford M. Hardin, has already urged the Senate to kill the House-approved ceiling.

He said he was not judging the moral or the ethics of big payments to some larger farms, but was considering how government programs can be operated so that they hold down surplus production. Quite simply, he said that the government was getting value received for the payments made to farmers, and that the payments were not a subsidy in the true sense of the word.

Mr. Hardin said the administration believes that a sound program of payment limitations to some of the larger farm operations can be drafted later, but should not be tacked on to programs now being carried out. He said the entire subject should be considered when Congress takes up general farm program revisions which will take effect in 1971

"As long as we are not talking about specific dollar limitations, we think a sound program can be devised that will certainly modify the payment structure that we now have, and modify it downward," he said.

The records show that relatively few farmers in Minnesota and the Dakotas get over the $20,000 total in annual payments. The collections in the million dollar classification generally come from the Deep South, the land of the old plantations and the huge land owning families, and from Texas and California. But if the $20,000 ceiling were successfully imposed, next year the ceiling would be cut to $15,000 and then to $10,000 and probably even lower.

This would be one effective way of killing all farm programs, and offer no substitutes. As a result there would be a threat of a potential glut on the market of some of the crops now under the control programs, and the net result would be the elimination of more and more family farmers who simply could not stand the economic pressure.

The big farms would grab up more and more land, and the United States would find itself with a massive farm-tenant operation calling for massive land reforms.

The Senate wiped out the $20,000 limitation a year ago, and certainly it should do so again, particularly with the rewriting of the farm programs slated for the next crop year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the pending business is the amendment the House of Representatives included in H.R. 11612, an amendment which provided as follows:

No part of the funds appropriated by this Act shall be used to formulate or carry out any price support program (other than for sugar) under which payments aggregating more than $20,000 under all such programs are made to any producer on any crop planted in the fiscal year 1970.

The Senate Appropriations Committee amendment proposes to strike that lan-

guage from the committee bill. Therefore, the parliamentary situation is that the committee amendment is now the pending business, and those who favor the retention of the $20,000 ceiling will vote no, against the committee amendment. I am proposing that we defeat the committee amendment and thereby retain the House amendment which places a limitation of $20,000 on these payments.

The argument has been made, as it is every time this matter comes up, that if we place a ceiling on these payments, it will cost more money to administer the program.

I disagree completely. That is a falacious argument. There is no substance which would substantiate that argument.

However, rather than debate the point I have a second amendment which will be offered immediately following the vote on the pending amendment. The purpose of this second amendment is to repeal the so-called snap-back provision under which the Secretary said he would have to support cotton as one commodity at higher rates than under the regular act. Therefore the argument about the so-called snap-back provisions need not bother anybody on voting on the $20,000 limitation because if we can defeat the committee amendment the next vote will be to eliminate the snap-back provision.

As far as the broad agricultural program is concerned I think it would be well to review the history of this law. It started at 90 percent support for certain agriculture commodities during World War II. It was initiated at that time as a wartime measure for encouraging and increasing wartime production on the farms so that we might have that production for our own use and for supporting and feeding our allies in Europe.

This high, rigid support of 90 percent was initiated during World War II with the understanding that it was to drop back within 1 year after the end of the war. However, now, 24 years later, these high support programs are still being continued on an even more expensive basis.

At some point, somewhere, I think we must face up to the problem and cut down on the cost of this agriculture program. There is no justification for continuing these large payments at this time. Both the Congress and every administration that has ever been in power, either Democratic or Republican, have always expressed a lot of sympathy for the small farmer. Yet these larger payments do not help the small farmer. Quite the contrary, they place the small farmer at a decided disadvantage from a subsidy standpoint, because the small farmer today has to have a certain minimum amount of equipment—a combine, tractors, and other types of large equipment—to carry on the work on the family-size farm and utilize his own labor and the equipment to capacity. If he has a one-family farm and puts a portion of his acreage under the soil bank or in one of the acreage diversion programs it means that he cannot efficiently utilize either his labor or his equipment.

Therefore, it becomes a less efficient operation, whereas the larger corporate-type operation, with several thousand acres, can place a portion of its acreage in the reserve program, take the payments, put the machinery in the shed, lay off a number of its employees, and still have an efficient operation.

The programs would help the small farmers if we placed a reasonable limitation on the amount. If we impose a limitation of $20,000 it would give an advantage to the small farmer. Then the large operator who is now getting in excess of $20,000 would certainly be at some disadvantage as regards the small farmer.

Besides, limiting the payments to $20,000 would cut the cost of the program by around $300 million annually.

The argument is made that if we impose this limitation it would completely destroy the agricultural program and that we will not be able to feed ourselves. I hope that that is not a serious argument. Certainly we have not drifted so far from our belief in the free enterprise system as to think we cannot operate an agriculture program successfully without continued paternalistic control from Washington.

Have Members of Congress forgotten that many of our agricultural products today are not receiving and over the years have never received benefits of Government subsidies or Government support programs; yet they have succeeded just as well in the free market as have some of the products which have been the beneficiaries of large subsidies. Also, smaller farmers have fared better in these uncontrolled programs.

Another argument that is made is, Why discontinue the subsidy for the agricultural program when there are so many other subsidies for private industry which should likewise be stopped?

That is no argument. If there are other subsidies that need correcting then let us do it.

It is true that there are many subsidy programs for various segments of industry, and they are long overdue for a change. I shall be the first to try to help to change them.

Nevertheless, whenever we have before us one of these other subsidy programs that is sought to be changed we get that same argument. The argument is always made, "Why not hit some of the other subsidies?" My answer is that the time to review any subsidy is when it is before the Senate. The subsidy for agriculture is before us today.

As to the fairness of the limitation, there are precedents for limiting the payments to small farmers. The ACP payments are limited to the small farmers, only with a $3,000 or $5,000 limit.

I placed in the RECORD on June 26 a list of those farmers who in 1968 received in excess of $60,000 under the present law. It was a partial list, taken from the committee's report; but it is significant to note that five farming operations received payments in excess of $1 million each. Thirteen recipients were drawing payments between $500,000 and $1 million. Certainly, those payments cannot be justified as having been made to small farmers

One of the payments under this program was to the Delta Pine Land Co., Scott, Miss., in the amount of $605,796. That organization is a group of British stockholders who own farmland in this country. Yet they are classified as a farmer and receive a cash payment of over $600,000 from American taxpayers. I see no justification for that payment, nor do I see why we should continue to support that type of corporate farm operation.

I cite another example of some of the so-called larger farming operations. The Texas Department of Corrections is classified as a "farmer" under this program and received two payments, one of $294,301, the other of $75,619.

The Arkansas State Penitentiary also is classified as a "farmer" under this program and received a cash payment of $154,412.

The State of Washington, classified as a "farmer," draws $146,764.

The Louisiana State Penitentiary is classified as a "farmer" under the program and collected $114,363.

I have previously said that an interesting question arises in those cases. Suppose a penitentiary violated the law with respect to the quota system and were indicted and prosecuted. I wonder how the penitentiary would be punished. Certainly it could not be put in a penitentiary.

These examples merely point up the absurdity of the whole program.

Certainly the smallest step the Senate could take would be to reject the committee amendment and retain the language of the House bill, thereby placing a $20,000 ceiling on these payments. Then the Senate should repeal the so-called snap back. Following this, Congress should get busy and write a good farm program, one which will be fair to the small farmer and far less costly to the taxpayers.

Some would now argue, why not defer this discussion until a bill from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is before us?

An agriculture appropriations bill is before us now. There will never be a better time.

Today we are in this very fortunate position in that the House of Representatives has already voted for a $20,000 limitation. In order that it may become law the only step necessary to be taken now is to have the Senate reject the committee amendment and support the position of the House. Then we shall be well on the road toward saving the taxpayers nearly $300 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The additional time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. President, the issue before the Senate is whether to delete the House-approved limitation by the amendment which is now before the Senate. I support

the Senate committee amendment to delete the House-approved amendment.

Mr. President, farm payments limitation is neither a new nor a novel question for most Senators. Last year, when the Senate debated a bill to extend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, one issue which received considerable attention was whether a limitation on payments to individual farmers was proper. Two amendments to the bill were offered, one limiting payments per farm to $25,000, and the other limiting payments per farm to $75,000. After useful debate, both amendments were defeated.

The amendment before the Senate today is similar to the amendments of last year, with similar arguments marshalled for and against. The only differences from the amendments of last year are the amount of the limitation and the fact that the amendment this year is proposed to an appropriations bill rather than a legislative bill.

A $20,000-a-year ceiling on payments to individual farmers was imposed by the House recently as an amendment to the 1970 agriculture appropriations bill, H.R. 11612. The bill passed the House and was sent to the Senate. The Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee and the full Appropriations Committee considered and, on a number of items, amended H.R. 11612, and reported the bill favorably to the Senate. That bill is before the Senate now. After careful consideration, the Appropriations Committee deleted the limitation of $20,000 which had been added on the floor of the House. Whether or not to restore that House-approved limitation at this time by amendment on the Senate floor is the issue before us.

Mr. President, the present farm programs are not helping the small farmers of America; on the other hand, if this amendment were adopted under the existing programs, the small farmer would be even more adversely affected. The proper way to improve the present program is by enactment of a new comprehensive program. A limitation of payments only undermines the existing program without offering any effective substitute.

On the surface, it might appear reasonable to limit the payments that can be received by a single farm operator under the price-support programs. This view prevailed in the House of Representatives when it voted 224 to 142 to place the ceiling of $20,000 a year on such payments. However, closer study reveals how unreasonable the proposal would be.

Our farms have great capacity for overproduction, and large producers will have to use that capacity if the ability to pay them to limit production is abolished. Then we will have to look to smaller farmers for the needed production adjustment. This will force the small farmers off the farms which become uneconomic to operate. Also, the increased production would force the low prices even lower, and make the impact even more severe on farmers having smaller holdings. The result would be injurious to agriculture, and disruptive to the economy of my home State of Nebraska, and to that of the Midwest generally.

Let us examine three arguments that have been made in favor of a farm payments limitation: that it will save the Government money; that it will remove an inequity of large producers receiving large sums of money while small producers receive pittances; that it will permit the farm program to concentrate on helping the small farmers.

First, the plain fact is that a simple limitation on payments as contained in the legislation passed by the House would not result in a savings to the Federal Government. The savings argument, which has been the peg on which the proponents of the limitation amendment have hung their case, simply does not stand up.

A payments limitation would trigger a snapback provision for cotton, for example, making the cotton program subject to a loan-and-redemption or buy-and-sell-back arrangement that would actually increase the cost to the Federal Government, besides the increased cost of the limitation program.

Every cotton cooperator would be entitled to receive either a loan on or to have purchased all of the cotton produced within his farm acreage allotment. When the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee held a hearing on June 4, 1969, on the proposed payments limitation, Secretary Hardin testified on this point. He stated:

> We feel that we would be required to carry it out in a manner which will make available to all cooperators price support at not less than 65 percent of parity through loan or purchase on all cotton produced on their 1970 acreage allotments.

Besides increasing the cost of the cotton program, the limitation would cause increased administrative expenses for all of the farm programs, because with the elimination of the large producers many more farms would be involved in the programs in order to control production.

A good example of the increased administrative costs would be the predicted impact of the limitation on the feed grain program. Participation in the program would drop, primarily because the economic incentive to participate in the program is considerably weaker than the incentive to participate in the cotton and wheat programs. A ceiling of $20,000 would reduce feed grain diversion by about 1.5 million acres and reduce Government payments by about $50 million. However in order to encourage the remaining participants in the program to absorb those 1.5 million acres to maintain a stable program, it would require an increase in payment rate costing the Government about $50 million. So, no gain would accrue to the Government by limiting payments. In fact, if some of the wheat producers who have their payments limited switch over to feed grains, it might cost the Government an additional $10 to $15 million to maintain the proper production level for feed grains.

It is also possible that the large farmers might, rather than dropping out of the programs, just change their mode of operation or ownership and still receive the same amount of payment as they do today, but at a greatly increased administrative cost to the Government. A considerable proportion of the farms subject to the limitation would undoubtedly be split up or leased out in such a fashion as to escape the limitation. Legally, these changes would not be difficult to accomplish, and it would be extremely difficult for the Department of Agriculture to prevent them.

The Department has estimated that as much as 75 to 85 percent of the potential cotton acreage affected by the $20,000 limit would be able to maintain its eligibility for full payment in this way.

The increased cost to the Government of the proposed payment limitation, considering all of the effects, has been estimated at about $160 million. I underline this point. Without other changes in the agricultural legislation, a payment limitation will increase the cost of our farm programs.

The second argument is that a payment limitation will remove the inequity of large producers receiving large sums of money while small producers receive pittances. This argument is based on the erroneous notion that farm payments are entirely subsidies or income supplements. This is not true, particularly for feed grains and wheat.

Where a feed grain farmer gives up the right to grow feed grains or any other crop for sale or use on 20 percent of his feed grain base under the farm program, in all fairness he has a right to be reimbursed for his contribution of this property right, regardless of his income status. Remember, the farm programs are based on the premise of voluntary participation to achieve an end of public policy; to be voluntary, the program must offer the proper incentive to the farmer who has committed his livelihood to his land.

Since America recognizes private property, the Government must pay for any public acquisition of property or any utilization thereof. If the Government were to limit the use of the land of a few owners without payment, this would be tantamount to confiscation of a property right of the owners. If we leave those owners the option of receiving only a partial value for diverting the productive use of their land, this would clearly drive most larger owners out of the program.

The amount of payment that smaller farmers receive is proportionate to the amount of land that they divert. This is the same standard applied against the larger farmers. The difference in payment is due only to the difference in land diverted.

Mr. President, the third argument in favor of a limitation is that a payment ceiling of $20,000 would return the advantage of the farm programs to the small farmers. This argument is fallacious. It would instead place an increased burden on the small farmers. The Government would be compelled to induce the small farmers to participate even more extensively in the programs in order to keep the production level stable. If the farmers did not, farm prices for crops would fall due to overproduction. If they did, it would become even harder for them to operate efficiently because their machinery and labor would be less economical for smaller production levels. They are damned if they do, and damned if they do not.

The adverse economic impact on the small farmers if they must carry the entire burden of production control is clear.

Mr. President, although the three arguments in favor of a payments limitation are made in good faith and with the best interests of the public well-being high in mind. They are misleading and erroneous. The costs to the Federal Government will be higher, not lower. The inequity alleged is imaginary, not real. The small farmers will be affected adversely, not favorably.

For Nebraskans, a payment limitation would have two detrimental effects. Because the biggest impact of the payments limitation would be on the large cotton producers in the South who would be restricted in their compensation for leaving land idle, it is quite likely that they would turn to other crops in direct competition with the primary crops of the Midwest.

This threat is real. A Department of Agriculture study stated:

> If payments were reduced or eliminated, a chain reaction most likely would occur as farmers began seeking alternative crops which give promise of enhancing their income position.

Besides this direct crop competition, if the farmers of the South turned to feed grains and grass for cattle raising this could seriously challenge the livestock industry of the Midwest. Cheap and available feed for cattle would not only induce increased cattle raising in the South as new competition but might also cause the disastrous overproduction of meat animals. This would undermine the hard price gains only recently achieved by the industry through restraint and orderly marketing.

My last point goes not to sound Government economy, nor to stable agriculture production, but rather to sound legislative procedure. I do not believe the agriculture appropriations bill is the proper place for an amendment such as the payments limitation, especially as an amendment from the floor of the Senate. Legislative changes are needed, not simple expedients as substitutes for sound legislation.

The wise and judicious course for the Congress to follow is to wait until the Department of Agriculture submits new farm legislation. The Department is expected to submit it early in the fall of this year. Secretary Hardin said during the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee hearings that the Department is ready to work with the legislative committee on basic changes in farm legislation. The committees should do so, and I recommend to Senators that rather than destroying the existing programs by adopting the payment limitation amendment, that we wait until this question of payment limitation can be considered in the context of new programs.

Last year the Senate voted to extend the 1965 act for 1 year until December 1970, in order to give the new administration an opportunity to devise sound and thoughtful legislation to replace the existing programs. Doing so, the Senate and ultimately the Congress rejected a payments limitation to permit present programs to operate until the new programs were proposed. The situation has not changed, and now that the new programs are imminent, it would be foolish to undo all that was so wisely done last year.

Mr. President, I urge that the vote on the amendment be in the affirmative, and that the amendment submitted by the committee be agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER).

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have served on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry since I first came to Washington almost 33 years ago. At that time the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was a very popular committee. Everyone desired to be a member, as is the case now with the Committee on Appropriations. However, in the last two sessions of Congress in order to get a sufficient number to serve on the committee, we have had to reduce the membership of the committee from 17 to 15 members, and then from 15 to 13, which is now the number of Senators serving on the committee.

Mr. President, to me the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry deals with the most important segment of our economy. Agriculture and related industries employ more people and spend more money than any other segment of our economy. Under the programs we have had in effect the amount of money that is spent for food from the average income of citizens is 17 percent. When I first came to Washington 26 percent of the income of families was required to buy food.

No segment of our economic society has made more progress than farming. The farmer does not ask for anything. If he were in the same category as other segments of our society the farmer would need no protection. In other words, if minimum wages and various tariffs that are now on the statute books and which protect various segments of our industry were removed, the farmer would need no protection. He could protect himself.

When we started this program back in 1937 it was based on acreage controls. A farmer was guaranteed price supports at a certain percentage of parity and required to reduce acres and, thereby, reduce production in keeping with our requirements. That program worked very well for quite awhile, or until after World War II. It also worked well during the Korean war. But increases in yields per acre, or increased efficiency if you wish, did much to undo acreage controls.

Mr. President, in 1961 the time came when excesses in production, notwithstanding acreage controls for some crops, were simply too much. Our surpluses were great and the cost of storage was tremendous.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry worked on another program beginning in 1969. The objective of that program was to reduce the enormous surpluses that had come about because of the previous program wherein we had had acreage controls. For instance, in the case of wheat we had 1.4 billion bushels of wheat, which was a carryover, over and above what we needed. In the case of feed grains we had 84.7 million tons over and above what we needed. In cotton we had 7.1 million bales.

As this new program developed, the purpose was to reduce acres further and enable farmers to plant in keeping with our requirements, both domestic and foreign. We set upon a new method of attaining that goal. The goal was to divert acres. In other words, instead of producing and storing, the department, as well as the committee, felt that it was better not to produce and plant only the acres necessary in order to meet our needs. That is the way this program has been operated since its inception in 1961 and its renewal on a 4-year basis in 1965.

Mr. President, the effect of the present law has been to reduce surpluses. For instance, in the case of cotton we had a carryover of 16.6 million bales. We now have an estimated 6.6 million bales in carryover, which is the proper amount. In the case of feed grain, the surplus has been reduced almost in half. We have now an estimated carryover of 44 million tons. In the case of wheat the estimated carryover is a little larger because of an error that I say the Secretary of Agriculture made in 1967 in increasing the acreage because he felt that there might be a shortage of wheat. But in any event the wheat acreage was increased by about 30 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point the tables on Carryover and Acres Harvested.

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

CARRYOVER AT BEGINNING OF MARKETING YEAR

Crop year	Wheat (million bushels)	Feed grains (million tons)	Cotton (million bales)
1961	1,411	84.7	7.1
1962	1,321	71.8	7.7
1963	1,195	63.9	11.0
1964	901	69.2	12.1
1965	817	54.9	14.0
1966	535	42.1	16.6
1967	425	37.1	12.3
1968	539	48.3	6.3
1969	[1] 794	[1] 44.0	[1] 6.6

[1] Estimated.

ACRES HARVESTED

[In million acres]

Crop year	Wheat	Feed grains	Cotton
1961	51.6	105.3	15.6
1962	43.7	101.9	15.5
1963	45.5	105.1	14.1
1964	49.8	97.1	14.0
1965	49.6	96.0	13.5
1966	49.9	97.8	9.5
1967	58.8	100.8	7.9
1968	55.3	96.6	10.1

Mr. ELLENDER. Therefore, our surplus for 1969 is greater than it should be but still about only one-half of what it was in 1961. If Congress desires to wreck the farm program, then vote with the Senator from Delaware. On many occasions, when the bills were up, he has pro-

posed these amendments to limit payments and the Senate, as well as the House, has voted against such limitations. Why? Because the bill gives the Secretary of Agriculture much flexibility in providing the number of acres necessary in order to produce the amount of wheat, corn, and other feed grains, as well as cotton and other commodities, that we can consume domestically and that we can export. In order to attain that goal under the law acres are diverted from production and farmers are paid not to plant. It has been determined that it is cheaper to pay the farmers not to plant than to let them plant and store the commodities.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the distinguished chairman of the committee yield at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true that if this limitation on payments is agreed to, price supports would remain the same?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. And the Government cost would be greater and not less?

Mr. ELLENDER. Well, let me say to my good friend that under the theory of the bill, it is the number of acres that counts.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 2 more minutes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the bill, it is the number of acres diverted that counts. Whether those acres come from a small farmer or a large farmer makes no difference because the purpose of the bill is to reduce production in keeping with our requirements. If this limitation is slapped on the farmer, it will mean that the large farmer will not participate.

Mr. TALMADGE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have only 2 minutes, but I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. Is it not true, in the cotton program alone, that this amendment, if not agreed to, will cost the Government $160 million more a year?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the estimate of the Department of Agriculture. The Senator is correct about that.

Mr. President, as I said, we will be wrecking the program if we put limitations on now. I plead with the Senate to wait until we meet next year in order to work on a new agriculture program. There will then be time to put on such limitations, if Congress agrees to them. But the law permitting payments is now on the statute books and the program has worked well in reducing our surpluses. I am, therefore, hopeful that Congress will sustain the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. And then I shall yield to the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY).

Mr. President, the claim that if the Senate adopts this amendment it will cost the Government $160 million additional above existing programs, as the result of the so-called snapback provision, is not an argument at all. If that were true we would be seeing the Senators from the cotton-producing areas enthusiastically embracing it. The fact that they are solidly opposed to this $20,000 limitation disputes that argument.

Besides the cotton farmer is not the only farmer getting these large payments. What about the large payments to the producers of wheat, corn, and feed grains? Furthermore, all we need to do to refute that argument is to repeal the snapback provision.

The next amendment that would be called up immediately after this vote would be the one repealing the snapback provision. So do not let that worry anyone. We can roll back the cost of this farm subsidy program by several hundred million dollars a year solely by rejecting the committee amendment.

Now, Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and then I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, it is with considerable temerity that I speak on an agriculture matter when the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) of my native State, and a man whose judgment I admire so much, takes a strong position, as well as when the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) takes an opposite position to the one I take.

As a man raised in urban areas, I find it hard to try to understand the agricultural problems of this country. All I know is that they are deep-seated problems and we must face them. Many feel that we must wait until next year to find a real solution to them. I have come to the conclusion that we had better start this year to find at least a partial solution and then set a trend in a different direction. I take this position because of several impressions.

When I married my wife, she had a farm in her family in Livingston County, Ill. It has been in her family for about 125 years. I said to her at the time, "I do not really know enough about farming. Don't you think that you should sell it and go out of production? Wouldn't it be better to sell it?"

She replied, "Well, I am still left with the impression my father gave me that as long as you are a farmer, the Government will guarantee you an income, and I think we had better keep it, because I know of no other income which is guaranteed that way."

Well, Mr. President, that may true. I do not know. I know that I did go down and talk to the manager of that farm, years ago, after a new agriculture bill had been proposed by the administration, and I asked him what he thought of the control program.

He said, "I will tell you, Chuck. There is not a dirt farmer in the State, with a stub pencil and writing on the back of a brown envelope, that can't figure out in 15 minutes how to beat that control program."

I have been left with the impression that people are producing now who should not be producing and should have gone into other occupations because we have, somehow, induced them to stay on the farms instead of migrating off.

I think we have induced large scale capital enterprises to come in to produce a great many operations, and we would now simply continue Government intervention. I am impressed with the fact that we do not seem to have a great deal of difficulty with hundreds of crops not under limitation and control.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PERCY. It is the sick crops that are under controls. The six basic supported crops, so-called, are sick agricultural areas.

It is for that reason I rise to support the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), to place an annual limitation of $20,000 on total payments that any farmer may receive from Government programs. I therefore support the position taken by the House and the fight which has been led by my distinguished colleague from the agricultural area in central Illinois, Representative PAUL FINDLEY. I believe he really represents the strong feelings of the overwhelming majority of Illinois farmers—and we are the largest agricultural exporting State in the Union—who now want to get away from control programs, and have more decisions made on the farm, and fewer decisions made in Washington.

I also serve with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) on the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. We are finding increasing evidence of hunger in this country and yet we are grappling with a shortage of funds to provide food for hungry Americans. It makes no sense to pay large Government subsidies to farmers not to produce food, when we have this situation. We are failing to meet the needs of the hungry, yet year after year we continue to pay these excessively large farm payments.

I recognize that with inflation rampant and unchecked in this country at the present time, we need to achieve budget savings in order to run a substantial budget surplus in fiscal 1970 to help slow down inflation.

On June 4, before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Secretary Hardin estimated that the $20,000 payment limitation can save $335 million for cotton, feed grains, and wheat. To limit payments would stop this unnecessary drain on the U.S. Treasury.

I am aware of the "snapback" provision of the present cotton program which provides that if as a result of payment limitations the Department of Agriculture is unable to provide to farmers the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled, then the Department is obligated to provide

price support at not less than 65 percent of parity. Some estimate that this provision would increase the cost of direct payments programs by $160 million, not decrease them. However, there is an easy answer to this objection. I also intend to vote for Senator WILLIAMS' amendment to repeal the snapback provision, thus effecting full savings of over $300 million.

Another reason to pass the payments limitations before us is that these large payments put small farmers at a disadvantage. Small farmers cannot afford to idle acreage in order to take advantage of these payments programs. What these programs really do is to subsidize large farmers and perpetuate the trend toward driving small farmers off the land, leaving agriculture in the hands of ever larger producers.

I concur completely with the Senator from Delaware when he indicates that the "snapback" provision is not a barrier.

For all the above reasons, I urge opposition to the pending committee amendment, thereby giving us the opportunity to limit farm payments to $20,000 annually, and I intend to support the position of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I never heard my father talking the way the distinguished father-in-law of the Senator from Illinois talked.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator speak a little louder? We cannot hear him.

Mr. AIKEN. My father never received a Government payment of any kind. Since I have been in the Senate, I have never accepted payments of any kind for agricultural crop reduction or for any other purpose. My father used to tell me that so long as we had enough farmers that our country and our Government would be safe. I think it is most unfortunate that agriculture should become the whipping boy of today. There are reasons for this. One reason is that the vote of the farmer has been reduced from a very large percentage down to 5 or 6 percent, as the number of people who live on the farm today. The other reason is that farmers, particularly family farmers, are notoriously poor campaign contributors, and that is an important item in many places these days. But agriculture is still the most important industry in the United States.

Not too long ago I checked on the percentage of people in this country who are dependent on agriculture, and found it was a little over 30 percent of all the people who were engaged in gainful employment. Many of them were producing supplies and equipment. Farmers are said to be the largest consumers of petroleum products of any industry in the United States. Then we have those who are living on the farms themselves—as I say, only 5 or 6 percent of the population. After that, we have twice as many in the processing and handling, domestic distribution and sales, and the exporting of farm products.

Another matter which concerns me is the fact that approximately half of the money in our agricultural appropriation bills that are charged to farmers is devoted to the welfare of people who do not live on the farm. Of the school lunch program, 5 or 6 percent of it goes to farm children. Then there are the special milk programs and the extension service. Most of the funds spent for extension service now are spent for nonfarm people, and the percentage is increasing every day. In the foreign aid program, the program under Public Law 480, roughly $1 billion a year that is charged to agriculture is spent to help our country help other countries get along.

We have got to look out for our own agriculture, or we will be a decadent Nation. There are those who today would like to see agriculture in the United States deteriorate. Among them are importers of subsidized agricultural commodities from other countries. Only last summer the Common Market countries undertook to dump into the United States subsidized dairy products at 25 percent less than the cost of producing them here in the United States.

Some of our chainstores are reported to join in the effort to reduce American agricultural production since it is to their advantage to place more foreign agricultural commodities on their shelves.

Then, perhaps most important of all, certain industrial manufacturers want to sell their products abroad and accept their pay in foreign-produced agricultural commodities.

So it is very formidable opposition that the American farmer faces today.

I would vote to abolish all subsidies in the United States if someone will make the motion to do so. That would certainly include the enormous subsidies given the petroleum interests, the public utilities, the power people, the transportation companies, and the mail advertisers, who had their rate reduced from 18 to 2.75 cents a pound so long as the advertising was slipped as special supplements inside a local newspaper.

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

Mr. AIKEN. May I have 1 additional minute?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not have time to yield.

I will say this, however: I have never been completely happy over the farm programs we have had over the last 30 years. I have done the best I could to help make them work, but I have felt they could be improved. I realize that our present program is subject to abuses and it could be improved. But the way to improve the present program is to revise the farm legislation to the extent necessary during this session or the next session of this Congress, rather than to undertake to revise it to any extent in an appropriation bill.

I want to point out just one item. Last year—and this report came to me this morning—the payments on cotton for 1968 were $1,479,000,000 plus. For fiscal year 1969, they are $1,302,000,000 plus. There were repayments of approximately $275 million on loans each year, leaving over $1 billion in subsidies. That subsidy was given to the cotton farmers so they could sell their cotton abroad and to industrial producers at home for 8 cents a pound less than what was supposed to be the fair cost of production. Certainly that situation needs to be corrected.

That is all I have to say.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida.

In many respects our national agricultural policy is indefensible. The huge price-support payments to a few large growers are but one example of what is wrong with our farm program.

A far more serious failure is our inability to devise a way to encourage farmers to produce more. When poor people in our Nation and the world are ravaged by hunger and destitution, it is contemptible to pay farmers not to grow food and fiber. Yet, in both the price-support program, which subsidizes underplanting, and in the cropland adjustment program—the soil bank—we pay farmers not to produce.

I believe the food needs of the Nation should determine how much our farmers grow, and I pledge my efforts to achieve a rational farm policy.

But no amount of dissatisfaction with our present policies can justify the ill-conceived and imprudent $20,000 limit on price supports. It has long been an axiom of rational men that the cure should not kill the patient.

The simple facts are that the precipitate limitation of price supports would wreak chaos on California's farm economy, as I pointed out to this body 3 weeks ago.

Two weeks ago, the author of the $20,000 limitation amendment in the House responded to my statement by inserting in the RECORD an article on cotton by Grover C. Chappell, a staff economist in the Department of Agriculture, which appeared to invalidate my warnings. Three days later, on June 27, Dr. Chappell very kindly wrote to me, saying that his article "was written in the summer of 1968 and the prices used were those prevailing in the market in the spring of 1968."

Dr. Chappell continued:

> As you know, cotton prices in California particularly have declined sharply since that time.

In his article, Dr. Chappell used the cotton price of 31 cents a pound, which was just under the average 1967 California cotton lint price. In 1968, according to Department of Agriculture figures, California cotton fell to 23½ cents a pound, a staggering drop of better than 25 percent under the previous year. Thus while it is fair to say that 2 years ago the agricultural economy of California might have survived an abrupt termination of price supports, it is not true today.

For example, in Fresno County, one of California's two largest cotton producing counties, it costs slightly more than $300 to produce an acre of cotton while at 1968 prices the grower received about

$265 per acre. Under present policies, only the price support program keeps our current farm economy from foundering.

In Kern County, the other of our cotton giants, I have received figures showing that high-cost cotton producers are losing better than $100 per acre even with price supports.

This troubled cotton situation has led growers to cast about for other, more profitable crops. Thus, in Kern County, a new crop, carrots, is being expanded where cotton previously grew. But it should be noted that with Kern County, carrots, as with all changes in farming, it takes several years to prove out the crop in the soil, to test growing conditions, and to try out farming techniques of a new area. Agriculture cannot change overnight, and any proposal which fails to take into account this need for gradualism can cause hardship for entire areas.

I think it is clear that this overly hasty limitation proposal would adversely affect tens of thousands of Californians, not only farmers, but all of the people whose jobs depend on a profitable agricultural economy.

One other aspect of the farm problem, which should temper the zeal for immediate support limitation, is the effect our Government's policy of raising interest rates to fight inflation has on the farmer. Almost every other segment of our economy can respond to higher interest rates either by borrowing less or by passing on the higher interest rates in the form of higher prices for their product. The farmer can do neither.

Higher interest rates simply eat into the farmer's profit. There is no way out for him. He must borrow money to produce his crop and he has no control over the price the crop will bring. Since high interest rates are a premeditated governmental policy, we should be discussing ways to help the farmers and other unfortunate victims of this policy, rather than consorting to bury the farmer even deeper in a profitless morass.

In this age of violence and revolt, when slipshod mentalities would blindly destroy our institutions both good and bad without any critical evaluation of the alternatives, in such a time this Senate must set a standard for deliberate and constructive change. The $20,000 limitation proposal satisfies neither criterion.

It is precipitous and destructive.

I urge that it be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I now yield 5 minutes to the junior Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized, but the Senator from Florida does not have that much time remaining. The Senator from Florida has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) assured me that he would yield me some of his time if I needed it. I yield the Senator from Missouri 3 minutes now, and I will talk with the Senator from Delaware about securing additional time if it becomes necessary.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, we have before us a series of amendments dealing with payment limitations on farm programs. I particularly wish to address myself to the two amendments (No. 53 and No. 54) as offered by the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the amendment (No. 60) as offered by the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL).

First of all, I want to make it clear that I believe the present farm program is not free of serious inequities and inefficiencies and I am not insensitive to the grim facts of rural poverty and hunger in America.

However, these amendments will not feed hungry people. They will not improve the condition of the small farmer who today does business on a profit margin no urban businessman could endure. They will not encourage the more economical production of food and fibre for the American consumer, nor improve the competitive position of American farmers in the world market.

I think we can all agree that our farm program needs a major overhaul. According to Secretary Hardin, only 35 percent of payments under the cotton program can be ascribed to resource adjustment, while 65 percent are, in truth, income supplements. His figures for the wheat program are 51 percent and 49 percent, respectively. At a time when there are many others in our society whose need and claim for income supplements are greater than that of our largest farmers, the Secretary's estimates suggest the need to carefully sort out the economic and social aspects of our programs and review our priorities on the basis of the findings.

Moreover, it appears that our pattern of acreage allotments may be so out of date that it has created serious dis-economies in agriculture without corresponding social benefits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 3 minutes have expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield the Senator 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. EAGLETON. If the Congress were to adopt a payment limitation as proposed by the Senator from Delaware in amendment No. 53 and were unable to muster the sufficient two-thirds vote to repeal the so-called snapback provision as contained in amendment No. 54, then it would actually cost the Government more money than we are currently spending on the programs in question, as both Secretaries Hardin and Freeman have convincingly argued.

The amendment as proposed by the Senator from New York, originally recommended by former Under Secretary of Agriculture John A. Schnittker, is certainly worthy of some indepth analysis.

I emphasize the words "indepth analysis."

I do not think that a series of amendments to an appropriations bill constitutes such "indepth analysis."

These are matters which cannot be adequately handled on a piecemeal basis on the floor of the Senate. They must be dealt with by the Department of Agriculture, the Agriculture Committees of the respective Houses of Congress, and the farmers themselves, before the farm program comes up for renewal next year. Therefore, if we vote down these amendments—as I believe we must—let us also make it clear that we expect to be able to vote on a carefully considered, more equitable and more efficient farm program by this time next year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, for a number of years there has been considerable sentiment in this country to impose payment limitations of varying amounts on producers of cotton, feed grain, and wheat.

Statistics from the Department of Agriculture indicate that individual and corporate farms are receiving many thousands of dollars to limit their production.

I am concerned about these facts. However, a close examination reveals that the proposed limitations would have a far-reaching effect on our entire farm program.

Secretary Hardin has stated that under present law a payment limitation of $20,000 on the cotton program would automatically implement the "snapback" provision requiring price support at a level of 65 to 90 percent parity. This could also result in additional cotton production causing increased costs for storage facilities and transportation. For the cotton program alone, there would be an increase of $167 million in 1970. It is also estimated that this amount, together with additional expenditures required by the payment limitation on wheat and feed grain programs, might be approximately $200 million in 1970. It is apparent that, contrary to popular opinion, it would cost the Federal Government more in price supports and warehousing of cotton, feed grains, and wheat than it now does to pay farmers not to grow these items. Obviously, there is no rational argument for the enactment of a payment limitation without repeal of the snapback provision.

Therefore, since the repeal of the snapback provision is absolutely essential for a sound fiscal approach to payment limitations—responsible thinking dictates that snapback should be acted upon first.

Of course, Senate rules prohibit legislating in an appropriations bill. I would, therefore, support any appropriate motion for suspending the rules in order to consider repeal of the snapback provision first.

Mr. President, it is for this reason that I oppose a $20,000 payment limitation unless the snapback provision is first acted upon and repealed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, on July 1, 1969, during the debate on this bill, I stated for the record why I oppose the House limitation. I refer to pages 18033–18040 of the RECORD for July 1, 1969. At this time, I obviously cannot repeat all of those arguments. I merely wish to say that the present Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Hardin, and the former Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, both oppose the limitation. We had a special hearing at which the Secretary of

Agriculture appeared before the committee, in which he made it very clear, first, that the snapback provision was mandatory, and that it would require $160 million additional to support cotton at 31 cents rather than at 21 cents under the present law. In addition, he stated it would immediately begin to build back the surpluses which we have been getting rid of over these recent years.

He also made it so very clear that in addition to the havoc it would constitute for the whole cotton program, it would also wreak havoc with other programs not in the price support classifications or not within the crops we are considering now. For instance, if wheat payments above $20,000, were limited here, it would mean that there would either have to be more acres of wheat or that those acres of wheat would have to be diverted to feedgrains or other crops. Many agricultural industries will be affected when they take hundreds of thousands of acres out of the production of wheat and require people to put them into some other kind of money-producing crop production.

The same thing applies with feed grains. If we cut out the feed grain payments for the very considerable number of people who receive more than $20,000 under the present program, they would have to divert acreage to other crops. That means trouble for vegetables, soybeans, cattle, and other industries which I could mention here.

Mr. President, I ask at this point to insert in the RECORD a memorandum prepared for me by the Chief Counsel of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

MEMORANDUM FOR SENATOR HOLLAND

The so-called snap-back cotton provision (section 103(d)(12) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, 7 U.S.C. 1444(d)(12)) is as follows:

"(12) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, if, as a result of limitations hereafter enacted with respect to price support under this subsection, the Secretary is unable to make available to all cooperators the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection for any crop of upland cotton (A) price support to cooperators shall be made available for such crop (if marketing quotas have not been disapproved) through loans or purchases at such level not less than 65 per centum nor more than 90 per centum of the parity price therefor as the Secretary determines appropriate; (B) in order to keep upland cotton to the maximum extent practicable in the normal channels of trade, such price support may be carried out through the simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support price therefor and resale at a lower price or through loans under which the cotton would be redeemable by payment of a price therefor lower than the amount of the loan thereon; and (C) such resale or redemption price shall be such as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the United States."

A price support limitation which prevented the Secretary from making full price support available to any producer would trigger this provision, requiring that the program be changed with respect to *all* cooperators, large and small. Price support for *all* cooperators would have to be made as provided in clause (A) through loans and purchases at 65 to 90 percent of parity.

Clause (B) authorizes the Secretary to provide for simultaneous sales and repurchases at lower prices, or loans and redemptions for lesser amounts, which would have have the same effect as payments. While Secretary Hardin, in his testimony before your subcommittee, points out that it may be argued that the difference between such sale and repurchase prices is a payment subject to any limitation on payments; it can certainly be argued that it is not a payment for such purpose, since the snap-back provision was intended by Congress to provide a price support method which would not be subject to a payment limitation. In any event, Secretary Hardin stated that he would feel required to carry out the provision in a manner which would make available to all cooperators not less than 65 percent of parity through loan or purchase on all cotton produced on their 1970 acreage allotments.

Since effectuation of the provision would result in a change from the existing program to a completely new one, there would be a number of problems, and a number of alternatives available to the Secretary. No one knows exactly what type of program might result.

One question we have discussed informally with the Department concerns the small farm and diversion payments provided by section 103 (d) (4) of the Act. While a literal interpretation of section 103 (d) (12) would leave section 103 (d)(4) in effect, the Department advised that it would probably look to the Comptroller General for an opinion to resolve the question.

It would appear that the program would be more expensive since the price support level would remain at the same level, but in order to obtain the full amount of support available to him, the producer would have to produce as much cotton as he could. At present the producer may limit his production to 65 percent of his allotment and receive his full share of price support payments, since at present price support payments are made on the projected yield of the farm domestic allotment. Under the snapback provision price support would be limited to cotton actually produced.

Section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 provides a limitation on Commodity Credit Corporation sales as follows:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for the period August 1, 1966, through July 31, 1971, (1) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell upland cotton for unrestricted use at the same prices as it sells cotton for export, in no event, however, at less than 110 per centum of the loan rate, and (2) the Commodity Credit Corporation shall sell or make available for unrestricted use at current market prices in each marketing year a quantity of upland cotton equal to the amount by which the production of upland cotton is less than the estimated requirements for domestic use and for export for such marketing year."

If the Secretary were to decide, as suggested by his testimony before your subcommittee, that he could not use the method of price support provided for by section 103(d)(12)(B), then the minimum price at which Commodity Credit Corporation could sell cotton for domestic use might be 110 percent of 65 percent of parity. If this were the case, producers might exceed the cooperator percentages fixed for them under section 408(b) of the Act in order to benefit from the enhanced market price, even though they could not qualify for price support as cooperators. There may also be some question as to whether the cooperator percentage provision of section 408(b) would be applicable if the snap-back provision became effective. While literally it would appear to be effective, Secretary Hardin's use of a 16.2 million acre national allotment in cost estimates given to your subcommittee suggests that he may regard this provision as superseded by effectuation of the snap-back provision. In addition to violating any cooperator percentage which might be fixed under section 408(b) if such section remains effective, some producers might find it advantageous, as they have under past program which provided higher domestic market prices, to exceed their acreage allotments.

The time you have allowed for this memorandum does not permit the careful and exhaustive analysis this section requires. In his testimony before your subcommittee, Secretary Hardin indicates that a number of questions have been raised that could not be answered by the Department, and that he was requesting an opinion from the Comptroller General.

Respectfully submitted.

HARKER T. STANTON,
Counsel, Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have had printed in the RECORD of July 1, 1969, starting on page 18038, the written statements of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Milk Producers' Association and other farm organizations opposing the limitation on payments and giving excellent reasons why they did so. I also made it clear that as to the National Farmers Union, while they oppose this limitation, support a graduated limitation starting at $37,500.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement by the National Farmers Organization which strongly opposes the House amendment.

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

NATIONAL FARMERS ORGANIZATION,
Corning, Iowa, July 5, 1969.

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLAND: The question of limitation on payments to farmers which is agitating and troubling many Senators is also of deep concern to most of the farm organizations. It is of serious concern to the National Farmer's Organization.

The action by the House in attaching a limitation of payments to the appropriations bill did not solve that problem. The Agricultural Act of 1965 provides that, if a limitation is applied to cotton payments, the cotton program would then revert to the previous program, which incidentally had proved too costly to maintain. So this does not put any real limitation on payments to cotton producers, which constitute over 85% of all the payments in excess of $20,000.

However, it does apply to the wheat and feed grain programs, approved by both Houses of Congress, which rely upon voluntary compliance for their effectiveness. This again was a substitution for an unworkable support program. The participation in these programs and their acceptability is now at their highest level.

With hearings scheduled next month on a Farm Bill in the House, it seems to us that it is procedurally preferable to legislate on this problem by using the regular procedures, remembering that the committee reports are always subject to amendments.

We submit that the problem of payments to the corporate and private farms constitute a complicated social-economic problem which does not lend itself to such simple answers as a limitation of payments. It rather involves the whole national policy toward ownership and use of the land. Let's begin to

attack, the total problem, not just the obvious manifestation.

It should also be noted that one of the most persuasive arguments for the payment limitations has been the past unwillingness of the Agriculture Committees to authorize and the Appropriations Committees to appropriate funds for the Food Stamps and other food programs.

I shared this conviction and led the efforts of farm organizations to increase these funds to the level demanded by both our rural and urban friends. This was not a real popular position in the past. However, I am pleased to note that both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees substantially increased the amount for Food Stamps over the amount requested by the budget.

We also noted with approval that the Senate approved and sent to the other body a bill authorizing $750 million for this purpose. Your own distinguished leadership in this effort is appreciated by the NFO and should be appreciated by those who have been critical of the low level of funding for the food programs.

We also note the approval that the legislation to extend the Agricultural Act of 1965 which Chairman Poage has introduced in the House includes an open end authorization for Food Stamps. We shall support this legislation. We think that these actions should be considered as a positive indication that the Congress is giving very sympathetic consideration to this problem and that the level and volume of their complaints should be reduced, and the rebellion against farm programs should be diminished in return.

We would also like to remind those who oppose farm payments that most of these payments are for compliance with programs approved by the Congress in both 1965 and 1968.

It should also be remembered by those who would limit farm payments that the wheat certificates payments were first substituted in 1964 for the higher support levels which had previously prevailed. These support prices were both expensive to the taxpayers and doubly expensive in that a very substantial export subsidy was required for the wheat which was exported for cash. The same thing was true in cotton.

As a result of this legislation, our wheat exports for cash steadily increased to the highest level in history, earning over $1 billion in 1966, with only a minor expenditure for export subsidies.

In 1965, the Congress recognized the long standing injustice of holding price for wheat at approximately $2.10 when parity was about $2.50. They increased the certificates for wheat to enable it to bring a parity price, but only for that part of the crop which was consumed for food domestically, about 45% of the total crop.

The rest was sold for the support level of 50% of parity. This was the wheat which constituted both our international relief contributions and soft currency sales, as well as our commercial exports, expand our foreign trade and dollar earnings and to validate our foreign policy commitments and to prevent mass starvation in several countries.

In other words American wheat producers subsidized the total wheat exports by about $1.25 per bushel. No other segment of our economy has been asked to provide to our government over one-half of its production *at less than the cost to the producer.*

When the value of the certificates were increased to represent a parity price for the domestically consumed wheat, most of the farm organizations supported the bill to require that this additional amount should also come from the market instead of from the general fund.

The other body decided against us in the face of our warnings that this would be resented by the tax payers. The only farm organization to support the final bill is now the only one seeking a limitation of payments.

When the Congress decides, as it frequently does, that minimum wages should be increased to provide a more equitable return for labor, they do not take this increase from the general funds, but from the consumers. Thus they have added very substantially to the burdens of agriculture.

In the defense industries, which are no more vital to our national security than is our food supply, they guarantee a return of cost plus a reasonable profit. No one mentions putting a limitation on these profits, although they amount to billions.

The same is true about subsidies to airlines, junk mail, and the whole field of subsidies.

We would submit a proposition to those who advocate a limitation on payments to farmers: "We will accept a limitation on government payments if you will apply the same limitation to all individuals and corporations." Let's limit the profit from federal contracts to $20,000 too, apply that rule to General Motors, Lockheed Aircraft, E. I. DuPont, Mohawk Airlines, et al.

We hope the Senate will permit us to work out this problem in the regular legislative processes. If the proposed legislation does not meet with your approval, it can always be modified on the floor. In the meantime the action of the Congress in 1965 will remain, as it should, a commitment of honor upon which farmers have made their own commitments in good faith.

Again let me express to you the gratitude of the NFO for your intelligent and fairminded leadership on this and other issues.

Respectfully yours,

HARRY L. GRAHAM,
Legislative Representative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, in closing, I want to make it very clear that I did not support the 1965 farm program or its extension last year. I stated both times that it was an expensive program and would cost too much money.

In spite of the fact that subsequent developments have sustained much of the opinion of the Senator from Florida at that time, it is also very clear that the Senator from Florida, in order to take the position that is taken by the House amendment, would have to be a wrecker of the only program we have.

The Senator from Florida may be many things, but he is not a wrecker. That is exactly what we would do if we were to agree to the House amendment.

We would wreck not only the outstanding programs, the programs seeking to cut down the surplus, but we would also wreck the programs which seek to divert acreage at Government expense in such a way that acreage would be diverted at the expense of other producing industries. We would wreck the only program we have on the books at this time.

Mr. President, the Senator from Florida himself is not a wrecker, and he does not believe that many other Senators want to be wreckers.

I am sorry that some of them do not see the situation clearly. However, when Secretary Hardin testified, as he did, the Senator from Florida suggested that he get an opinion from the General Accounting Office. The Secretary did that, and that opinion is in the RECORD. It shows clearly that the General Accounting Office, after some 2 or 3 weeks' study by the counsel, said that the Secretary of Agriculture was exactly right and that the cotton program under the snapback provision would go back to the old high-price support which meant that not only the production of cotton would cost the Government $160 million more than the present program, but it would immediately start rebuilding the terrible surplus of cotton which had been built up in past years and were slowly cut down.

The Senator from Florida could not vote for the House amendment, as much as he wishes for a better program.

I would prefer to work it out this fall or next spring, I have attempted to follow this course in years past. I am sorry that some of those so devoted now to the limitation did not devote their intelligence to the working out of a better program heretofore. However, they will have that chance this fall or next spring.

Mr. President, I agreed with the Senator from Delaware that we would both ask for an extension of 5 minutes so that both the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Illinois might be heard.

I make that unanimous-consent request at this time.

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

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I strongly support the committee amendment which would delete the language of the Conte amendment approved by the House in passing H.R. 11612, the Agriculture Appropriations Act for fiscal year 1970.

The Conte amendment would establish a $20,000 ceiling on payments under any price support program, other than for sugar, to producers on any crop planted in the fiscal year 1970.

As the language is written, the ceiling is designed to apply to feed grains, wheat, and cotton. Sugar is specifically excluded, and wool payments are not covered because wool is not a "crop planted."

In the case of cotton, however, testimony by Secretary of Agriculture Clifford M. Hardin before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, on which I have the honor to serve, indicated that the proposed limitation on payments would trigger the so-called snapback provision for cotton. Secretary Hardin estimated the increased cost to the taxpayers for the cotton program, should the $20,000 limitation go into effect, at about $160 million.

The snapback provision—section 103 (d) (12)—of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which was enacted as part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, provides as follows: If, as a result of payment limitations, the Department of Agriculture is unable to make available to all cotton cooperators through payments, the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled, then the Department is obligated to provide price support at not less than 65 percent of parity through loans or purchases, and the payment limitation would not be applicable.

The Secretary of Agriculture testified that his Department believes the snapback provision is mandatory and not discretionary with the Secretary. The Comptroller General of the United

States, in a letter dated June 19, agreed. He said that the "clear purpose" of the snapback provision was to "assure cotton producers that they would not be deprived of a total return from their cotton crops of at least 65 percent of parity if limitations on price support payments were later enacted." He said the legislative history of this provision "makes this purpose clear beyond doubt."

I am convinced that the snapback provision would come into play if the Conte limitation is approved, and thereby increase the cost of the cotton program by some $160 million.

In other words, instead of saving the taxpayers money, the $20,000 limitation would cost more more than the present price support program for cotton.

In addition, Secretary Hardin testified that other effects of the $20,000 limitation "would bring about very little savings, if any, and might result in a net increase in cost."

He said:

First, a considerable proportion of the farms subject to the limitation would undoubtedly be split up or leased out in such a fashion as to escape the limitation.

Secretary Hardin said some of this could be prevented but not all by any means. He said many such changes are constantly occurring and are entirely legal.

He estimated:

Perhaps as much as 70 to 85 per cent of the potential cotton acreage affected by the $20,000 limit would be able to maintain its eligibility for full payment.

Second, Secretary Hardin testified:

If a given acreage is to be retired from crops and if payments are the means of doing this, and if a payment limit is in effect, we would have to divert more acreage out of the smaller farms, which would be the only likely cooperators.

In the case of feed grains, which have resource adjustment as the dominant feature, Secretary Hardin said:

It would cost considerably more to run the program with payment limitations than without.

I believe the people of America would be astonished to know that the $20,000 limitation offered in the name of economy would in reality cost the taxpayers even more than the present program.

The extra burden imposed on taxpayers by the House-approved limitation would be sufficient reason, in my judgment, for rejecting it.

There are other reasons, however, for voting against this ill-advised proposal.

Although the House provision qualifies technically as a limitation on an appropriation, its effects would be much broader. The impact would be significantly to alter the intent of Congress so laboriously fashioned in the legislative process of enacting the Agricultural Act of 1968.

During Senate consideration of the farm bill last year, a $25,000 limitation proposal was offered as an amendment. It was rejected by the Senate on a 47-to-25 rollcall. Another amendment, with a $75,000 limitation, was rejected by 40 nays to 30 yeas.

The House $20,000 limitation this year is an attempt to accomplish in an appropriation bill what failed of accomplishment in connection with the farm authorization bill last year.

Such a provision should not be considered in connection with this appropriation bill. It has substantive ramifications and should properly be considered in connection with farm legislation which has received the thorough consideration of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture.

Secretary Hardin has assured the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, as he has assured Members of the House of Representatives, that he "believes it is possible to design a sound farm program that limits the number of dollars that can be paid to any one farmer for programs following the 1970 crop year."

He has stated that the administration plans to submit new farm legislation proposals, including alternative payments plans, to the Congress later this year.

These can be given thorough consideration by the appropriate legislative committees in preparation for consideration by Congress of a new farm law. The present law expires next year and a new law should be enacted by next spring in order to be effective for crops planted in 1971.

This is the sensible and orderly procedure.

Our Nation's farm programs are too complex to tinker with by means of a payments ceiling such as proposed in the House provision.

That is a second important reason for rejecting the House limitation.

Let me cite additional reasons against the $20,000 ceiling.

It would keep controls on large farmers but would deny them payments of over $20,000 for complying with these controls.

It discriminates against large farmers and legal entities. While individual farmers could collect up to $20,000, it would prevent farmers in partnerships or other joint organizations from collecting more than $20,000.

It discriminates against stockholders of companies who operate large farm enterprises. While an individual farmer could receive as much as $20,000, the individual stockholder could not. A farm enterprise owned by 100 stockholders, for example, could not be eligible for more than $20,000. Stockholders would get the short end of the stick.

It would very likely invite subterfuge. A large individual farmer who is now entitled to more than $20,000 might decide to break up his farm. His wife could own one part of it, he could own another, and if he had any adult children, they could own other segments. In this way, each could perhaps qualify for the maximum of $20,000. The intent of the House-passed Conte amendment could thereby be evaded.

Similarly, large company-owned farms might be able to subdivide the ownership in order to qualify for separate agricultural payments, thereby circumventing the intent of the House provision. Those large companies unable to subdivide their ownership would be discriminated against and possibly could be forced out of business.

Such a limit, which fails to provide any substitute program for the protection of farm industries affected by the amendment would seriously disrupt several of America's basic farm programs which help provide a cornucopia of foodstuffs and fibers at moderate prices.

As the House limitation is written, sugar producers are exempt from the $20,000 ceiling. But all my colleagues should understand that if approved, the House provision would be followed by an amendment to place a similar $20,000 limitation on compliance payments to sugar producers. Proponents of the limitation have made this clear in the past.

Such a limitation would be grossly unfair to sugar farmers in America. It would deny them an important part of their farm income by cutting back on their compliance payments under the Sugar Act. Yet it would not allow them to recoup this loss through price adjustments in the marketplace or through repeal of the Federal excise tax of 50 cents per hundredweight on all sugar refined in the United States.

The fact is, the proposed $20,000 limitation if extended to sugar would leave standing the Federal excise tax. It would also leave standing the provision in the Sugar Act which effectively provides a ceiling on the price of sugar a domestic sugar farmer can obtain for his crop.

The Sugar Act controls sugar prices. It controls sugar production. It establishes sources of sugar supply. It includes tax and payback provisions—compliance payments—which are not subsidies, but are part of Federal regulations of the sugar industry.

Payments are made to domestic sugar producers who comply with production restrictions, pay "fair" wages to workers, agree not to employ child labor, and if they are processors pay "fair" prices for sugar cane.

These payments are made out of the U.S. Treasury out of funds obtained from the Treasury's collection of the excise tax on all sugar, foreign and domestic, processed in the United States.

Over the life of the Sugar Act, the Federal Government has profited to the tune of $549 million on the sugar program. In other words, the Federal Government has collected more than half a billion dollars more in sugar excise taxes than it has paid out in compliance payments to domestic sugar producers.

Under the Sugar Act, smaller producers of sugar receive more per ton in compliance payments than large producers. Growers who produce 350 tons of sugar or less are entitled to the maximum authorized compliance payment of $16 a ton—or 80 cents per hundredweight. Large growers receive less per ton, with largest producers paid $6 a ton.

Last year, compliance payments to Hawaii producers totaled $10,840,000 whereas the excise tax paid on Hawaii sugar totaled $12,319,060. So even under the present Sugar Act, excise taxes on Hawaii sugar exceeded compliance payments to Hawaii sugar producers.

If a $20,000 limitation on payments were imposed, the excise tax on Hawaii sugar would still be collected—approximately $12 million—and Hawaii sugar

producers could collect in compliance payments only about $1,639,000.

The consequence of such a limitation in my State of Hawaii, which produces one-sixth of all the sugar produced in America, would be destruction of the sugar industry in Hawaii. It would destroy the jobs of some 11,300 year-round sugar workers in my State. Hawaii's sugar workers are the highest paid agricultural workers in the world, earning $30 a day with fringe benefits. The sugar payroll in Hawaii annually runs about $71,700,000 including fringe benefits.

Where would so many workers find substitute jobs? Where would Hawaii sugar producers find a new source of income? There are no alternative agricultural uses for most of the acreage now devoted to sugarcane in Hawaii. Only a tiny fraction of the land could be converted to produce income.

Last year, the payment made to Hawaii's largest sugar producers was $7 a ton; whereas the payment to Hawaii's smallest producer was $16 per ton.

Total compliance payments last year to Hawaiian sugar companies ranged from a low of $53,542 to a high of $1,311,267, with the majority of companies, who are large sugar producers, receiving over $200,000.

These large payments are necessitated by the special nature of sugarcane production. Unlike many other agricultural commodities, sugarcane needs vast acreages in order to attain high efficiency. Hawaii sugar producers must plant enormous acreage before they can produce a high output of cane and achieve the efficiency of labor that will make Hawaii's sugar competitive in the marketplace.

There are about 240,000 acres devoted to cane, and at least one-half of this acreage must be irrigated. Because of Hawaii's mountainous terrain, expansion of acreage is limited and costly. Sugar producers have spent large sums of their own money—none Federal—to develop and operate wells, reservoirs, ditches, and tunnels of the elaborate irrigation systems now in use. Hawaii's sugar industry also spends more than $2½ million annually on sugar research—an activity financed by the producers since 1895. We have had a sugar research program for more than 70 years. As a result of the Hawaii sugar industry's own efforts, Hawaii has one of the highest sugar yields per acre of any area of the world.

Efficiency per acre is a "must" for Hawaii's sugar producers, considering the cost of modern equipment, the cost of its skilled labor, and the great distance of Hawaii from mainland markets. Hawaii's closest market for sugar is San Francisco, some 2,400 miles away. Most of the Hawaiian sugar is refined at Crockett, near San Francisco, and is marketed in 26 Western and Midwestern States, including Alaska.

These are some of the compelling reasons for development and operation of large farming units in Hawaii. There are 24 large sugar plantations which produce some 93 percent of Hawaii's sugar. The other 7 percent is produced by 750 small independent growers. As I have already stated, the small producers receive higher compliance payments per ton than the large producers; that is, $16 per ton as compared to $7 for large producers. Since compliance payments are based on total farm production and most Hawaiian sugar is produced on the large plantation company farms, many of the total payments are large.

In every year since the inception of the Sugar Act 35 years ago, the excise tax paid on sugar produced in Hawaii has substantially exceeded the compliance payments to our sugar companies.

Over the period of the last 10 years, a majority of the sugar producers in Hawaii would have operated at a net loss if there were no compliance payments. In fact, many of our companies were in the red even with these payments. Any lowering of the ceiling on compliance payments would sound the death knell for Hawaii's sugar industry.

It would be an economic disaster for my State, which is the largest sugar producing State.

The $20,000 limitation, if extended to sugar, which it will be if the House provision on cotton, feed grains, and wheat is approved, would plunge the economy of Hawaii into a tailspin from which it would be very difficult to recover.

It would destroy the jobs of more than 11,300 sugar workers and the investment of 12,500 individual stockholders in Hawaii's $200,000,000 sugar industry. More than two-thirds of the stockholders live in Hawaii.

While I have spoken in some detail about the adverse effect of a $20,000 ceiling on payments to sugar producers in Hawaii, there is no question the limitation would also place the sugar industry in other domestic areas in serious jeopardy.

I remind my colleagues that the sugar program has been in operation for 35 years. Congress has reexamined and extended the basic legislation some 12 times during these 35 years. Yet the program has remained substantially unchanged. This is proof of how well it has worked.

From the standpoint of the American consumer, the sugar program has worked exceptionally well. American consumers today pay less for their sugar than consumers in practically all of the developed nations of the world and less than is paid in some of the undeveloped countries of Africa and Asia. The retail price of sugar has gone up less in recent years in America than the price of most other staples on the grocery shelf. And, remember, the sugar program is self-financing, even returning a profit of $549 million to the U.S. Treasury.

In conclusion, I shall summarize my strong opposition to the House provision to impose a $20,000 limitation on payments to cotton, feed grains, and wheat producers.

First, it will cost $160 million more for the cotton program than existing law and may well cost more for the other programs. It may well hurt small farmers far more than large producers.

Second, it would use the agriculture appropriations bill to effect substantive changes in farm programs, which if changed at all should be done in the agriculture authorizing legislation. The Department of Agriculture is currently at work on new farm authorization proposals and expects to submit them to Congress this fall for consideration in time to complete congressional action by next spring at the latest.

Third, it would keep controls on large farmers but would deny them payments of more than $20,000 for complying with these controls.

Fourth, it discriminates against large farmers and legal entities.

Fifth, it discriminates against stockholders of companies who operate large farm enterprises.

Sixth, it would very likely invite subterfuge.

Seventh, it would seriously disrupt some of America's major farm programs, which help provide a cornucopia of foodstuffs and fibers at moderate prices. It fails to provide any substitute program for the protection of American farmers affected by the amendment.

Eighth, if adopted, the House limitation of $20,000 would lead to a similar limitation on payments to sugar producers. This would cause the death of the sugar industry in Hawaii and would seriously disrupt the sugar industry elsewhere in America.

I strongly urge support of the committee amendment striking the House provisions setting a $20,000 ceiling on payments to farm producers of cotton, feed grains, and wheat.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I was around here 35 years ago when we enacted the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Henry Wallace was the Secretary of Agriculture and Marvin Jones, now the chief justice of the Court of Claims, was the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

The logic of what we tried to do was to cut the surplus and raise prices. Those were the days of the campaign that caused 15 million little pigs to go into the rendering basket.

Today it is not exactly the same. It is land retirement. The subsidy policies have been rather costly, and they have not been very satisfactory. However, the program had one virtue. It was uniformly applied.

In this world we do not get something for nothing. We may put on a ceiling of $20,000, but we will get $20,000 worth of acreage taken out of cultivation.

What about the remainder? We either take it out or it goes back into cultivation. In that event up goes the surplus, down goes the price, and up go the subsidies.

We cannot beat it. We cannot beat it with this kind of gimmick. That is why I am opposed to it. The Farm Bureau is opposed to it. And I think that those who understand the program are opposed to it.

What would be the justification? I think I know. Of course, this is politically distasteful. It does not sound good that a farmer gets $100,000 or $200,000 or $400,000 for not growing things. However, it is forgotten that he surrendered that much acreage. This is no one-way street.

If the Senate wants to dump this program, all right; but let us dump the

whole business and be through with it. This is a good way to dump it. If this acreage is taken out in any other way, it will go into some other kind of program. There will be competition and surpluses, and then we will be back to the old grind.

I think this proposal is a colossal blunder. That is one reason why, together with 20 other Senators, I introduced the Farm Bureau bill last week, the idea being to get rid of these acreages, to get rid of quotas, to get rid of this and that, and finally to give the Department of Agriculture a chance to take 10 million acres out of cultivation every year, even if it is necessary to do it on a bid basis and do it for entire farms. To me, that is a better approach.

Then if we phase out all the ideas that we pursue at the present time, it can be done over a 5-year period, and we can finally get around to a market economy. But this way is not the proper approach.

I earnestly hope that the Senate will not approve either this ceiling or any other ceiling that may be offered in the course of the debate on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on the amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on June 4, 1969, I testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on the Agriculture and Related Agencies, of which I am a member, against the placing of a limit of $20,000 on the amount of money a farmer can receive under our agricultural programs. After a comprehensive hearing, this subcommittee recommended that this hastily conceived provision be dropped from H.R. 11612. The full committee concurred with this recommendation.

Our agricultural programs were designed to meet the problems created in our farm community by a depression, a world war, a booming economy, spiraling inflation, increasing technology, and many other factors. They are extremely complex. Any effort to limit payments or to change any segment of these programs should be well thought out and carefully planned to be sure that the family farmer is receiving an adequate and just income. An across-the-board limitation, such as the one dropped from H.R. 11612, effected without sufficient groundwork and exhaustive study, would indiscriminately have eliminated many family farmers and destroyed the voluntary crop limitation programs.

In reply to a questionnaire sent out by the University of Texas as a part of an extensive study that their cotton economic research unit was conducting on the effects of a $20,000 payment limitation, some cotton farmers stated that they could not stay in business if such a limitation, or any limitation, should go into effect. They would not be able to pay the high prices for equipment, parts, and labor. Without subsidy payments and loan programs, they would lose their bank credit and would be out of business.

Because of the snapback provision under section 402 of the Agricultural Act of 1965, a limitation such as the one under H.R. 11612 and dropped by the Senate Committee on Appropriations would not accomplish the purpose for which it was intended. This kind of a limitation would place the cotton program into a loan-and-redemption or a buy-and-sell situation which would only increase the Government's cost of administering the program.

The present wheat supply management program requires farmers to divert a specified number of acres from wheat production each year to balance supply with demand. If the program does not attract sufficient acres into the diverted pool, the management of supply fails; and the program will not work. If one farmer is required to divert 10 times as many acres as another, he should be compensated accordingly. If he is not proportionately compensated, he will not participate. If he does not participate and a specified number of acres must still be diverted, then they must necessarily come by additional reductions in allotments to the smaller farmers remaining in compliance. This would unnecessarily penalize the smaller farmer as well as defeat the intent of the program. I should also point out that the farmer diverting 10 times as many acres also has 10 times the investment in his diverted acres, pays 10 times as much taxes on these acres, and has surrendered 10 times as much productive capacity.

Mr. President, it is possible to design a sound farm program that limits the number of dollars paid to any one farmer. However, legislative changes are needed. A simple amendment to the appropriations bill will not suffice.

The present agricultural programs are scheduled to expire after the 1970 crop. I sincerely hope that this distinguished body will set aside any effort to limit payments until such time as our agricultural programs have been carefully and fully studied as a whole. Any revision should be carefully worked out in the Agriculture Committee and based on sound judgment and valid data to be certain that it will effectively accomplish the purpose for which it is intended. To rashly slap it on an appropriations bill without hearings by the legislative committee charged with initial responsibility for studying this complicated policy, would be unwise at this time. This is particularly so when the basic law will expire in 1 year and is now under study both by the Department of Agriculture and the legislative committees of Congress.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, over the past decade, the United States has witnessed revolutionary changes in rural America which transformed agriculture from an industry of 4 million units to 3 million units, with a greater and greater number of these owned by large corporations or wealthy individuals. What this means in terms of human lives is even more profound. In the mere 7 years from 1960 to 1967, farm population decreased 31 percent—from 15.6 million to 10.8 million. At the same time, Federal loan programs originally intended to assist and promote the family farm have been slighted because of tight budgetary demands brought on, principally, by our military commitments in almost every corner of the world.

Policymakers have judged, I fear, that what they would define as an "efficient" agriculture serves our national welfare better and calls less upon Federal resources than the small family owned unit. They have thus encouraged the migration of millions of rural people into urban centers. I believe we are discovering that this mass migration into megalopolis is far more expensive in social costs—and if we were able to measure accurately, in actual dollar costs—than programs which should have preserved the family farm; encouraged individually owned, small-town businesses, and resulted in the preservation and growth of rural communities. We are not doing this, but we have not lost the opportunity.

We need to turn the tide of rural migration, without slighting urban needs. In fact, I believe we must take immediate and effective measures to eliminate urban slums, educate people for meaningful employment which will produce living wages, and create hope for them and their children. Urban and rural problems are a part of the same problem and vigorous attention to revitalizing the rural economy will lift some of the pressure upon our urban complexes.

It is to this purpose that I believe we must take greater advantage of existing farm programs. For example, although the rural electrification program is only one of the many Federal programs that need to be beefed up in order to improve rural areas, it is a vital and strategically placed program. The locally elected directors of the nearly 1,000 rural electric systems in the country and the managers they hire, are well acquainted with the needs of their local rural communities. These rural systems have the means of accelerating rural growth. They are providing essential electric service in most rural areas and through dependable low-cost electric service can encourage new developments. The rural electric loan program has demonstrated the wisdom of Federal loans to locally organized, locally controlled groups.

I wish to stress the loan aspect of the REA program. The rural electric systems have a nearly unparalled record of repayment of their Federal loans. Their record is ample proof that the people of the United States are making a wise investment in rural areas with this program, ample proof that local people can direct their own programs for community development. It is the acceleration of this kind of program—a catching up—that I wish to encourage. I believe, incidentally, that urban leaders should design and seek similar programs to solve some of the problems of the central city—for example, to provide decent housing for millions of low-income families.

So I support the $365 million REA loan fund appropriation before us as recommended by the Appropriations Committee Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies. In addition, I believe that the survey requested of REA Administrator David Hamil by the subcommittee will show that the Nation's rural electric systems have a very large

backlog of unmet loan-fund needs—in the order of $400 million—which have accumulated over the past several years of budgetary drought. When the Administrator's report is in, I will support a meaningful and substantial supplemental appropriation for the rural electrification program which will begin to help rural areas catch up with the economic development which has been allowed to slip by. A strong, growing rural electrification program is essential to rural development. The Congress will do well to start to direct its attention to crucial domestic needs by catching up with this and other programs which make Federal moneys available to local people striving to build their communities.

In conclusion, I believe we face critical domestic problems because we have been preoccupied by foreign commitments which have bloated one segment of our economy to the deep injury of other segments. Our military spending must be put to the test of sound policy and prudent administration. Our economic life has been dominated by massive military procurement over the past decade, and we will have to pay dearly for the inflation this kind of prolonged, unproductive expenditure has created.

Congress must, I believe, distinguish between vital defense needs and those unjustified programs developed by a military-industrial segment of the economy ever ready to expand its domination of our society. I believe we must begin to fashion new plowshares of social progress for America. We can save our cities from chaos. We can revitalize our rural areas. And we can begin this effort with proven programs like REA to nurture peace in the world through greater achievements of our agriculture.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, during debate upon the pending appropriation bill, amendments may be offered to establish arbitrary limitations on payments authorized by law to those who participate in various agricultural programs. I intend to oppose these amendments and I hope that they may be defeated.

I will not take the time of the Senate to discuss the considerations which justify provisions of law authorizing various types of payments to cooperating farmers. It is sufficient to say at this time that these payments come about because of public policy developed over a long period of time to stabilize agricultural production and the agricultural sector of our national economy.

The principal purpose of these payments is to induce farmers—large and small—to refrain from using their lands to produce agricultural commodities which would otherwise be grown and marketed. Without this inducement no one knows what products would be grown by which farmers and in what amounts. One possible result would be chaos throughout the agricultural sector of our economy as farmers might shift from one commodity to another or as they might glut the marketplace with an overproduction of one or more of many commodities. The National Grange has estimated that imposition of limitations on payments under existing law might, in fact, cost the Federal Government an additional $160 million in 1970 by activating other provisions of law with respect to the production of cotton.

Present farm policies have been adopted after thorough and careful consideration by the Agricultural Committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, by the Department of Agriculture, and by the votes of both Houses of the Congress.

Amendments to an appropriation bill do not provide the proper forum for determination of basic agricultural policy. The amendments to which I refer are opposed by the Secretary of Agriculture and by the Senate Appropriations Committee which reported the pending bill to the Senate.

The proper forum for consideration of agricultural policy is the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. During the 91st Congress modifications of agricultural policy will be proposed by the President and by Members of the Senate. These proposals will be carefully considered by the Agriculture Committee and recommendations will be made to the Senate. Among other proposals, a bill was introduced last week by Senator DIRKSEN for himself and other Senators. No doubt other proposals will be made later during the present session of the Congress.

I urge the Senate to reject amendments to place arbitrary limitations upon payments under farm programs which were designed to benefit the Nation as a whole and were intended to affect all agricultural producers in the same way.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, on June 4, 1969, the Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Senate Agriculture Committee. At that time, he testified on the proposed payment limitations under the commodity programs, now under consideration.

In his testimony, Secretary Hardin offered a list of 10 specific questions concerning this program, such as how many farms and how many dollars and what share of the production would be affected by a $20,000 limitation. Additionally, he discussed the issue of any possible savings and the aspects of the so-called snapback provisions.

I think Secretary Hardin's statement in opposition to limitations was clear, concise, and complete, and I would respectfully recommend that every Member of this body give it close study. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE CLIFFORD M. HARDIN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Subcommittee, I am here in response to your invitation to clarify, if I can, a number of issues regarding the effect of placing limitations on the amount of money that can be paid to any one producer in connection with our commodity programs. Many such issues, some of them quite technical, were raised in the House debate on the agricultural appropriations bill. Presumably similar questions will be raised when the appropriations bill comes before the Senate.

The questions to which I address myself are these:

1. How many farmers and how many dollars and what share of the production would be affected by a $20,000 payment limit.

2. Would a limitation on payments result in a saving to the government and if so, how much?

3. Approximately what share of the payment, crop by crop, consists of inducements to limit acreage and what share consists of income supplements?

4. Specifically, what is the snap-back provision for cotton?

5. What options are open to the Secretary under the snap-back provision?

6. What would be the added cost of running the cotton program under the snap-back provision?

7. Would it be possible to operate a successful cotton program if payment limitations were in effect and if the snap-back provision were repealed?

8. Would it be possible to finance payments in excess of $20,000 from certain CCC funds which are not directly covered by the appropriations bill?

9. Would a payment limitation, written into the 1970 Appropriations Act, be specifically restricted to payments made during fiscal 1970?

10. Finally, what position does the Department of Agriculture take on the matter of payment limitations?

I now address myself to these questions. My answers will be as factual as I can make them.

1. How many farmers and how many dollars and what share of the production of various crops would be affected by a $20,000 limit on payments?

We have studied the payments made during calendar year 1968 for all programs, particularly for cotton wheat and feed grains. Our analysis, which was begun before the recent House debate, has been primarily in terms of individual commodity programs. The Conte limitation relates to the individual producer, who may be in more than one commodity program. Therefore, our figures will not show the exact effect of the Conte amendment. But we have done enough additional work so that we know that our presentation reflects the general situation reasonably well. We will continue our studies and will be in position to report further if you wish.

Payment limitations of $20,000 in 1968 would have affected, for cotton alone, 5,159 cotton farmers, 1.2 percent of those cotton farmers to whom we make payments. For feed grains alone, 877 feed grain producers would have been affected, one-tenth of one percent of those feed grain farmers who received payments. And for wheat alone, 702 wheat growers would have been affected, again one-tenth of one percent of those in the program. The number of dollars paid to these three groups receiving more than $20,000 totaled $215 million for cotton, $26 million for feed grain, and $21 million for wheat, a total of $262 million. The proportion of production that would have been affected was 28 percent of the cotton crop, 2 percent of the feed grain crop, and 3 percent of the wheat crop. These and related facts are summarized in tables 1 and 2.

TABLE 1.—NUMBER OF PRODUCERS AND AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS BY SIZE OF PAYMENT, FOR EACH OF 3 PROGRAMS, UNITED STATES, 1968

[Dollars in thousands]

Payments in excess of—	Cotton		Feed grain		Wheat	
	Number of producers	Amount of payment	Number of producers	Amount of payment	Number of producers	Certificates
$3,000	55,045	$560,282	79,422	$431,995	52,395	$305,121
$5,000	33,526	477,931	29,120	241,566	21,866	188,333
$10,000	14,790	347,211	5,335	83,858	4,663	72,748
$20,000	5,159	214,585	877	25,765	702	20,843
$30,000	2,455	149,270	233	10,448	213	9,211

TABLE 2.—DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCERS AND AMOUNT OF PAYMENTS BY PROGRAMS TO PRODUCERS RECEIVING IN EXCESS OF SPECIFIED AMOUNTS, UNITED STATES, 1968

[In percent]

Payment in excess of—	Number of producers			Amount of payment		
	Cotton program	Feed grain program	Wheat program	Cotton program	Feed grain program	Wheat program
$3,000	12.4	5.4	6.4	72.2	31.8	41.8
$5,000	7.7	2.0	2.7	61.5	17.8	25.8
$10,000	3.4	.4	.6	44.7	6.2	10.0
$20,000	1.2	.1	.1	27.6	1.9	2.9

The above discussion relates to those producers who would be affected by the limitation on a single commodity basis. In addition there are other producers affected by the $20,000 limitation because of a combination of cotton, feed grain and wheat program payments. Under 1968 programs 8,890 producers were so affected, constituting four-tenths of one percent of all producers receiving payments under these programs. This group of producers received payments totaling $240 million for cotton, $56 million for feed grains, and $39 million for wheat, or a total of $335 million. Table 3 shows the figures:

TABLE 3.—NUMBER OF PAYEES RECEIVING $20,000 OR MORE [1] AND THEIR TOTAL PAYMENTS BY KIND OF PROGRAM OR COMBINATION OF PROGRAMS, 1968

Programs	Number of payees	Amount of payment (millions)
Cotton	7,063	$240.4
Feed grain	5,201	55.9
Wheat	3,794	38.9
Cotton, feed grain, or wheat	[2] 8,890	335.3

[1] Payments from the 3 commodity programs listed. Entries for each program shown refer to payees receiving a payment of some size for that program.

[2] Net number of payees; some payees appear in 2 or all programs listed above.

Table 4 indicates the incidence of the payment limitations by states and by crops. This table includes wool and sugar. Half of the producers receiving payments in excess of $20,000 were cotton growers. The states most affected were in the South and in the West.

2. Would the limitation on payments result in a saving to the government? As I shall shortly show, the limitation on payments would trigger a snap-back provision for cotton that would increase the cost to government for the cotton program. We estimate this increased cost at about $160 million.

There are other reasons to support the conclusion that the limitation on payments would bring about very little savings, if any, and might result in a net increase in cost. First, a considerable proportion of the farms subject to the limitation would undoubtedly be split up or leased out in such a fashion as to escape the limitation. We could prevent some of this but not all by any means. Many such changes are constantly occurring and are entirely legal. We estimate, for example, that perhaps as much as 70 to 85 percent of the potential cotton acreage affected by the $20,000 limit would be able to maintain its eligibility for full payment.

Secondly, if a given acreage is to be retired from crops and if payments are the means of doing this, and if a payment limit is in effect, we would have to divert more acreage out of the smaller farms, which would be the only likely cooperators. With feed grain, which is the best example of a program having resource adjustment as its dominant feature, it would cost considerably more to run the program with payment limitations than without.

TABLE 4.—PRODUCERS RECEIVING $20,000 OR MORE FROM SPECIFIED PROGRAMS, 1968

State	All programs	Cotton		Feed grain	Wheat	Wool [1]	Sugar [1]
		Price support	Total				
Alabama	279	118	204	2			
Arizona	568	442	504	15	1	12	74
Arkansas	599	461	558	2	2		1
California	972	681	773	8	23	49	328
Colorado	195		1	19	50	26	52
Delaware	1						
Florida	69	3	3	2			59
Georgia	255	75	120	12			
Idaho	115				51	35	37
Illinois	108	2	2	76	1	8	
Indiana	95			63	1	2	
Iowa	88			76	1	3	
Kansas	301			31	69	6	50
Kentucky	7	2	2	5			
Louisiana	340	189	228	1	2	6	90
Maryland	2						
Michigan	17			7		1	4
Minnesota	32			17	2	2	11
Mississippi	1,145	901	1,074	2		9	
Missouri	178	37	51	59		3	
Montana	131				89	24	3
Nebraska	152			74	11	8	14
Nevada	16	2	3		2	10	
New Mexico	233	45	52	54	14	27	24
New York	3			1			1
North Carolina	77	28	45	8			
North Dakota	66			3	34	1	14
Ohio	35			17		4	4
Oklahoma	95	16	30	8	21	1	
Oregon	72				58	8	4
Pennsylvania	8			7			
South Carolina	225	91	152	4			
South Dakota	42			9	11	9	
Tennessee	104	45	63	1			
Texas	3,122	824	1,297	282	96	122	183
Utah	29				5	22	3
Virginia	3			2			
Washington	197	1	1	1	157	8	14
Wisconsin	15			9			
Wyoming	66				1	65	5
Alaska	1					1	
Hawaii	21						21
U.S. Total	10,079	3,963	5,163	877	702	472	996

[1] Includes payments to payees receiving $20,000 or more from all programs and includes some wool (or sugar) payments.

3. Approximately what share of these payments, crop by crop, consists of inducements to limit acreage and what share consists of income supplements?

There are two myths floating about, one to the effect that these payments are wholly for resource adjustment and the other that they are entirely income supplements.

It is easier to refute these two myths than it is to establish what are indeed the facts, because the matter is very complex. Our judgment is that for the 1968 crop, the breakdown was about as follows:

	Percent of payments	
	For resource adjustment	For income supplement
Cotton	35	65
Wheat	51	49
Feed grain	89	11
Total	65	35

Thus it will be seen that a limitation on payments would have a sharply different program effect, crop by crop. The method by which this breakdown was made is too complex to include in my testimony. The basic idea is that all payments made for diversion were in fact payments for resource adjustment, and that some part of the payments for price support or certificates were also an inducement to restrict planting. I can supply the background material for the record if you wish.

4. Specifically, what is the snap-back provision for cotton?

The enactment of a payment limitation would bring into effect the so-called "snap-back" provision in the cotton legislation. The snap-back provision (Section 103(d)(12) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, which was enacted as a part of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965) provides that if as a result of payment limitations the Department is unable to make available to

all cooperators through payments the full amount of price support to which they would otherwise be entitled, then the Department is obligated to provide price support at not less than 65 percent of parity though loans or purchases and the payment limitation would not be applicable.

5. What options are open to the Secretary under the snap-back provision?

The question has been raised whether the snap-back provision could be carried out in a manner which will still make cotton producers subject to the payment limitation. The question arises out of the existence of language in the snap-back provision which gives the Secretary permissive authority, as one method of providing the price support, to carry out a simultaneous purchase of cotton from producers at the support price and resale to them at a lower price. The argument is that such a transaction would constitute a payment and that if the program were carried out exclusively through that method, the limitation would still apply. It is our conclusion, however, that we could not legally restrict the method of providing price support to one to which the payment limitation would be applicable since that would defeat the very purpose for which the provision was enacted. We feel that we would be required to carry it out in a manner which will make available to all cooperators price support at not less than 65 percent of parity through loan or purchase on all cotton produced on their 1970 acreage allotments.

6. What would be the added cost of running the cotton program under the snap-back provision?

The snap-back provisions for cotton, which would be activated in the event payment limitations are invoked by the Congress, would provide that:

A. Price support for cotton would be not less than 65 percent or more than 90 percent of parity.

B. Price support may be carried out through simultaneous purchase of cotton at the support level and resale at a lower level—or through loans under which the cotton could be redeemed by the grower at a price lower than the amount of the loan.

C. Such resale or redemption price would be that which the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of cotton during the harvest season and will retain an adequate share of the world market for cotton produced in the U.S.

If the snap-back provision is invoked, CCC operations would be affected as follows:

A. It is estimated that production would amount to 14 million bales or about 2 million bales above the current crop. This is based on the 16.2 million acre national allotment with an allowance for some voluntary diversion.

B. The 1970 crop loan rate, basis middling 1-inch cotton, would increase from 20.25 cents per pound (90 percent of the estimated world price) to around 31.5 to 32 cents per pound (65 percent of the current parity price).

C. Practically all cotton would be placed under the CCC loan or purchase program. The cotton would either be redeemed by producers at a lower price or acquired by CCC and sold at a lower price.

D. The work load in the county offices and in the New Orleans Commodity Office would probably be expanded in the proportion of 14 million bales to the 4.4 million bales of the 1968 crop placed under loan.

E. More storage facilities would be required to handle the larger production. Storage costs, reconcentration activity, and transportation costs would increase substantially.

F. The total increase in CCC inventory would be an estimated 2.1 million bales.

G. The additional cotton production (1.5 million bales) would add materially to our problem of surplus cottonseed oil and surplus cottonseed meal.

Table 5 provides the pertinent statistics.

7. Would it be possible to operate a successful cotton program if payment limitations were in effect and if the snap-back provision were repealed?

This would be very difficult. Under present legislation, marketing quotas are in effect for cotton. Heavy penalties are provided for overplanting, about 23.6 cents per pound. With quotas in effect and a limit on payments, large growers would be compelled to stay in the program but would be denied the advantages of the program.

TABLE 5.—UPLAND COTTON: ESTIMATES OF BASIC DATA FOR 1968 THROUGH 1970 CROPS (BASED ON PRESENT PROGRAM) AND 1970 UNDER THE SNAPBACK PROVISION

Item	1968 crop (1)	1969 crop (2)	1970 crop (present program) (3)	1970 crop (snapback) (4)
Acreage (thousands):				
Allotted	16.2	16.2	16.2	16.2
CAP, CR, Adjustment, etc	1.0	.9	.9	.9
Diverted for payment	3.2			2.4
Planted	10.9	11.9	11.9	12.7
Harvested	10.1	11.1	11.2	12.1
Field: Pound per acre harvested	515	520	530	550
Supply and utilization (1,000 bales):				
Production (including imports and city crop)	10.9	12.1	12.5	14.0
Beginning stocks (including preseason ginnings)	6.3	6.6	7.2	7.2
Domestic disappearance	8.1	8.3	8.4	8.4
Exports	2.5	3.2	3.5	3.5
Ending stocks	6.6	7.2	7.8	9.3
CCC stocks July 31	3.0	3.6	4.2	6.3
Support price per pound (Middling 1 inch) (cents)	20.25	20.25	20.25	32.0
Support price per pound (average of crops) (cents)	19.69	19.71	19.71	31.25
Price support payment rate (cents)	12.24	14.73	17.31	
Diversion payment rate (cents)	10.76+6.0			[1] 10
Producer payments	784	−826	966	156
Farm value of production (million dollars)	1,192	1,290	1,302	2,172
Total (million dollars)	1,976	2,116	2,268	2,328
Major receipts or expenditures (million dollars):				
Net change in stocks at loan rate	−230	−60	−60	−432
Storage, handling, and loan settlement	−3	−18	−20	−30
Producer payments	[2] −742	−826	−966	−156
Snapback loss on sales or loan repayments				−595
Subtotal, price support expenditures	−975	−904	−1,046	−1,213
Public Law 480	−82	−70	−70	−70
Estimated major expenditures	−1,057	−974	−1,116	+1,283
Change in CCC stocks (million bales) (from June 30 of prior year)	+2.2	+0.6	+0.6	+2.7

[1] Vol.
[2] F.Y.

Some people have suggested that payment limitations could be made operable for cotton if the snap-back provision were repealed. Our studies indicate that greater changes than these are required if payment limitations are to be made workable.

8. Would it be possible to finance payments in excess of $20,000 from certain CCC funds which are not directly covered by the appropriations bill?

The suggestion has been made that since the limitation is only a limit on the funds appropriated by this Act, it could be avoided by using funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation which are on hand or those funds which are received from the repayment of loans or sale of commodities to administer the program. It is our view, however, that the limitation would be an effective legal limitation upon us, and that we could not use other funds to avoid it.

9. Would a payment limitation, written into the 1970 Appropriations Act, be specifically limited to payments made during fiscal 1970?

The question has also been raised whether the payment limitation would expire on June 30, 1970, or whether it would continue to apply after June 30, 1970, to the crops planted during the fiscal year 1970. This question assumes, of course, that the payment limitation might not be continued in the appropriation for fiscal year 1971. A similar question arose in connection with the $50,000 limitation on price support which was included in the Appropriation Act for fiscal year 1960. The Comptroller General of the United States ruled that such limitation applied to all of the 1960 production of those commodities for which the 1960 program was approved on or before June 30, 1960, notwithstanding that the regulations implementing such programs were not completed until after June 30, 1960, and notwithstanding that the actual loans and purchases were not made until after June 30, 1960. That decision would appear to be applicable to this limitation.

In view of the importance of the questions of legal interpretation which have arisen in connection with the limitation, I am asking the Comptroller General for his opinion on such questions. Our submission develops at some length the basis for the views I have just expressed concerning these questions. I can supply it for the record if you wish.

10. What position does the Department of Agriculture take on payment limitations?

My position is as stated during the debate in the House. At that time I sent the following message to members of the House of Representatives:

"The Department of Agriculture believes it is possible to design a sound farm program that limits the number of dollars that can be paid to any one farmer for programs following the 1970 crop year.

"However, to make such a limitation effective, legislative changes are needed. With only the simple amendment that is possible in connection with appropriation bills, the so-called 'snap-back' provision for cotton would come into effect. The cotton program would then become subject to a loan-and-redemption or a buy-and-sell-back arrangement that would increase costs while the large producers would escape the intent of the payment limitation.

"A simple amendment to the appropriations bill will not suffice. The Department is ready to work with the legislative committees on basic changes in the legislation and has modifications to suggest.

"The preferred time for considering these changes would be later in this session or early next session, when consideration must be given to the type of legislation that is to replace present laws. These laws are scheduled to expire after the 1970 crop."

I have not discussed limitations on payments under the wool and sugar programs. I have excluded wool because the expressed in-

tent of the payments is to increase production. Sugar is excluded because it already has a limitation on payments, albeit a very moderate one. Additionally sugar, along with wool, has an element of production incentive.

Appended to my statement are a number of tables that will provide added factual background, in the event that you should wish it. I assure you, gentlemen, that we have examined and are examining the whole question of payment limitations with great care, having been quite sure that the question would arise, and being equally sure that the best judgments would emerge if all the known facts were made available.

TABLE 6.—FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF PRODUCER PAYMENTS,[1] EXCLUDING WOOL AND SUGAR PROGRAM PAYMENTS, UNITED STATES, CALENDAR YEAR 1968

Payment range	Producers			Total amount of payments		
	Number	Percent distribution	Cumulative percent distribution	Million dollars	Percent distribution	Cumulative percent distribution
Less than $100	281,413	11.9	11.9	13.6	0.4	0.4
$100 to $199	258,762	10.9	22.8	38.3	1.2	1.6
$200 to $499	543,822	22.9	45.7	182.8	5.7	7.3
$500 to $699	244,819	10.3	56.0	145.4	4.6	11.9
$700 to $999	257,576	10.9	66.9	216.3	6.8	18.7
$1,000 to $1,999	397,360	16.8	83.7	555.8	17.4	36.1
$2,000 to $2,999	154,187	6.5	90.2	376.0	11.8	47.9
$3,000 to $3,999	79,591	3.4	93.6	274.6	8.6	56.5
$4,000 to $4,999	46,359	2.0	95.6	206.9	6.5	63.0
$5,000 to $7,499	52,908	2.2	97.8	319.1	10.0	73.0
$7,500 to $9,999	21,342	.9	98.7	183.6	5.8	78.8
$10,000 to $14,999	17,290	.7	99.4	208.2	6.5	85.3
$15,000 to $24,999	10,320	0.4	99.8	194.5	6.1	91.4
$25,000 to $49,999	4,611	.2	100.0	153.5	4.8	96.2
$50,000 to $99,999	1,010	(2)	100.0	66.7	2.1	98.3
$100,000 to $499,999	255	(2)	100.0	41.2	1.3	99.6
$500,000 to $999,999	6	(2)	100.0	3.9	.1	99.7
$1,000,000 and over	3	(2)	100.0	7.0	.2	99.9
Subtotal	2,371,634	100.0		3,187.3	100.0	
Wool payments				69.4		
Sugar payments				83.4		
Undistributed funds[3]				122.7		
Total	2,371,634			3,462.9		

[1] Includes payments under following ASCS programs: cotton, feed grain, wheat, milk indemnity, agricultural conservation, emergency conservation, Appalachia, cropland conversion, conservation reserve, and cropland adjustment.
[2] Less than 0.05 percent.
[3] Includes approximately $90 to $100,000,000 ACP (CMS advances) cost sharing made directly to vendors and not accountable to individual farm operators, payments to unidentified producers, etc.

Note: Sum of individual percentages and individual total amount of payments may differ from totals shown because of rounding.

TABLE 7.—MAJOR PROGRAM CHANGES HAVING A BEARING ON TOTAL PAYMENTS EARNED BY PROGRAM PARTICIPANTS, 1967 TO 1969

Item	1967	1968	1969
Cotton, upland			
Price-support payment rate on 65 percent of farm allotment (cents per pound)	11.53	12.24	14.73
Diversion payment rate (cents per pound):			
Required diversion	10.78	10.76	0
Additional diversion	10.78	6.00	0
Diversion acreage[1] (percent allotment):			
Required diversion	12.5	5.0	0
Maximum diversion (percent allotment):			
Planting	35	35	0
Not planting[2]	12.5	5	0
Feed grains			
	Corn, grain sorghum	Corn, grain sorghum	Corn, grain sorghum, barley
Grains included:			
Price-support payment on 50 percent of farm base (cents per bushel):			
Corn	30	30	30
Grain sorghum	30	30	30
Barley	0	0	20
Diversion payment rate[1] (percent county support):			
Required diversion	0	0	0
Additional diversion	0	45	45
Diversion acreage (percent of base):			
Required diversion	20	20	20
Maximum diversion[3]	0	50	50
Wheat			
National acreage allotment	68,200,000	59,300,000	51,600,000
Domestic certificate allocation on projected production (percent)	35	40	43
Domestic certificate value (per bushel)	$1.36	$1.38	[4] $1.50
Diversion payment rate:			
Minimum diversion	0	0	0
Additional diversion	0	0	(5)
Diversion acreage (amount equal to percent of allotment:			
Minimum	0	0	15
Maximum	0	0	50
Wool			
Price-support payment rate (cents per pound):			
Wool	.129	.262	.270
Mohair	.221	.355	.324
Cotton ELS			
National acreage allotment	70,500	70,500	79,700
Price-support payment rate on actual production (cents per pound)	0	8.69	8.88

[1] Small farm provisions differ, but have not been outlined.
[2] Farms not desiring to plant cotton will earn diversion payments based on the required diversion percentage times the effective allotment.
[3] Except farms with bases of 26 to 125 acres could divert 25 acres for payment if they do not plant feed grains.
[4] Based on May 1969 parity.
[5] 50 percent of county loan rate.

TABLE 8.—NUMBER OF PAYEES, TOTAL PAYMENTS, AND AVERAGE PAYMENTS, BY KIND OF PROGRAM AND BY PAYMENT SIZE FOR 1968

Program	For payees receiving total payments of—[1]								
	More than $4,999			More than $9,999			More than $19,999		
	Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment	Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment	Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
Cotton	46,016	$520,107	$11,303	21,045	$389,782	$18,521	7,401	$244,477	$33,033
Feed grain	74,720	332,803	4,454	21,875	148,843	6,804	5,705	58,948	10,333
Wheat	63,552	273,654	4,306	17,691	120,414	6,807	4,285	42,237	9,857
Wool	7,414	31,363	4,230	1,986	20,570	10,358	472	10,317	21,858
Feed grain wheat[3]	56	50	893	16	39	2,438	7	24	3,429
Cotton, feed grain, wheat, or wool	111,600	1,157,977	10,376	35,385	679,648	19,207	9,916	356,003	35,902

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 8.—NUMBER OF PAYEES, TOTAL PAYMENTS, AND AVERAGE PAYMENTS, BY KIND OF PROGRAM AND BY PAYMENT SIZE FOR 1968—Continued

Program	For payees receiving total payments of—[1] More than $4,999 Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment	More than $9,999 Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment	More than $19,999 Number of payees	Amount of payments (in thousands)	Average payment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
CAP	4,287	$24,348	$5,679	1,228	$10,682	$8,699	292	$3,784	$12,959
Sugar	5,476	47,360	8,649	2,430	35,060	14,428	996	25,044	25,145
ACP	41,241	17,947	435	12,335	7,314	593	3,194	2,497	782
ECM	1,386	1,513	1,092	535	735	1,374	188	323	1,718
Appalachia	13	6	462	2					
CCP	212	629	2,967	44	154	3,500	5	15	3,000
CRP	7,672	20,442	2,664	2,285	5,966	2,611	564	1,481	2,626
All programs	114,334	1,270,222	11,110	36,008	739,559	20,539	10,079	389,147	38,610

[1] "Total payments" refers to all programs shown in col. 1. Entries for each program shown refer to payees receiving a payment of some size for that program.

[2] Payments were occasionally combined in 1 check.

TABLE 9.—PAYMENTS TO FARMERS OF $20,000 OR MORE UNDER COTTON, WHEAT, AND FEED GRAIN PROGRAMS, 1968, 25 LEADING STATES

State	Total (millions)	Excess (millions)	Average per payee (thousands)	Wheat Total (millions)	Wheat Average (thousands)	Feedgrains Total (millions)	Feedgrains Average (thousands)	Cotton Total (millions)	Cotton Average (thousands)	Class
1. Texas	$96.3	$38.3	$33.2	$10.2	$6.9	$26.0	$11.2	$60.2	$23.6	Cotton, feed grain, wheat.
2. California	51.5	35.0	62.3	1.3	12.1	.8	5.1	49.4	61.5	Cotton.
3. Mississippi	45.4	22.6	39.8	.3	2.2	.8	1.7	44.2	38.8	Do.
4. Arizona	30.6	19.7	56.3	.5	2.5	1.0	8.1	29.1	53.8	Do.
5. Arkansas	21.2	9.5	36.1	.3	4.2	.1	1.2	20.8	35.5	Do.
6. Alabama	8.8	3.4	32.7	.1	1.5	.8	3.7	7.9	29.1	Do.
7. Louisiana	8.4	3.4	33.1	.1	3.1	.2	2.1	8.0	32.3	Do.
8. Kansas	7.4	2.3	28.7	4.4	17.0	3.1	12.2		2.0	Wheat, feed grain.
9. Georgia	6.6	2.3	30.3	.1	2.5	1.5	8.6	5.0	23.2	Cotton, feed grain.
10. South Carolina	6.5	2.4	32.1	.1	1.3	.7	4.2	5.8	28.2	Cotton.
11. New Mexico	6.1	2.3	32.6	1.4	11.4	2.8	18.8	1.9	18.5	Feed grain, wheat, cotton.
12. Washington	5.3	1.9	30.7	5.2	30.5		8.0			Wheat.
13. Missouri	5.1	1.9	32.3	.4	3.8	2.7	19.9	2.0	21.6	Feed grain, cotton.
14. Colorado	4.1	1.6	32.8	2.6	21.1	1.4	12.4		3.7	Wheat, feed grain.
15. Nebraska	3.8	1.1	27.7	.8	7.5	3.0	21.7			Feed grain, wheat.
16. Montana	3.4	1.4	34.8	3.4	34.5		2.7			Wheat.
17. Tennessee	3.0	1.0	30.5		2.4	.4	5.6	2.5	26.2	Cotton.
18. Illinois	2.7	.8	28.7	.2	4.5	2.4	25.9		13.0	Feed grain.
19. North Carolina	2.7	1.2	36.8		.9	.7	10.4	2.0	29.3	Cotton, feed grain.
20. Indiana	2.6	.9	31.5	.2	3.6	2.4	28.7			Feed grain.
21. Oklahoma	2.5	.8	29.3	1.0	12.9	.3	5.5	1.2	18.3	Cotton, wheat.
22. Iowa	2.3	.8	29.0		3.1	2.2	28.4			Feed grain.
23. Oregon	1.8	.6	29.4	1.8	29.2		15.0			Wheat.
24. Idaho	1.7	.6	30.3	1.7	30.2		2.0			Do.
25. North Dakota	1.2	.3	26.3	1.1	23.7	.1	3.4			Do.
Total	331.0	156.1		37.2		53.4		240.0		
Cotton/grain States		46.8		13.1		34.0		72.3		
Cotton States		97.0		2.7		4.8		167.7		
Wheat, feed grain States		5.0		7.8		7.5		0		
Wheat States		4.8		13.2		.1		0		
Feed grain States		2.5		.4		7.0		0		
Subtotal		156.1		37.2		53.4		240.0		
United States	335.3	157.5	37.7	38.9	10.2	55.9	10.8	240.4	34.0	

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall be ready to vote in a minute.

The argument has been presented that this bill is not the proper vehicle for the Senate to deal with this proposal for a limit on farm subsidy payments. I call attention to the fact that this is not an amendment from the floor of the Senate. The Senate will be voting on an amendment that was included in the bill as it passed the House of Representatives. The Senate Committee on Appropriations proposes to delete the language of the House amendment. What I am opposing is a Senate committee amendment and am thereby trying to retain the $20,000 ceiling on the subsidy payments.

It has been conservatively estimated that the rejection of the Senate committee amendment would save about $335 million that is now being paid to those so-called farmers who are drawing in excess of $20,000.

The next amendment that will be proposed if this Senate amendment is rejected will be a proposal to repeal the snapback provision.

I remind Senators that tomorrow hearings will begin in the Senate Finance Committee on the bill to continue the 10 percent surcharge tax. If today we can save $335 million this is even more important than increasing taxes. Before we increase taxes it is equally important that we discontinue some of the spending.

This present farm program does not help the small farmer. The small farmer who must maintain the efficiency of his operation, cannot afford to take advantage of the acreage reserve program.

I listened to the argument that the Secretary of Agriculture is against any limitation of these large payments. The former Secretary of Agriculture, likewise, opposed any ceiling or any limitation. Both Secretaries, unfortunately in my opinion, are more interested in supporting the large corporate-type operations. I do not see how any Senator can justify payments involving half a million dollars and some of more than a million dollars to so-called farmers not to cultivate their land.

Most of the cultivating those corporations are doing is not on the farm but in the Federal Treasury. The American taxpayers cannot afford this giveaway program.

I hope the Senate will reject the committee amendment and thereby retain the House provision with its $20,000 ceiling on these payments, both in the interest of economy and in the interest of fair play for the American farmer. I speak as a Senator from the East, but I also point out that I come from a county that recently ranked fifth in agricultural production among counties east of the Rocky Mountains. So I think I can say that I understand some of the problems of the farmers. I repeat, the county in which I live, even though small, will outrank many of the farm counties of Midwestern States.

I do not think these large payments, ofttimes to absentee owners, can be justified under any circumstances. I hope that the committee amendment will be rejected and that we can hold the ceiling at $20,000. The next order of business, then, will be to repeal the so-called snapback provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The Senator from Florida will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that the vote about to be taken will be on the committee amendment to eliminate from the bill the House provision relating to a limitation of payments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct; beginning with line 14 and extending through line 19 on page 23.

Mr. HOLLAND. A vote "yea" will be a vote for the committee amendment which strikes the House limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct, to eliminate the limitation.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning with line 14 and continuing through line 19 on page 23. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. METCALF (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) is paired with the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea" and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) is paired with the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS). If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from Maryland would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), would vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) is paired with the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY). If present and voting, the Senator from Florida would vote "yea" and the Senator from Vermont would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 53, nays 34, as follows:

[No. 53 Leg.]

YEAS—53

Aiken	Ellender	Montoya
Allen	Ervin	Mundt
Allott	Fannin	Murphy
Baker	Fong	Muskie
Bennett	Fulbright	Pearson
Bible	Goldwater	Randolph
Burdick	Hansen	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Smith
Cook	Hollings	Sparkman
Cooper	Hruska	Stennis
Cranston	Inouye	Stevens
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Symington
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Dodd	Long	Thurmond
Dole	McCarthy	Tower
Dominick	McClellan	Yarborough
Eagleton	McGee	Young, N. Dak.
Eastland	Miller	

NAYS—34

Bayh	Hughes	Pell
Bellmon	Jackson	Percy
Boggs	Javits	Proxmire
Byrd, Va.	Kennedy	Saxbe
Case	Mansfield	Schweiker
Church	Mathias	Scott
Goodell	McGovern	Spong
Gore	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Mondale	Williams, Del.
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Packwood	
Hatfield	Pastore	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mr. Metcalf, for.

NOT VOTING—12

Anderson	Gravel	Nelson
Brooke	Griffin	Prouty
Cannon	Gurney	Ribicoff
Cotton	Magnuson	Tydings

So the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have agreed to yield to the distinguished Senator from Delaware at this stage and gladly do so at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I indicated that I was going to offer the next amendment which would repeal the so-called statute of limitations. However, I recognize that it would be the same vote as the preceding one and, therefore, I see no need to delay the time of the Senate and I shall not offer it at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 11, after "(21 U.S.C. 114b–c)", strike out "$89,493,000" and insert "$92,126,500"; and, in line 19, after the word "exceed", strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$2,000,000".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) has any preference among his amendments as to which ones he would like to call up first, I would have no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that this matter can be settled.

The committee amendment on page 4, line 11, and the committee amendment, on page 4, lines 19 and 20, go together and relate to the facility at Fort Tilden, N.Y. This amendment relates to the construction of a replacement on the animal quarantine station presently located at Clifton, N.J. I have received a letter from the Department of Agriculture concurred in by Under Secretary of the Interior Russell E. Train on this subject which I should like to read into the RECORD. I have already consulted with the two Senators interested; namely, the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE).

This letter is signed by the Under Secretary of Agriculture, J. Phil Campbell, and is concurred in by Under Secretary Train, of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, July 1, 1969.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This has reference to proposed relocation of U.S. Animal Quarantine Station, now located at Clifton, New Jersey, to a site at the Fort Tilden Military Reservation, Queens County, Long Island, New York. The relocation of the Clifton facility was authorized by Act of September 12, 164 (P.L. 88–592, 78 Stat. 939).

The $2 million provided in the 1970 Agricultural Appropriation Bill (H.R. 11612) as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations will be used for construction of animal quarantine facilities at Fort Tilden, New York, only if the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior agree that such facilities are compatible with the use of Fort Tilden and its environs for public outdoor recreation purposes.

If such agreement cannot be reached, these funds would be used for construction of animal quarantine facilities at an alternative location yet to be selected. The Department of Agriculture would advise the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations before final decision is made on such alternative location.

I have discussed the above proposal with Under Secretary of Interior Russell Train and our two departments are in agreement with this arrangement.

Identical letters are being sent to Senators Spessard L. Holland and Roman L. Hruska and Congressmen Jamie L. Whitten and Odin Langen.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the important paragraph is as follows:

The $2 million provided in the 1970 Agricultural Appropriation Bill (H.R. 11612) as reported by the Senate Committee on Appropriations will be used for construction of animal quarantine facilities at Fort Tilden, New York, only if the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior agree that such facilities are compatible with the use of Fort Tilden and its environs for public outdoor recreation purposes. If such agreement cannot be reached, these funds would be used for construction of animal quarantine facilities at an alternative location yet to be selected.

Mr. President, I am satisfied with that disposition and I gather that other Sena-

tors are. The committee amendment should be agreed to, with the understanding of both departments as expressed in the letter which I have just placed in the RECORD.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would have no objection to that course being followed but I want the RECORD to show two things: First, that the island on which Fort Tilden is located contains 311 acres. It is proposed by the Department of Agriculture, after a long search over the past several years, for a site, to locate its quarantine facilities for imported livestock, and birds, and other imported species will require only 27 acres of that 311 acres. The Department of Agriculture, as I understand it, is quite willing to see the rest of the island used for park or recreational purposes.

I think I should state, as the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE) is not in the Chamber at the moment, that the town of Clifton, N.J., where the old quarantine facilities are located, has been trying for years to get rid of those facilities, and already has the financing and the plans available to build a civic and community center at the location of the old quarantine station. The Department of Agriculture has found the existing facility is not adequate by any means for the handling of imported animals and other living things which pass through that station.

I am quite agreeable to the solution reached between the two departments. I think we will have to leave it up to them to work out.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague from Florida. I merely point out, as the letter states, that the question is really one of possibility of accommodating both the quarantine station and the Gateway National Seashore. I, too, am content that the relevant departments should share this determination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 4, line 11.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 4, line 19, strike "$1 million" and insert "$2 million."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, both of these amendments, as I understood from the Senator from New York, were covered by the letter which he had placed in the RECORD, and it now becomes a matter of agreeing to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the committee amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 19, after line 7, insert:

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Special Milk Program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772) $84,000,000.

AMENDMENT NO. 63

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, at my request, the Senator from Florida withheld unanimous consent on this amendment. He was kind enough to ask me which of my amendments I would like to bring up first, and I should like, with the Senator's permission, to ask unanimous consent that, at this stage of the proceedings, I may bring up amendment No. 63, changing that figure from $10 million to $20 million.

Mr. President, I should like to explain the reason for my request. The reason is that it would be more logical to bring up this amendment before dealing with the specialized question of milk. If it is agreeable with the Senator, I would ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 63 may now be considered out of order. It would only be in order, as I understand it, after all committee amendments have been dealt with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up amendment No. 63 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, line 18, delete "$10,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$20,000,000".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am joined in offering this amendment by Senators BROOKE, HART, KENNEDY, and MONDALE. We have prepared a memorandum which is available to such Members as are in the Chamber and are interested in this particular amendment. This amendment would restore the amount requested by the previous administration. This administration cut this particular item by 50 percent, or $10 million. The previous administration had recommended $20 million. We are proposing in this amendment to go back to the figure of $20 million.

This is the so-called Vanik program which relates to special food service for children not in school but in day care centers, recreational centers, settlement houses and other child-care centers. Our interest in this question goes directly to the question of day care about which I have had very deep concern during the years I have been in Congress and which has come into focus now, when we talk about the rearrangement of national priorities.

One of the great national priorities is reform of the welfare system, and endemic in the welfare system is the question of jobs. We all know, because we have heard it now so many, many times, that the greatest reservoir of jobs is among the AFDC mothers—that is, relatively young women who could work if some way were found to look after their children.

The fact is that the day care programs of the United States reach perhaps, at the most, about 25 percent of the children of mothers who are working or could work. Children whose mothers do work are deprived and, in communities like mine, children will often wander around with keys on strings around their necks so they can get into their apartments, if they need to, with the help of neighbors; moreover, many mothers do not work and are on welfare when they do not have to be.

Resources allocated to the nonschool food program are inadequate. This program has an authorization this year of $32 million. I repeat, the authorization is $32 million for 1969, 1970, and 1971. The previous administration recommended $20 million. This administration reduced that to $10 million. The sponsors of this amendment propose that it be restored to $20 million.

The nonschool food program is a new program. It is an effort to encourage day-care centers by having available adequate food to make it desirable to establish day-care centers. This, as it were, is an inducement, an incentive, to establish more day-care centers. The program is flexible, so that food services may be available on a year-round basis as well as in summer programs.

It is a fact that this program has just started. Indeed, it has had to date hardly a year of operation, so much so that last year there was a $3 million carryover. So there would be carried over to this year, if we appropriated the $10 million as it came from the House a total of $13 million.

Interestingly enough, though it is a new program, its growth is phenomenal. It seems to have touched a chord of particular interest in the country. To indicate the size of its growth, may I give this figure? On February 19 last, only 4 months ago, the Department of Agriculture had contracted with 300 institutions, serving 16,000 children. Yet only 4 months later, the program had already grown to include 1,200 institutions, with 115,000 children. Hence, in 4 months, there were 900 additional institutions, serving nearly 100,000 more children.

The Children's Bureau estimates that there are 150,000 children in year-around day-care centers now. All we are reaching through this food program is, according to the Agriculture Department, 28,000 and, according to the testimony to the appropriations committee, 50,000.

We may also expect a very large increase in the potential number of children to be served, because we are putting into effect certain provisions of the law regarding AFDC mothers. This will bring about a much greater work force among AFDC mothers than we have had up to now. This was the major change in the welfare laws adopted by the last Congress.

The experts in the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimate that 1,380,000 chil-

dren from infancy through age 14 need day-care service in the United States. Of this number, something like 500,000, exclusive of Headstart, are in the poverty category.

As of March 1967, we had over 4 million working mothers with children under 6 years of age, and 6.4 million working mothers with children of 6 to 17 years of age, whereas licensed day-care centers were available for under half a million.

In short, my argument is that here is an extremely desirable program, which gives an incentive for the establishment of day-care centers so urgently needed in the country and supports the very policies which we ourselves are offering, to wit, a basic policy to bring as many AFDC mothers as we possibly can into the work force. This particular appropriation should not be an object of economy. There should not be a 50-percent cut in the recommendation of the previous administration that $20 million is necessary for this program.

Through doubling this amount, we will contribute to a policy which we have ourselves legislated, the policy of the Social Security Act, title IV, which requires States to provide AFDC mothers with training and employment opportunities, and which will accordingly, materially increase the child population in day-care centers.

We have proposed a $20 million appropriation, because these changes, which are gradually biting in and taking effect, will mean that there are likely to be 200,000 children in day-care centers in 1970.

Based upon that estimate of day-care enrollments, the amount needed will be, in round figures, $20 million. It is that upon which this amendment is based.

Just one more comment, Mr. President. The reason I said I would like to call this amendment up before the committee amendment on the use of section 32 funds for milk is that that amendment is intended to reach some of the same children.

Frankly, having served with the distinguished Senator from Florida on the conference committee last year, and knowing of his very deep devotion to the section 32 concept, I would like to avoid getting into what I know is a very difficult subject.

Certainly, I hope that we can amend this particular item that should appeal, it seems to me, to Senators of all points of view—liberal, conservative, or middle of the road—because the nonschool food program conducive to encouraging a kind of activity which is indispensable to adequate welfare reform. It will enable young women to work rather than to remain on welfare.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New York for referring to my particular sensitivity to anything that raids section 32 funds.

After all, these funds are the main anchor to windward for protecting between 70 and 80 percent of the agricultural dollar production of this Nation. These nonprice supported perishables include livestock, poultry, vegetables, fruits, and even some dairy items.

I am not unsympathetic with the objective of the bill which we passed last year and which I supported—Public Law 90–302—which provided this special food service program. In the Appropriations Committee, I was not unsympathetic to the request, in the 1968 supplemental appropriation bill, for a $10 million appropriation to be available throughout 1969.

Now we are through 1969, and instead of spending that $10 million in this very worthy program, or even spending as much as they thought would be spent when they submitted the budget, I am advised now, in this letter dated today from Mr. John M. Buhl, Director of the Budget division handling this nonschool food program, better known as the Vanik bill, that there is now $5.7 million carried over from the $10 million of last year, and that amount will last throughout the summer.

I have two proposals to make to the Senator, either one of which I am willing to accept, provided my distinguished friend from Nebraska will approve.

Mr. Buhl and Mr. Davis, who are handling this program, both suggest that we wait for the last supplemental bill, and see what progress they can make this summer. They doubt if they can spend the entire $5.7 million carryover from the 1969 available funds. I am willing to state to the distinguished Senator that if the $5.7 million proves to be insufficient, as chairman of the subcommittee and as the ranking member of the supplemental committee, I would be agreeable to add into that last supplemental bill any sum that was within reason and which could be absorbed by the program.

I think that is the more reasonable way to support the Senator's objective. If the Senator insists upon an amendment, I would have to insist that it be greatly reduced from the $10 million which he proposes to add, and I think he will get more, in the long run, if he will stay with the Senator from Nebraska and myself—and I see the Senator from Nebraska nodding his head in agreement on this—and await the consideration of the last supplemental bill. At that time we will be under obligation to do whatever seems to be reasonable to meet the program as it then exists.

As it now exists, the program cannot even use this $5.7 million carryover during the summer months—at least we are so advised by Mr. Davis and Mr. Buhl; and of course, they have the knowledge in the Bureau of the Budget and in the Department of Agriculture which we do not have here, of how much the program can usefully absorb.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. The Senator from Florida has pretty well outlined my position. There is a carryover of $5.7 million. We do have advice that they have not been able to use the appropriation of $10 million in fiscal 1969. Certainly the next 60 days will pretty well give indication of the extent to which they can use that carryover, and what might come about by way of a deficiency which would require a supplemental at that time.

The Senator from Florida and I have discussed the matter. We do believe it would be in better keeping with sound appropriation practices and procedures to await the developments in the next 60 days, and then take the matter up in the Supplemental Appropriations Subcommittee, of which both the Senator from Florida and I are members. I should prefer that first alternative.

Mr. HOLLAND. The second alternative, Mr. President, which I have not discussed with my distinguished friend from Nebraska, but which has now been suggested to me by the distinguished Senator from New York, is that we add $5 million, with the understanding that this will be for the full fiscal year, and we will not have to deal with this matter again in a later supplemental for 1970.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator yield, so that I may explain that?

Mr. HOLLAND. Let me simply add that I think the Senator is taking the less desirable course, because if they proceed with this program as quickly as the Senator thinks, they would be justifying the larger amount anyway.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe that I know the parameters of planning. If the two Senators—and I am convinced that they will—smile upon this program, as it were, then I think a modest increase would be giving the Department the encouragement needed. The Senate would have complete control of the process throughout.

This program has been functioning for less than a year, and there has been a phenomenal rate of growth from February to July in the number of States and children covered. I would hope very much that the Senators could go along with this figure. As I say, they fully control the process. It would give the Department an indication of the fact that this is a program with which we find favor. That, I think, would go a long way toward encouraging the process of extending it throughout the country. Having been on the Appropriations Committee, and knowing both Senators, I know their word is as good as gold. That is not my point. I have no doubt whatever that if the Senators are faced with a supplementary appropriation, having said what they have, they will handle it properly.

I think that it would be much more salutary to give an indication that this program does find favor with the Congress and we are willing to encourage it by allowing somewhat more money for it.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would think, Mr. President, that an appropriation of $10 million, plus the $5.7 million, amounts to a fairly substantial fullsome smile in and of itself. The operations are then open, and the supplemental process will address itself to whatever the situation is when we get into the August or September conditions as they then will exist.

But I should think this colloquy on the floor, together with an amount available of $15.7 million, should be ample for the purpose.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this committee—including, I am sure, the Senator from Nebraska—has been as sympathetic to this action as any other Senators, and I believe the Senator from New York also has been sympathetic to it. The committee has already recommended the amount for the entire feeding program be raised from $1.243 billion-

plus for fiscal 1969 to $1.955 billion-plus for 1970, or a total increase of $711 million. Mr. President, I do not think we need to state anything more to show the fact that this committee has shown great sympathy for all these feeding programs.

I hope that our distinguished friend, recognizing that fact, which speaks louder than words, will permit this matter to go on to the supplemental bill. I agree completely with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska that the $10 million already in the bill, plus the $5.7 million which we have as a carryover, or a total of $15.7 million, makes more than three times as much as has been spent all through 1969 on this particular program. It seems to me that fact shows that we should proceed rather slowly in making any additional increase. I hope the Senator will accept that proposition. Certainly the offer is made in good faith by the Senator from Nebraska and me. We simply want to see what is done in this program, and we think that our record in jumping the total of the feeding program—Senators will find it on page 18 of our report—from $1.243 billion to $1.955 billion speaks rather loudly for the sympathy which the committee has felt in the support of these feeding programs, which go to the poverty stricken, the schoolchildren, and the children in the disadvantaged spots of which the Senator has just spoken.

I hope the Senator will leave the matter as it is on this basis, which is much more nearly in accord with our feelings than any other disposition which could be made.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I can understand the desire of the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee to stay with the figures which they have brought to the Senate and not have them increased.

I have three answers to the points which have been made. First, as to the overall total with respect to the feeding programs, surely $10 million is not anything when compared to $1,243,332,000. That is why one has to move item by item in respect to this matter and analyze what is and is not being done.

The $10 million figure is exactly the same as advanced last year on this particular program, notwithstanding the fact that this program is growing by leaps and bounds. The program got started just last year. We can understand that there is a carryover. If the Senate were to appropriate $20,000,000, there would be a totally different view of this program.

I have no doubt of the good faith of my colleagues. I would be the first to affirm it. But we direct this amendment to the frame of reference in which the program is handled within the Department of Agriculture and in which it goes to the country.

Thus, my first answer is that this program has shown such growth as to deserve an increase in the program as recommended by the previous administration. Second, we are, ourselves, enforcing under the Social Security Act, title IV, a requirement which would place infinitely more children in the day-care centers. We are now insisting that the AFDC mothers put the children in day-care centers. That will very materially increase the child day care population.

Third, I felt that it was desirable not to press the amendment on special milk, in view of the fact that the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) had a passionate devotion to the section 32 equation. So I offered the pending amendment in the hope of thereby wrapping up everything I had to say and to propose in one package.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the Senator mean that, if we appropriate the $5 million here, the Senator will withdraw the amendment to increase the transfers from section 32?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as I understood the proposal of the Senator from Florida, if the $5 million is added now, it is conditioned upon the idea that there would be no further request this fiscal year for any additions to the fund.

If that is what the Senator from New York wants, I think he ought to have it. However, I suggest to the Senator that the Senator from Florida is correct. The wiser course would be to allow $15.7 million, which is the $10 million plus the carryover from last year.

There would be no prejudice to the full-steam-ahead development of the program to which the Senator referred. That would see us through the calendar year. And there is a supplemental coming up within the next 60 days. The options would be more generous and liberal by acceding to that than by calling for $5 million additional now and calling for a supplemental for the balance of the year.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I do not believe—and the Senator does not have to agree with me—that it is desired to hold the children hostage for me or vice versa.

Mr. HRUSKA. I have no desire to do so.

Mr. JAVITS. If the amount should be more than $15 million and we can convince the Senator that we need more than $15 million, I am convinced we can get it. As far as I am concerned, I will not ask for it, and I will not press the matter of the special milk if the amount is increased to $15 million.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from New York, as usual, has exhibited a heart as big as a Georgia watermelon, and that is all right. The Senators on the committee also have rather large hearts. We will agree to the $5 million increase, and we understand the Senator will not press his other amendments.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I revise my amendment to make it read $15 million instead of $10 million.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is modified accordingly.

Mr. JAVITS. I understand that another place in the bill needs to be amended.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the increase of $5 million on line 18 from $10 million to $15 million would require also an increase of $5 million on line 11 from $247 million to $252 million.

Mr. JAVITS. I modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is accordingly modified.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from New York.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from New York.

I want to relate one instance which will reaffirm the tremendous need for this new program. A week ago Friday in East St. Louis the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs held hearings. We had testifying before the committee a man who indicated that he had 11 or 12 children and that he had been on welfare, but that he was now able to get a job that paid him $50 a week. However, he was immediately taken off welfare. He had to feed 12 children on $50 a week.

The man indicated that he was able to get good, nourishing, hot lunches and breakfast for 25 cents for his children in school, but that the children who were eligible to go to day-care centers did not have the benefit of the breakfast or lunch program.

Mr. President, a program such as has been agreed on will help us accelerate meeting the needs of many Americans, millions of them children, for whom we have not provided a delivery service for getting meals to them in day-care centers, recreation centers, and other community centers which have the physical facilities but need the financial support that the accelerated program will help us provide.

Mr. President, I commend the Senators for providing the aditional $5 million.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it sometimes might sound as if we are matching things together very quickly here. However, I join with the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) in thanking my colleagues, men of conviction, on the Appropriations Committee who feel very deeply and fight very hard for far less than $5 million, as they should.

I am very grateful that we were able to work the matter out to everybody's satisfaction.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) and I listened to the man testify, along with members of our staff. We were deeply moved by his statement.

I said, "What will you do if you cannot get the food with which to feed your children?"

He said, "Senator, I will tell you now, I will go out and rob. I will go out and steal. I will somehow get the money to feed my children if I cannot get it any other way."

Here was a man who did not have an education and who could not read or write. He finally got a job paying $50 a week but then was taken off the welfare roll. He was penalized because his children received less as a result of his

wanting to go out and earn his living rather than to accept welfare. Under that kind of program, adequate food was not available for his children in day-care centers.

We have much to learn about welfare and how to handle these programs. I think that this year Congress, will move forward dramatically in meeting these great human needs.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida and the distinguished Senator from New York.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am advised by the clerks at the desk that two committee amendments not yet acted upon remain. Both deal with the special milk program, recently discussed by the Senator from Nebraska and me with the Senator from New York. They appear on page 19, lines 8 through 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the pending amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Florida about one point?

Mr. HOLLAND. Certainly. First, let me describe the other amendment, because I think the two amendments should be considered en bloc. The first amendment begins on line 17 through line 20 on page 20.

The second amendment begins at the end of line 20 and continues on lines 21, 22, and 23 of page 20, and on lines 1 and 2 of page 21.

I ask that the two committee amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The last committee amendment will be stated.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 20, line 17, after the word "employability", insert "and (c) milk for children in nonprofit high schools and schools of lower levels, child-care centers, summer camps, and similar nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children"; and, in line 20, after the amendment just above stated, strike out "For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Special Milk Program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772) $120,000,000, to be transferred from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c).".

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendments being considered en bloc, nor do I have any objection to their being agreed to.

I think the real issue involved in these amendments is, Shall the milk for children in nonprofit high schools and in the other places mentioned in the amendment be paid for by section 32 funds, as the House provided, or shall it be paid for from the general revenue? The House has opted for section 32 funds. The Senate, it will be noted from the amendment on page 19, lines 8 through 12, has opted, for the most part, for general revenues.

It is a fact that the Senate amendment is a little less liberal in terms of money.

The House provided $120 million, all chargeable to section 32.

It is my feeling, of course, that whatever develops in conference will represent a struggle. I know that the House will insist on its position, and the Senate on its position, and that a compromise will be effected. That is why I was willing to forgo action here, but I want to ask the Senator this question:

I do not know what the intention of the committee was, and I think it would be useful to find out for the administrators. It will be noted that there was no qualification of the word "children" in lines 18 to 20, inclusive. The language refers to "milk for children in nonprofit institutions devoted to the care and training of children."

Have we the right to assume, without its necessarily being locked into the amendment, that the Committee on Appropriations contemplated that the issue of need should be a factor; in other words we were really talking about needy children?

Mr. HOLLAND. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. In addition, to answer the earlier question of the Senator, the provision in the Senate bill of $20 million for needy children in day-care camps, and the like, is to come from section 32 funds. I want the Senator from New York to recognize that the Senator from Florida is not always ungenerous when it comes to the use of section 32 funds.

Mr. JAVITS. I know the Committee on Appropriations had in mind the needy children. I thought it would be useful to have this explanation in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the two committee amendments en bloc.

The amendments were agreed to en bloc.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I understand that completes the discussion of all committee amendments and that the bill is now open to amendments from the floor.

I move that the Senate reconsider the votes by which the last two committee amendments on pages 19, 20, and 21 were agreed to.

Mr. HRUSKA. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 60

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 60 and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 14, after the colon, insert the following: *"Provided further,* That—

"(1) None of the funds appropriated by this Act of any funds available to the Commodity Credit Corporation shall be used to make price support payments or acreage diversion payments which will result in a total of such payments to any producer in excess of $10,000 for each of the 1970 crops of upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, wheat, and feed grains.

"(2) If the foregoing payment limitation reduces the payments which otherwise would be made to a producer of feed grains (which for the purposes hereof shall be considered as a single commodity) and wheat on any farm, the minimum acreage diversion requirements for such commodity on the farm or farms shall be reduced by the same percentage as the payment to the producer of such commodity on the farm are reduced by the limitation. The term "payment" includes payments-in-kind, wheat marketing certificates and export marketing certificates, but does not include loans or purchases.

"(3) If the foregoing payment limitation reduces by 20 percent or more the payments which otherwise would be made to a producer of either upland or extra long staple cotton on any farm, such producer, without affecting his status as a cooperator and without being subject to marketing quota penalties, may be permitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to exceed the applicable cotton acreage allotment for the farm by not more than 30 percent.

"(4) The Secretary may not permit the owner and operator of any farm, for which the foregoing cotton payment limitation reduces the payment that otherwise would be made, to sell or lease all or any part of the right to all or any part of such allotment, to any other owner or operator of a farm, unless he finds the lease or sale is not for the purpose of evading the foregoing payment limitation.

"(5) Acreage planted to the 1970 crop of cotton in excess of the acreage allotment for the farm established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be taken into account in establishing future state, county, and farm acreage allotments and shall not be considered as part of any acreage allotment.

"(6) Section 103(d)(12) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended shall not be applicable to the 1970 crop of cotton.

"(7) The Secretary of Agriculture shall provide such regulations as he determines necessary to effectuate the purposes of this section and to prevent evasion of the limitations contained in this section."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall, of course, have to raise a point of order against this amendment at the proper time. I do not wish to do so in such a way as to prevent the Senator from explaining his amendment or making any other statement he wishes to make. I simply wish to give notice that since the amendment contains several items of legislation pure and simple, I shall be forced, under the rules of the Committee on Appropriations, to raise a point of order.

Mr. GOODELL. I intend, as I gave notice on July 1, to move to suspend the rule and to allow the amendment to be offered. So if the Senator from Florida wishes to move to suspend the rule at this time, he may do so.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am trying to be courteous and helpful to my distinguished friend by reserving the point of order, and shall make it at a future time. However, I shall be glad to make it at this time, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. GOODELL. Since the motion is debatable, it does not make any difference. I shall be glad to explain the amendment, and then the Senator can make his point of order.

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall not make the point of order now.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the amendment would accomplish a simple change in the Agriculture Act. It could be administered quite simply.

This amendment in its entirety is germane to the Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1970 as it provides for a reduction in annual Government expenditures of well over $200 million, without interfering with the basic purposes of the farm programs financed by these appropriations. It is not long-term legislation. All provisions of this amendment apply only

to the price support and acreage diversion payments relative to the 1970 crops.

This amendment limits the price support and acreage diversion payments under each of the 1970 price support and adjustment programs of upland cotton, extra long staple cotton, wheat, and feed grains, to a single producer to $10,000.

This amendment is to be distinguished from the so-called Conte-Findley amendment which provided for an overall limitation of $20,000 per producer. This amendment would limit each crop covered, each commodity, to $10,000 per producer.

The Conte-Findley amendment approved May 27 by the House limited total payments for all price supported crops planted in fiscal year 1970 to $20,000 on any farm. I have been advised that farm program administrators conclude that a lower limitation on the payments taking each major price support program separately would accomplish similar overall savings and would greatly simplify the administration of such a limitation. For this reason I am offering an amendment which limits the payments under each major crop program.

Department of Agriculture statistics report that 15,097 cotton producers, 5,428 feed grain producers and 4,861 wheat producers received payments in 1968 in excess of $10,000. These 25,386 producers received payments totaling $515,196,000. Had a $10,000 limitation been in effect their payments would have been reduced by well over $200 million.

According to the Department of Agriculture, a payment limitation at this level would affect only 3.4 percent of the cotton producers, 0.4 percent of the feed grain producers and 0.6 percent of the wheat producers, yet would reduce payments to those producers by over $200 million.

In his June 4 testimony before the Appropriations Committee, Secretary Hardin estimated that 65 percent of the cotton payments, 49 percent of the wheat payment and 11 percent of the feed grain payments in 1968 were simply income supplements rather than payments for acreage diversion. These figures would change somewhat from year to year. In other words, a large part of these large payments are a net addition to the large producers' substantial incomes from farm products marketed rather than payment for leaving land out of production to balance supplies with market outlets available.

Paragraphs (2) and (3) of the amendment are germane to the Agriculture Appropriation Act for 1970 in that they provide for changes in 1970 only in the production or acreage diversion requirements of producers who have their payments limited in order to achieve equity for them and provide the same incentives for them to cooperate in the voluntary wheat and feed grain programs as they have had in the absence of payment limitations.

Paragraph (2) provides that any wheat or feed grain producer who has his 1970 Government payment limited by the $10,000 limitation would have his minimum acreage diversion requirements reduced by the same percentage as his payment is reduced. As an example, a feed grain producer whose payments are reduced by one-third by the $10,000 limitation would have his feed grain base acreage diversion requirements reduced by one-third.

Paragraph (3), which is a modification of the earlier Schnittker amendment, provides that any cotton producer who has his 1970 cotton program payments reduced by the $10,000 limitation by 20 percent or more, may, at the discretion of the Secretary, be permitted to plant up to 30 percent additional cotton acreage without being subject to marketing quota penalties. This is to provide a measure of equity of treatment under the program to the large producer whose payment is limited. Under the export acreage section of existing legislation, producers who wish to forgo all price support payments and loans, and plant for export a larger acreage of cotton than their allotment, may do so.

The provisions of paragraph (2) and (3) are germane to H.R. 11612 in that they make it possible to reduce Government fiscal year 1970 expenditures over $200 million, yet continue equitable provisions for large producers and achieve the goals of the programs financed by these appropriations.

Admittedly, paragraphs (2) and (3) would permit large-scale producers of wheat and feed grains to cooperate in the voluntary programs for these crops although diverting less land and receiving smaller payments than in the absence of a payment limitation. The differential in diverted acreage would be so small, however, that small adjustments in the program could easily offset the smaller acreage diversion on the large farms.

It is my understanding that permitting the large cotton producers affected by payment limitations to increase their acreages of cotton would not create a serious problem in balancing cotton supplies with market outlets. At prevailing world prices most cotton producers would not increase their cotton acreage even though given the opportunity. Although the announced national cotton acreage allotment for 1969 was approximately 16,000,000 acres, fewer than 12,000,000 acres were planted. Except for provisions in the cotton program regulations relative to cotton acreage planting requirements in order to be eligible to collect the Government subsidy of 14.7 cents a pound, even fewer acres of cotton would have been planted in 1969.

In the Mississippi Delta and in the irrigated areas of Texas and of States farther west, cotton returns far more per acre than competing crops. Some would increase their acreage of cotton if their payments were limited and their cotton allotments were increased. Producers in other sections, however, would reduce their acreage of cotton if cotton program regulations were changed somewhat.

Paragraphs (4) and (7) of the proposed amendment are germane to H.R. 11612 in that they authorize the Secretary to provide regulations as he determines necessary to prevent the evasion of the limitation specified in paragraph (1).

Paragraph (5) is self-explanatory. Any excess acreage planted to cotton in 1970 as a result of these provisions shall not be taken into account in establishing future cotton allotments.

Paragraph (6) is a vital provision and it is germane in that it repeals the so-called snap-back provisions in the 1965 act insofar as they would apply to the 1970 crop year. As Secretary Hardin clearly pointed out in his Senate testimony, unless section 103(d)(12) is amended eliminating its application to the 1970 crop of cotton, the savings achieved by the application of paragraph (1)(a)—$10,000 limitation on payments under specified farm commodity price support programs—could be dissipated under the program provisions authorized by the present section 103(d)(12) of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended.

I refer to the major argument raised by those who earlier supported the committee amendment, and those who wanted to raise the $20,000 limitation on farm payments. That problem would be eliminated by my amendment in that the snap-back provisions in the present law would be repealed and the cotton producers would be taken care of in the flexibility provided for in my amendment.

In summary, this amendment in its entirety is germane to H.R. 11612, Agricultural Appropriation Act for 1970, in that it is limited to the crop year 1970 and restricts the expenditures of funds appropriated for 1970 in an equitable manner, providing potential Government savings in excess of $200 million. Yet it does not interfere with the attainment of the real goals of the programs financed by these appropriations.

At a time when important rural development, educational, health, housing, and nutritional programs, to mention only a few, are being limited because of our inability to adequately finance them, it does not make sense to make farm program subsidy payments in excess of $10,000 to some 25,000 large farmers who, by any reasonable standards, already have high incomes and substantial equities in property.

In the absence of this amendment, in 1970 some 2,000 giant farms, many of them corporations, will collect $150 million in subsidies. Five to 10 large corporations may each receive subsidies of $1 million or more. One large corporation received over $4 million in farm subsidies in 1967 and over $3 million in 1968.

It is therefore imperative that a limitation affecting the 1970 crop be enacted. We cannot afford to wait any longer to eliminate the inequities which this program represents. This is an effective interim measure while broader revision in the farm program is being worked out.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I will yield to the Senator in just a moment. First, I wish to make several other points.

The amendment I offer is based on a study made under the direction of former Under Secretary of Agriculture, John A. Schnittker.

It was completed in the Department of Agriculture last November. It did not come to our attention until this spring. In that study I think that Mr. Schnittker effectively answered the arguments

which have been raised against a payments limitation here today. He stated:

Payments to producers under existing price support and acreage control programs for feed grains, wheat, cotton, wool, and sugar, could be limited to around $20,000 per farm for all payments, or to $10,000 per program without serious adverse effects on production or on the effectiveness of production adjustment programs.

The Schnittker report also points out that the savings would be from $200 million to nearly $300 million. It concluded that the various arguments against this proposal and the difficulty of administration are not decisive, and are not good reasons for opposing a payments limitation. I would make it clear that the Department of Agriculture opposes all amendments to the basic legislation at this time. This is said without prejudice to what programs they may present in the future as a part of the general farm program. I am advised that the Department of Agriculture prefers my amendment to a straight $20,000 limitation. They prefer it in the sense that it would be far simpler to administer. I believe it is a simpler provision to administer because it would save over $200 million and would do equity to the farm program in the interim period, before we are able to deal with overall farm legislation at a later time.

Now I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I feel that this is a most constructive way in which to put the matter before us. Let me say that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) has been a longstanding champion in this field and I, generally speaking, have supported him. I think that my colleague from New York has rendered a signal service in the refinement which he has introduced in his amendment, especially in the informed backing given by an official who has had long experience with the program. One thing it should do is to awaken us to the realities.

I should like to address a question to my colleague: Does he not agree that the basic philosophy of his amendment is that the whole concept which dictates these payments, unless a limitation is imposed such as he has described, has become obsolescent? The program is not necessary to encourage production because, as he himself has pointed out, there would be even less production than there is now and more conformable, probably, to the demand if there had not been a program. Whether justified or not, this program has hung on, and hung on, and hung on, because, somehow or other, we still feel in America that rural America represents the backbone of the country and whether it needs it or wants it, it is still subsidized without any regard for the realities which have long since overtaken them, and us, and everyone else.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with my colleague. I think that rural America has contributed vitally to this country's backbone, but I do not think this kind of program strengthens the farmers of this country as presently constituted. I would point out, in this respect, that my amendment on income supplement goes largely to the very big producers who do not need it and who can conform under flexible provisions that I have provided on the basis of Mr. Schnittker's current study, and still not reap the $200 million bonanza from the taxpayers each year.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. DOLE. I cannot speak with any great authority with reference to cotton, but, coming from the greatest wheat-producing State in America, I can touch on that commodity.

With reference to the percent of producers, the six-tenths of 1 percent referred to, how much wheat production is represented in this figure? This, in my opinion, is the key to the entire argument; that is, wheat production, not numbers of wheat farmers. As one who opposed the original mandatory programs when they were advocated by former Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman as well as Under Secretary Schnittker, I feel farmers might be better off if programs moved in some other directions. Presently, as is illustrated here today, farmers are at the mercy of Congress.

This is an appropriation bill and your amendment is perhaps subject to a point of order. The point is, however, that we have a program and it is a mistake to say or even suggest that certain farmers receive $10,000 or $20,000 because of our gratitude, because he happens to participate in a farm program. The key questions are, How much land does a man own, how much does it produce, and how many acres will be diverted if he goes into the program?

I have no quarrel with the general intent and believe the amendment of the Senator from New York is far superior to the so-called Findley amendment.

We may need new farm legislation but it is late in the day now to impose certain restrictions on farmers who participate in a program. Does the Senator have information as to the amount of wheat produced by the farmers the Senator referred to earlier?

Mr. GOODELL. I would want to be completely accurate to answer the Senator's question. I will get the exact figures on that. In any event, under the provisions of my amendment, changes in production or in acreage diversion requirements on farms which have their payments limited would go a long way toward achieving equity and we would not have to reduce production any more than the reduction in the payments.

Mr. DOLE. It is the superior part of the amendment because it would not force them completely out of the program. Living in a farm State, I know payment limitation may sound good in the press, but many who will report these proceedings do not know a Jersey cow from the Washington Monument. They know little about the limitation of payments, and less about farm programs but I would guess the large producers would benefit more by being outside the program, and not accepting any payments. They could produce all they wished and still be protected by the price umbrella. The result would be more surpluses and more costly programs to dispose of surpluses.

If the program is bad, let us change the basic program. Let us not change it by trying to impose restrictions on the farmer just because of his size.

Mr. GOODELL. The Senator from Kansas is aware of the reason I enforced suspending the rule. I am following exactly this procedure so as not to put on a straight limitation without changing the program, whether changing it in a minor way, or if it would need adjustment so that the big producers who are substantially affected would be able to operate effectively and would be dealt with on an equitable basis. There is a maximum flexibility here placed at the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to deal with this situation. If we do not act now, as the Senator is well aware, we will have no opportunity to put a payment limitation on this year's farm program. This amendment would give ample notice to the producers for the next plantings and we can save over $200 million in the interim.

Mr. DOLE. While I doubt whether it would save anything—it would probably cost more money—the amendment has some merit. I would hope the committee would this year consider changing the basic agriculture act. That would be a good and proper time to offer the amendment but not on an appropriation bill. Perhaps the American public and the farmers have about reached the end, so far as subsidies are concerned but this can better be determined when considering basic farm legislation.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator from New York has offered the amendment. I shall certainly support it. It is a realistic approach to the problem of controlling these large payments. One argument used on the previous amendment was that it did not repeal at the same time the so-called snapback provisions.

The Senator has included that in his amendment. I certainly hope his amendment can be approved because it is the very least we can do at this time when we are having a major job trying to raise enough money to support the essential programs of our country.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware for his support. The repeal of the "snapback" provision which was placed in the law of 1965 would really take us back to obsolete price supports, by which the Commodity Credit Corporation would acquire most of the cotton and sell it on the market. That would disrupt the cotton market and would avoid the intent of the Congress.

That was the argument which was made on the $20,000 limitation. Because of the rules which exist, in order to avoid having a two-thirds vote on suspending the rules, we were unable to repeal the "snapback" language. My amendment would do that. It is a clean, compact amendment, and I think it would be easy to administer.

Mr. President, in answer to the question raised earlier by the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), less than 10 percent of the wheat produced in this country is

produced by the wheat farmers affected by my amendment.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. I think we all realize we need some reform in our farm legislation. As long as 5 years ago, I advocated a reassessment of our subsidy program on a definite term basis, 5 or 6 years, included in one act, to see if we could not get our whole farm program back on a more practical basis.

On page 1 of his statement the Senator says:

> These figures would change somewhat from year to year. In other words, a large part of these large payments are a net addition to the large producers' substantial incomes from farm products marketed rather than payment for leaving land out of production to balance supplies with market outlets available.

That is confusing to me. It is not in conformity with what I understand the law to be. With all due deference to my friend from Kansas, we raise a few bushels of wheat in Colorado, too.

The Senator certainly is not implying, is he, that those who raise wheat, for example, or feed grains, do not have to take land out of production in order to get these payments?

Mr. GOODELL. No. The point I make——

Mr. ALLOTT. Perhaps the phrasing of the sentence is a little unfortunate, but I think that is the implication of this particular sentence. I think it ought to be made perfectly clear that if a man draws payments of more than $20,000 a year, for example, he still has to take land out of production in order to get those subsidy payments.

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. Technically, 49 percent of the wheat payments are simply income supplements rather than payments for acreage diversion. Sixty-five percent of the cotton payments are income supplements rather than payments for acreage diversion. Eleven percent of feed grain payments are income supplements rather than payments for acreage diversion.

Mr. ALLOTT. I do not know where the Senator gets his figures.

Mr. GOODELL. These are figures given on June 4 by Secretary Hardin.

Mr. ALLOTT. Unless he reports them some other way, I do not think they are necessarily true even if the Secretary of Agriculture gives them. If a man takes land out of production, no matter whether he is farming 640 acres or 10,000 acres, he still has to take some land out of production in order to get the subsidy payments. In the case of a wheat allotment, for example, which, again, is not the way I have ever thought it should be—I have always thought if there is any subsidy, it should be on a unit basis such as a bushel, rather than acres; they have taken the unit measurement, reduced it to production, and then converted it to acres—the farmer still has to take acreage out of production. That is the point that should be made, because the inference can be read into the statement that it is not done that way. I hope the Senator understands.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand.

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

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. COOK. With regard to the remarks I made earlier on the motion of the Senator from Delaware, my main objection was that we were voting on a limitation without consideration of the repeal of the snapback provision. I merely would like to say I shall be delighted to support the Senator from New York in voting to suspend the rules in regard to the amendment that he has presently before the Senate.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, after a few remarks, I shall raise a point of order.

I want to call to the attention of Senators that the proposed amendment amounts to general legislation on an annual appropriation bill in three different fields.

The first is in regard to feed grains and wheat, which are conveniently incorporated in paragraph 2 of the proposed amendment. which reads:

> If the foregoing payment limitation reduces the payments which otherwise would be made to a producer of feed grains . . . and wheat on any farm, the minimum acreage diversion requirements for such commodity on the farm or farms shall be reduced by the same percentage as the payment to the producer of such commodity on the farm are reduced by the limitation.

In other words, here is a provision which, if it went into effect as to the so-called voluntary programs—which are not too voluntary, because they have both a carrot and a stick—would immediately encourage or require the return to production of substantial acreage of both wheat and feed grains; and there is no way to avoid that interpretation. This is obviously general legislation.

Paragraph (3) of the amendment reads:

> If the foregoing payment limitation reduces by 20 percent or more the payments which otherwise would be made to a producer of either upland or extra long staple cotton on any farm, such producer, without affecting his status as a cooperator and without being subject to marketing quota penalties, may be permitted by the Secretary of Agriculture to exceed the applicable cotton acreage allotment for the farm by not more than 30 percent.

In other words, there would immediately return into production 30 percent more acreage of cotton, if that provision went into effect.

The fourth paragraph of the amendment reads:

> The Secretary may not permit—

And Mr. President I certainly do not know by what authority—

> the owner and operator of any farm, for which the foregoing cotton payment limitation reduces the payment that otherwise would be made, to sell or lease all or any part of the right to all or any part of such allotment, to any other owner or operator of a farm, unless he finds the lease or sale is not for the purpose of evading the foregoing payment limitation.

In other words, with respect to cotton, it is proposed to give to the Secretary authority to refuse the right to an owner of cotton producing acreage to sell or lease any part of his acreage for the production of cotton.

Paragraph (5) of the amendment reads:

> Acreage planted to the 1970 crop of cotton in excess of the acreage allotment for the farm established under section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, shall not be taken into account in establishing future State, county and farm acreage allotments and shall not be considered as part of any acreage allotment.

This paragraph acknowledges that they are going to have to produce more cotton, but it says it shall not be taken into account in giving him his future allotments.

Paragraph (6) is, of course, the one we have been talking about all during the earlier debate. That would repeal the snapback provision of the law, which would require, as I think all Senators now know, going back to the old law. Under that law, the price support for cotton would go from about 21 cents, as of now, to about 31 cents under the 65-percent price-support program, which is the lowest price-support program under the old law.

We all know that the snapback provision not only would prevent any saving, but would require that about $160 million more be paid out to the producers of cotton.

The seventh section simply gives the Secretary the right to provide any regulation necessary to enforce these new laws in the fields of wheat production, seed grain production, and cotton production.

Mr. President, I do not see how a fuller change of legislation could possibly be suggested in any proposed amendment to this bill. I therefore make the point of order now that this amendment proposes to add general legislation on an annual appropriation bill, and is therefore out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MATHIAS in the chair). The Chair sustains the point of order made by the Senator from Florida, on the ground that the amendment would constitute legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, pursuant to the notice I filed on July 1, I now move to suspend the rules and permit my amendment (No. 60) to be voted upon, and I ask for a rollcall vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from New York to suspend the rules. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HOLLAND. To sustain this motion would require a two-thirds vote of the Senate, would it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) is paired with the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL). If present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut would vote "yea" and the Senator from Alaska would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) is paired with the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON). If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) is necessarily absent, and, if present and voting, would vote "nay."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 26, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 54 Leg.]

YEAS—26

Bayh	Hartke	Percy
Boggs	Hatfield	Proxmire
Brooke	Javits	Saxbe
Case	Kennedy	Schweiker
Cook	Mathias	Scott
Cooper	Miller	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Packwood	Williams, Del.
Gore	Pastore	Young, Ohio
Hart	Pell	

NAYS—65

Aiken	Fannin	Mondale
Allen	Fong	Montoya
Allott	Fulbright	Moss
Baker	Goldwater	Mundt
Bellmon	Gurney	Murphy
Bennett	Hansen	Muskie
Bible	Harris	Pearson
Burdick	Holland	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Smith
Church	Hughes	Sparkman
Cotton	Inouye	Spong
Cranston	Jackson	Stennis
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Stevens
Dirksen	Jordan, Idaho	Symington
Dodd	Mansfield	Talmadge
Dole	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eagleton	McGee	Tydings
Eastland	McGovern	Yarborough
Ellender	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Metcalf	

NOT VOTING—9

Anderson	Griffin	Nelson
Cannon	Long	Prouty
Gravel	Magnuson	Ribicoff

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fewer than two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the motion is rejected.

The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that we reconsider the vote by which the motion was defeated.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) proposes an amendment:

On page 20, line 16, after the word "location" add a semicolon and the word "resources".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, this is a very simple amendment. It merely adds the word "resources" to the factors to be taken into account in connection with the low-income families.

On page 20 of the bill, line 16, are certain factors that are to be taken into consideration in determining what are low-income families. These factors include location and in the case of a minor, income of parents. My amendment would merely add the word "resources," so that that part of line 16 would read "location, resources, and income."

The reason for the amendment is simply that income by itself may cause the Secretary to make a determination, in the case of someone who may not, in a particular year, have very much income but may have a great amount of personal resources and property, or who may have a large sum of money in the bank or may have a large inventory of grain or other agricultural products. I believe this factor ought to be taken into account.

I have discussed the amendment informally with the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), the manager of the bill, and I hope he will agree to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. HOLLAND. Provided my distinguished friend from Nebraska, the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, has no unwillingness to take it to conference, I am willing to take the amendment.

I am perfectly aware that resources sometimes can make the difference between poverty and affluence. Sometimes it will not. I think we ought to emphasize the fact that it is poverty and an inability to take care of oneself that is the real issue. A person can own a home and still be without income or resources.

With that explanation, I am willing to take the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HRUSKA. I would have no objection to the amendment and am willing to accept it on the basis that the chairman of the subcommittee has outlined.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I do so for this reason. This is a totally new matter, and I would like to have a few minutes to discuss it and understand its purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on the passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have no desire to raise a capricious question, but with respect to this amendment, it seems on its face to be innocuous. It does puzzle me, and I would like to hear the answer of the author of the amendment and the answers of the people who will manage the measure in conference, the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), with respect to this matter, as I read it, and interpret its meaning.

If the Senators will address themselves to the language on page 20, lines 6 through 17, inclusive, they will find that this language deals with certain moneys which are authorized, not for individuals, but for an area in which individuals live. In other words, it is money for an area, in which individuals live, which includes "needy children and low income persons whom the Secretary determines to be suffering, through no fault of their own, from general and continued hunger resulting from insufficient food."

The Secretary can dip into this $100 million which is provided for at the top of that page for additional direct distribution or other programs in such area, whether or not it is under the food stamp program or direct food distribution. So he is determining whether that area deserves an additional distribution program. This is strictly a relief-of-hunger proposition.

Then, in reading further, he is to decide that in that area—I would assume although it does not say so—there are enough needy children and low-income persons who, through no fault of their own, suffer from general and continued hunger resulting from insufficient food, and whether he should put in a program directly, moving over the heads of local and city officials, and so forth. Then, in making such determination, whether he is in that kind of area, he is determining the nature of the area as to certain conditions with respect to needy children and low-income people in that area; and in making that determination he must decide questions such as the age, income, location and income of parents, if a minor. That is rather indefinite language but I assume he must look at the income of the parents as well in order to determine if this is a suitable area for him to go into.

The Senator from Iowa would add "re-

sources" to the income of the parents. By that addition I am sure he means furniture, fixtures, money in the bank, and so forth. I would assume that if they have a few iron bedsteads that would not disqualify the area. However, that is not what concerns me. I am worried about this situation. If it is an area determination how can the Secretary arrive at the resources? He can determine age, income, and location figures. Income would include the income of the parents because that is a census figure. However, with respect to a figure for resources, I do not know where that would exist.

By including "resources" will we strip the Secretary from making any determination to put in an additional program because we are giving him a standard he could not possibly meet?

I am not raising this question because I am trying to defeat the Senator's amendment, but I would like to know what the Senator has in mind and how to meet the questions I raised.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, responding to the questions raised by the Senator from New York, I think it is fortunate that he is troubled by this language because now that he has raised the matter we can make legislative history on the floor of the Senate.

As I understand the language it would not require any area determination at all. It would require merely a determination by the Secretary as to whether there are any of these needy children and low-income persons. If he determines that there are, then he has the authority for this additional direct distribution and for other programs which the bill provides for. I do not see anything here that would require any area determination on his part.

I suggest the way the language reads to me is that if he finds one person who is needy in any area that is not covered by a food distribution program or a food stamp program, then he has the authority to see that that one needy person can be helped. The word "resources" describes the condition of the parents if there is a minor needy child.

All we are trying to do by this amendment is to make clear that we are not going to have abuses of the program which have caused such a great amount of agitation in some areas. The Senator from North Dakota pointed out during the course of the food stamp hearings that there are some cases where farmers may have no income during the course of a year but have considerable farmland, a large livestock inventory, and crops.

If these people are entitled to some individual assistance it should go to genuine needy families. It is a matter of some concern on the part of the people paying the bill. That is all the amendment is designed to do, Mr. President, and I suggest to my colleague from New York that there is no area of determination involved; although I am happy now to yield to the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) or to the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), who are on the committee and have considered the whole language in the bill and can explain it further.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I do not believe that the construction contended for by the Senator from New York applied at all. The word "determinations" applies in the next preceding reference to determination. If, however, there would be any doubt about it, may I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that there be inserted after the word "determinations" in line 15 these few words, which will nail it down:

As to such children and such persons—

So that the sentence will read:

In making such determinations as to such children and such persons, the Secretary shall take into consideration * * *

Then we have no question about it, and instead of legislative history we have legislative language.

Mr. JAVITS. Does the Senator from Iowa accept that?

Mr. MILLER. I think that clarifies what we are talking about beyond question and I hope that if this would satisfy the Senator from New York, I would be more than happy to modify my amendment. I ask the Senator from New York, does that satisfy him?

Mr. JAVITS. When the Senator says, does it satisfy me, I am not satisfied at all with the need for evaluating resources in a welfare situation, but I believe that if we have income anyhow, and we do confine it to the individual and make it a test of whether a single individual shall have the benefit of the program that the Secretary of Agriculture puts into an area, I have no objection.

Therefore, if the Senator will modify his amendment, I have nothing further to say against it.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment may be modified as suggested by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to the amendment as modified, but I want to repeat what I said a while ago, that I do not believe resources can always be a test, because I know of cases of very poor people who have a home to live in, a roof over their heads, but who, nevertheless, are completely without any viable means of existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment as modified.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 20, line 16, insert after the word "location" the following: "; resources".

On line 15, after "determinations" insert "as to such children and such persons".

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, with that understanding, I am very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Florida. Let me say that I am sure the Department of Agriculture will interpret such a term reasonably. I think it would be most unfortunate, if it did otherwise. I cannot conceive of an interpretation in such a strict manner. Thus, I do not think the Senator from Florida would have to worry about how the Department will administer this one provision.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am not worried about it because we have put it in the legislative history that we are not expecting people who are really poor and without means of sustenance to be deprived simply because they have shelter over their heads.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield for a question on the amendment?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I have tried to follow the debate as it has related to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa and the modification that was made to it.

May I make sure I understand that by inserting the word "resources" we are really talking about a test of assets for eligibility?

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the understanding of the Senator from Florida plus the additional fact that if the word "resources" consists of mere shelter, or a mere place to be sheltered from the weather, but without really any means of living or any means of acquiring food in the house, and so forth, the possession of that mere resource would not be considered as disqualifying.

Mr. BAKER. We have had a situation in my State of Tennessee that is somewhat similar, I am afraid, to the dilemma we are heading for by including the word "resources." That is the rather sad situation of finding, as an example, an elderly couple who own their own home and its furnishings but that is the only resource and assets they have. They have no income, but they would be deprived of any aid, because of a change in our statute, because they owned a home unencumbered and they refused to sell it. But even if they did, they would be out on the street in 3 or 4 years, or however long it might take to dissipate the funds derived from the sale of their house. I do not think that the legislative history we have made today is sufficient to assure me that mere shelter is all we are referring to.

When we say "resources," resources mean generally the assets of the recipient. I intend to oppose this amendment and do so not because I think it is bad, but rather because I think in the present state of affairs it is so imprecise that we cannot tell what the consequences of it will be.

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps the Senator did not hear the explanation of the amendment, but I pointed out as an example of what we are trying to get at here a situation where there could be a great amount of farmland owned by a parent, or a large amount of livestock inventory on hand, or a large amount of crops in the bins which have not been sold, or a considerable amount of money in the bank. That is all I am suggesting we are trying to get at here; and certainly I think, as the Senator from Florida pointed out, we are not trying to get into the situation that the Senator from Tennessee describes.

We have to leave it up to the administration, to the sound and reasonable discretion on the part of the Department of Agriculture. I cannot imagine any administrator worthy of his name reducing the meaning of this amendment to exclude a person such as the Senator from Tennessee has described. I would certainly think they would read the remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during discussion of this amendment and

understand, loud and clear that they are not to get into that kind of area.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I said earlier—and, by the way, I have listened to the explanation given by the Senator from Iowa—that I proposed to vote against this amendment because of its imprecision. If we can put some other specific directive into the amendment to eliminate that imprecision, I might see it in a different light, but it does not do that. It simply says "if there are resources," then the Secretary and the administrator at their discretion could deny the benefits of this act. If some perfecting amendment could be drafted to that effect, I would have no objection, but, Mr. President, I, for one, am not willing to leave that imprecision to the executive branch at this time.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, there is no limitation. The Secretary is enjoined to take into consideration the income of those persons. It does not say whether it is an income of $50,000, nor does it say whether it is $500. We are assuming that the administrator of the program is a man of good faith and intelligence, will decide if it is income, and if it is too small to make an impact, then there will be no denial of the benefits. If it is large enough to encompass a situation where we have to spell all these things out, let us enlarge the lines in the bill and put in some regulations in the form of law to be used, and adopt them administratively.

Mr. BAKER. I am not speaking of income. I am speaking of the proposed inclusion of the words "assets and resources." Then, after we have defined that, I think I could withdraw my objection, but as it stands now, there is absolutely no question that there is total discretion on the part of the administrator. We are leaving too much unsaid. It should be changed, or the amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I think we are becoming involved in a web of words that mean nothing. If it is within the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture to feed people—who are suffering through no fault of their own—who are suffering from continued hunger, then why do we need a proviso at all? Why do we have to find out what the age is? Why do we have to determine if they are minors? If they are suffering from prolonged hunger, through no fault of their own, and the Secretary of Agriculture feels, in his discretion, that an affluent society should feed them, why do we have to have all these provisos?

Mr. BAKER. Let me say to the Senator from Rhode Island, that is precisely my point. I do not want to see the opportunity to feed hungry people abrogated or prohibited merely because they have some resources.

I think the committee version of this matter is far superior to what it would be with the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think, as a member of the committee, I ought to share with the Senate some information which I happen to have. The conference considered this last year, at great length, and the words which are presently in the bill were proposed by the distinguished chairman of the House conferees, Mr. WHITTEN, of Mississippi. We found no particular fault with them. We saw no particular use in them, but we agreed with them. They have not imposed any hardship on anybody that I have heard of. I do not believe the addition of the word "resources," with the explanation we have had on the floor, would itself produce any additional difficulty.

So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he is not sold upon the proviso at all in any irredeemable way, and if the Senate wishes to strike the entire proviso, we would still have it in conference. But as I stated, that is the origin of this proviso, which was agreed to after considerable argument in conference, extending several hours. All of you who have been in conference on a feeding item for poor people know it is not a simple matter to reach an agreement.

I hope we will not strike the formula, because it was agreed upon and has not proved to be hurtful in any way that I know of. Nobody has complained to me about that formula, and I do not believe anybody would complain of it, even with the word "resources" added, with the explanation that has been made on the floor; but as to that, the Senate will have to be the judge.

I just wanted to share this information with the Senate, because in submitting the budget this year, the Bureau of the Budget included the exact formula agreed upon in conference last year, and which was advanced, as the Senator from Nebraska will recall, by the distinguished Congressman from Mississippi who is the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Agriculture.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so I may make a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee insist on his request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. BAKER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the Miller amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. PASTORE. Is the pending amendment open to further amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is open to amendment in one degree.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a further amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment to the amendment.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request? I have a few words, if the Senator from Montana is present.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I withhold my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield?

Mr. PASTORE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island makes a unanimous-consent request to suspend the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as I understood it, the Senator from Rhode Island wanted a little time.

I thought the Senator from Montana was on the floor. He has been waiting here to make an announcement about the probable calendar for tomorrow. I would not attempt, of course, to speak for him. If other Senators wish the floor, I shall yield to them.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I would like to speak in the same vein as the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Tennessee with respect to the Miller amendment to add the word "resources." We have a situation in rural poverty areas in California, which I suspect prevails in other States, although I do not know that, where owners of homes that are ramshackle and do not meet the building codes transfer the ownership of those homes to impoverished people, with no downpayments, get out from under the obligation of either having to tear them down or repair them, and during the time the ownership is transferred, briefly, elsewhere, they escape that liability. This presents the actually impoverished person with property that may be determined to be of some value and affects his eligibility under this provision. During the time he is working on a farm there, or in a community, he loses title and it goes back to the former owner; but that situation has not been taken into account in the suggested amendment and, to me, is an adequate reason to reject the word "resources" as a test of qualification here.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. I must reply to the Senator from California and repeat what I said to the Senator from Tennessee just a few moments ago. I cannot imagine any administrator worthy of the name interpreting this language so restrictively. I think we have made plenty of history on the floor of the Senate so that anybody who looks at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would not dream of interpreting it so that he would be going contrary to the intention of the author of the amendment or the manager of the bill. I think it ought to be made very clear that that interpretation could not be made in any such situation.

Mr. BAKER. In reply, Mr. President, I cannot visualize it, either, except I saw it happen to one extent or another in my home State of Tennessee. I saw the pitifully sad situation in which elderly people were declared to be ineligible for benefits because they owned homes. A home was their only resource. The wel-

fare people frankly told them, "Sell your home or you will not receive benefits." I am afraid that the word "resources" in that language would give rise to the possibility of misinterpretation. If it is to be in that language, we might have a different situation if the words were "resources in excess of X" or "resources in addition to homestead."

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

Mr. BAKER. I am willing to yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure who denied the relief under the conditions the Senator from Tennessee has described, but I would interpret it to be a matter for local welfare authorities rather than the Department of Agriculture. I think all of us come from States where in some cases some local welfare officials may have been unduly arbitrary or restrictive. We are talking about the Agriculture Department now, not some local agencies where personalities may be involved.

As the Senator from Nebraska pointed out, the same argument the Senator from Tennessee is making could be applied with reference to the standard of income. Let us be fair—if we are concerned about lack of information on resources, why are we not concerned about standards of income? The same standards would apply, except I think the Department is going to be reasonable and not go off the deep end that the Senator from Tennessee described, especially in view of what has been said on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that whether or not this amendment carries, I can then move for my amendment to delete the whole proviso clause?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PASTORE. I shall do that in due time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. I hope that the Senator will not let it go at that now, because we are very much in the argument, there is good attendance, and I hope very much that he will elucidate his point. I think it extremely valid and well taken.

I had not intended to say anything further about the matter, but with a new amendment coming up, I think it is vital that we understand exactly what this paragraph means.

As I understood it, it would allow the Secretary of Agriculture to put a program into an area. When I objected to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, it seemed to me that, if the qualification for putting this program into an area was to be an appraisal by the Secretary of resources of certain children or their parents, there was no way to obtain such information, and therefore no means by which the Secretary could make the determination.

As a practical matter, all the proviso really does is to provide an opportunity, either to the Secretary of Agriculture or to municipal officials or other local authorities, if the Secretary chooses to delegate that authority to them, perhaps to deny the benefits of a direct distribution program which he puts into effect, based upon a determination as to a general situation in that area, to certain individuals because they do not qualify under this proviso.

Otherwise, it has no meaning at all.

I believe it is completely impracticable for the Secretary of Agriculture to deal with this matter from Washington on an individual child or individual family basis. I do not think the Miller amendment, as clarified, applies in personam, or is particularly meaningful or adds anything special by way of a solution.

But I heartily agree with the Senator from Rhode Island that this evaluation really has no place where you give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to move into an area, which is the only power he could practically carry out. Therefore, the right way to pursue this issue and present it to the Senate is by striking the whole proviso.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, may I have the attention of the Senator from New York? Is he suggesting now that he disagrees with the removal of the proviso clause?

Mr. JAVITS. No, I am suggesting that I agree with it.

Mr. PASTORE. The point I make is very simple. We all agree here that the Secretary of Agriculture, in this critical time, is being given certain discretionary power to step in, in certain situations, where they do not have these programs already organized, to make sure that no American goes hungry through no fault of his own. That is how I understand the matter.

I do not think any determination as to age is needed. What difference does it make whether you are 2 years old or 80 years old, if you are suffering continued hunger through no fault of your own, and cannot help yourself? What is wrong with this affluent society feeding such an individual?

That is all this is intended to do. So it does not make any difference. Naturally, if you are well off and have resources and money in the bank, then, of course, if you are hungry it is through a fault of your own.

This says specifically "through no fault of your own." That is the criterion, and that is the only criterion.

All I am saying is that it is nonsense here to attempt to establish a formula which to me means nothing at all, and naturally subjects the Secretary to a determination that he may never be able to make.

When a person is hungry through no fault of his own, whether he is young, old, middle-aged, or whatever the case may be, that person ought to be fed, and the Secretary has the discretion to do it. As practically every Senator here has said, we hope we have a Secretary who knows what he is doing. The whole issue is about that simple.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Iowa is willing to accept my amendment as a substitute for his amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I could not more thoroughly agree with what the Senator from Rhode Island has said; and if he wishes to amend my amendments so that it will take care of the point he is making, I shall be more than happy to accept that.

Mr. PASTORE. All the Senator from Iowa has to do is withdraw his amendment, and I will put mine in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from Iowa that he would have to ask unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment, and then, at that time, the Senator from Rhode Island could press for his.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment, that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is rescinded and the amendment of the Senator from Iowa is withdrawn.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Rhode Island send his amendment to the desk?

Mr. PASTORE. I did not take it back, Mr. President. I left it at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 20 line 14 strike the proviso down to and including the word "employability" in line 17.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

Mr. HART's amendment is as follows:

On page 5, line 10, change the semicolon to a colon and add the following: *"provided further,* That no appropriation contained in this Act shall be used for the purchase or application of chemical pesticides, except for small quantities for testing purposes, within or substantially affecting States in circumstances in which the purchase or application of such pesticides would be prohibited by State law or regulation, for any citizen or instrumentality of State or local government;".

Mr. HART. Mr. President, first of all, I apologize to the Senate, and most particularly to the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), for raising this proposed amendment so late. I hope that I can, nonetheless, persuade the Senate that it is sound and prudent to add it to the bill.

There is contained in this bill an authorization for the Department of Agriculture to purchase certain chemical pesticides to be used in pest control. Very late in the day, we are awakening to the fact that there are some very damaging side effects, particularly in the cumulative results, from the use of certain of these hard pesticides.

At least one State, Michigan, and I am advised a second State, Arizona, have sought by regulation to prohibit the use of certain pesticides. My amendment would make clear that no moneys authorized to be appropriated hereunder shall be used for the application of pesticides in any State which by regulation or law would prevent the use of such pesticide within its borders by any citizen or instrumentality of that State.

My first reaction, when the matter was brought to my attention, was that surely the Federal Government is not going to use a pesticide in Michigan or anywhere else if State regulation or law should prevent its use there.

On further study, however, I find that while the probability is great that no Secretary would use such a pesticide, the possibility of his doing so nonetheless remains.

There are two general types of pest control programs which the Department engages in within various States. The first is one where there is very little likelihood that any of these moneys would be used in derogation of a State's wishes. These are the cooperative programs to control specific types of pests within the State. In these cases, the determination of which pesticides should be used is normally arrived at by consensus.

It may well be, however, that as more and more States come to regard the use of pesticides as being a threat, even in these cooperative programs a true consensus will be difficult to achieve.

The greater hazard, however, attaches to the second type of program conducted by the Agriculture Department. These are the programs in which protection of Federal lands, particularly national forests, is involved. Again, I am told that the Department normally consults with the State authorities before launching a pest control program on Federal lands located within a particular State. However, the State has no veto over the type of chemical which the Department ultimately decides to use.

Except where the Federal Government has prohibited certain uses of a pesticide, I think the State should be the ultimate arbiter of the type of chemical compounds which are actually applied within its borders for the purposes of pest control, for the State authorities are most attuned to their specific environmental problems. This is the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled, "Obituary for DDT—in Michigan," written by Hal Higdon, and published in the New York Times magazine section of July 6, 1969, and an article entitled, "AF to Ban Pesticide Dieldrin," published in the Washington Post of July 4, 1969.

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

[From the New York Times Magazine, July 6, 1969]

OBITUARY FOR DDT—IN MICHIGAN

(By Hal Higdon)

Died. DDT, age 95, a persistent pesticide and onetime humanitarian. Considered to be one of World War II's greatest heroes, DDT saw its reputation fade after it was charged with murder by author Rachel Carson. Death came on June 27 in Michigan after a lingering illness. Survived by dieldrin, aldrin, endrin, chlordane, heptachlor, lindane and toxaphene. Please omit flowers.

LANSING, MICH.—In early spring, 1968, the coho salmon began their gradual migration up the eastern shore of Lake Michigan, feeding as they went, growing as they fed. Along with them came the army of sport fishermen, casting from piers and trolling from boats, pulling the fighting silver fish out of the water by the thousands. Yet thousands still survived until September, when the coho reached the mouths of the Manistee and Platte Rivers and Bear Creek in the north and started upstream to spawn.

Awaiting them was Marvin Blackport of Grand Rapids, Mich. Earlier in the year his Blackport Packing Company had outbid 25 others for the right to harvest salmon from the spawning streams. As the coho moved upstream state fishery workers trapped them in weirs. They stripped some of the fish of their eggs for use in nearby hatcheries; then as fast as the fish were caught they were trucked to Grand Rapids for dressing, canning or storage in a freezer. The operation continued well into December, when two million pounds of fish (for which the state would be paid 15.6 cents a pound) had been pulled from the rivers.

The first hint of trouble came in February, when the Michigan Department of Agriculture examined some cans of salmon and discovered a relatively high level of dieldrin, like DDT a member of the chlorinated hydrocarbon family of chemicals. (It is more toxic than DDT, but because it is much less frequently used poses a less serious threat.) Then the U.S. Food and Drug Administration examined several interstate shipments of coho salmon, found high levels of DDT and seized 28,000 pounds of fish. Eventually the state agriculture department embargoed 500,000 pounds of salmon that had been canned or was awaiting processing. Marvin Blackport, who had contracted for the fish with one government department only to see them confiscated by another, had cause to feel perturbed. If he was upset, he wouldn't admit it: "I'm not planning any lawsuits. There's DDT in everything we eat. Nobody's ever died of it. We're going to wait this thing out. In fact, I'm going fishing tomorrow and I plan to eat anything I catch."

While Blackport was probably correct in saying that nobody had died from an excess of DDT in food, the pesticide itself was in the throes of a fatal illness, partly because of the controversy arising from its discovery in the coho salmon. At no time since the publication in 1962 of the late Rachel Carson's best-selling book "Silent Spring" had DDT, the miracle chemical of World War II, faced such a concentrated attack. Sweden declared a two-year moratorium on its use (including a complete ban on home use of DDT and all uses of aldrin, lindane and dieldrin, its close relatives). After another DDT relative, endosulfan, was blamed for the deaths of millions of fish in the Rhine River late last month, French conservationists demanded that pollution by chlorinated hydrocarbons be ended. The pesticide boards of Maine and Massachusetts have banned DDT as a weapon to control Dutch elm disease. Arizona has halted agricultural use of the chemical for a year to prevent contamination of dairy products. In Wisconsin, DDT is on trial before the state Department of Natural Resources, charged with being a water pollutant. The California Agriculture Director has issued an order that will ultimately prohibit the use of DDT in households and home gardens and restrict its use on farms. At least a half dozen states have anti-DDT legislation pending; Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan has begun subcommittee hearings in Washington on DDT (he plans further sessions in his home state this week); Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin has introduced a bill that would restrict the pesticide, and the National Audubon Society has announced a campaign to ban its use in the United States.

Parke Brinkley, president of the National Agricultural Chemical Association, says the DDT market in the United States has dropped by a third. In 1968 the five American manufacturers of DDT produced more than 125 million pounds of the pesticide, valued at more than $20-million,[1] but 90 million pounds went to overseas markets.

To protect this profitable business, the five American DDT manufacturer (Montrose Chemical Corporation, Olin Mathieson Chemical Corporation, Allied Chemical Corporation, Diamond Shamrock Corporation and Lebanon Chemical Corporation) have organized a task force to defend their products against what they call "emotional" attacks. The DDT task force provided a number of witnesses at the hearings in Wisconsin. They testified that DDT does not harm humans and warned that its complete elimination would leave the state vulnerable to outbreaks of such diseases as encephalitis. In Michigan, meanwhile, the state Department of Agriculture moved to cancel licenses for the sale of the pesticide. Those interested in preserving DDT were given 60 days to present their case; the deadline was June 27.

DDT (dichloro-diphenyl-trichloroethane) was originally synthesized in a laboratory by Othmar Zeidlar, a German chemistry student working on a doctoral thesis, in 1874. It was a lesson in pure chemistry, he had no idea what this new compound would do. The chemical is one of a number of so-called chlorinated hydrocarbons, many of which have been used as insecticides. The insecticidal properties of DDT didn't become apparent until 1939. A Swiss chemist, Paul Mueller, while searching for a plant-contact insecticide—one that need not be ingested by the insect—discovered that DDT when it contacted an insect's nerve endings caused muscle spasms and, eventually, death. For his work, Mueller received the Nobel Prize in 1948.

In 1942, the U.S. Army began testing the insecticide, and when the tests proved successful DDT played a significant part in World War II, particularly in malaria-control programs in the South Pacific. Largely because of DDT, it was the first war in history in which fewer soldiers died of typhus than of bullet wounds.

DDT was used to reduce the incidence of 27 diseases, saving perhaps 10 million lives and eliminating an estimated 200 million illnesses in the human population. DDT was cheap. It was persistent; the chlorinated hydrocarbons are very stable compounds with half-lives as long as 15 years. This persistence contributed to DDT's low cost as well as its efficiency: a single spraying frequently produced lasting effects. It was the same charac-

[1] DDT now sells for 17 cents a pound, compared with $1.19 a pound shortly after its discovery. A spokesman for the National Agricultural Chemical Association says the profit margin is relatively small because of competition and declining markets.

teristic, however, that was to cause most of DDT's problems.

After its military baptism the pesticide became available for civilian use, and Michigan, with its large number of fruit farms, was one of the first states to utilize it. One early use was to control flies on Mackinac Island, at the juncture of Lakes Michigan and Huron.

The first hint that DDT might prove a mixed blessing came around 1949. Traces of the chemical began to appear in milk. DDT sprayed on crop-producing lands drifted onto neighboring alfalfa fields where cows grazed and the chemical was also used in dairy barns. Nobody then—or now—could prove that DDT harms humans, but reckless and excessive spraying seemed unwise. As early as May 16, 1950, the Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station recommended in a newsletter: "DDT should be used in moderation on crops, only in amounts sufficient to get the job done." Since most Michigan farmers plant their crops, spray for insects and probably even shave in tune with the Agriculture Experiment Station, this recommendation reduced DDT usage. "There was concern over DDT contamination 20 years ago," says Dr. Gordon Guyer, director of M.S.U.'s pesticide-research center. "We haven't changed our philosophy at all. Research on this problem has been going on constantly. We have attempted to phase out DDT wherever substitute materials become available."

But the blame for polluting the environment, and particularly the Great Lakes, cannot be hung entirely on farmers. DDT is virtually insoluble in water; it will move downstream only if it is clinging to something else—most often a soil particle. And farmers are careful about their soil; they ordinarily take pains to guard against erosion. Many cities in Michigan—and even conservationists—are partly responsible for pollution. DDT seemed the perfect means for eliminating pesky mosquitoes. Conservationists sprayed it in the state parks (many of which, in Michigan, are near water), homeowners sprayed it in their back yards and municipalities used it along streets, where it often found its way into sewers, then rivers and eventually the Great Lakes. Slowly, the DDT residues built up in the Lakes, and Gordon Guyer admits, "We are all involved."

In the nineteen-fifties Dutch elm disease threatened some of the lofty trees that lined the streets of many Midwest towns. In 1954, Michigan State University, which has a large number of elms on its East Lansing campus, began DDT spraying to kill elm bark beetles, which spread the disease. The beetles began dying, but so did large numbers of robins. Within a few years robins virtually disappeared from the campus. Soon zoologists discovered why. Leaves covered with DDT fell to the ground to become food matter for earthworms; the worms in turn were eaten by the robins. When the robins had eaten a sufficient number of earthworms their DDT levels rose to a point where they died of nerve poisoning.

Michigan State's experience is a demonstration of the phenomenon known as biological magnification. Although the DDT concentration in one area may be microscopically low, it can multiply through the food chain. Thus in the Green Bay area of Lake Michigan, the bottom muds contained 0.014 parts per million of DDT. Tiny amphipods living in the mud absorbed the chemical, concentrating it to 0.41 parts per million. Fish fed on the amphipods and, because of the volume of food they ate, soon had concentrations of 3 to 6 parts per million. Herring gulls ate large numbers of fish and their DDT level reached 99 parts per million. This won't kill the gulls (except under stress or starvation conditions), but it will impair their ability to reproduce, thus diminishing their numbers.

Several bird species along the Great Lakes, including the American eagle, are threatened with extinction because of DDT, which causes the liver to produce enzymes that attack the hormones governing calcium production. When the eagle's system produces less calcium, the egg shells become thinner and thinner, causing more frequent breakage and fewer baby eagles. (Sergei Postupalsky of the University of Wisconsin has reported having found an eagle egg without any shell on the shores of Lake Superior in northern Michigan. The embryo was enclosed only by a membrane, which had broken, allowing the contents to ooze through the bottom of the nest.) The osprey, peregrine falcon and mallard duck have problems similar to those of the eagle. And the Mink Ranchers' Association believes that DDT may be affecting mink reproduction.

Birds suffer the most because they cannot excrete liquids as rapidly as mammals can. When the DDT is not excreted it builds up in the birds' bodies. Humans, on the other hand, seem to eliminate DDT once it reaches a level of 10 or 12 parts per million. (Most Americans apparently have that level in their bodies.) Experiments in feeding prisoners massive DDT doses have uncovered no measurable dangers, and workers in DDT plants survive in apparent normal health. No human has died from DDT—yet. But there are hints that DDT may be more injurious to human health than current evidence indicates. Researchers at the University of Miami have discovered that people with several diseases, including leukemia, have high residues of pesticides. The National Cancer Institute has found a greater tendency for tumors in DDT-fed experimental mice. No reputable scientist will yet condemn DDT as poisonous to humans, but the pesticide has been in use less than three decades. Measurable effects could appear in two or three generations.

The publication of "Silent Spring" in 1962 brought to public attention the dangers of environmental poisoning by DDT. "You could see people standing around in the garden stores reading labels," says Paul Flink of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources. "They were aware there was a problem. That's the first step to cleaning things up: get people aware." According to Gordon Guyer of M.S.U., "Some of the things Rachel Carson said lacked perspective, but hers was an important book. It made people look at the issues." Robert Reinert of the Michigan Bureau of Commercial Fisheries adds: "Scientific progress and public pressure seem to go hand in hand."

Scientific progress appeared in the form of the gas chromatograph, which enabled scientists to measure minute levels of DDT in the environment. Some of the problems caused by DDT in the Great Lakes, for example, come from concentrations as low as two parts per *trillion*. One part per *million* is the contents of a single one-ounce shot glass in that of a small railroad tank car; one part per *trillion* is the contents of a single one-ounce shot glass in that of a million tank cars. Yet such concentrations, through the process of biological magnification, have far-reaching effects.

The mounting evidence of DDT's hazards led to an increased threat of regulation. In addition, many insects began to develop resistance to DDT. This prodded the chemical companies to find substitute pesticides. Many of the substitutes are organophosphates and carbamates, which also attack insect nervous systems but have shorter lives than the chlorinated hydrocarbons—often a matter of days or weeks instead of years. Because the substitutes are less persistent, they must be used more frequently than DDT and are therefore more expensive.

As other insecticides became available, the Michigan State University Agricultural Experiment Station gradually eliminated DDT from its recommendations for insect control. It suggested the other chlorinated hydrocarbons only in cases in which no adequate substitute was available. Between 1962 and 1967, DDT was dropped from half the recommendations for control of vegetable insects. Where it was still recommended, prescribed dosages were reduced. In 1967, M.S.U. suggested that methoxychlor, a chlorinated hydrocarbon but a much less persistent chemical, be substituted for DDT in Dutch elm disease control programs. At about the same time, the Environmental Defense Fund, a New York group, took 56 Michigan cities into Federal court in an effort to halt their use of DDT in fighting Dutch elm disease. Detroit rebelled at first but eventually capitulated. The following year, M.S.U. removed DDT from its mosquito-spray recommendations and the Michigan Department of Agriculture moved to guarantee that the recommendations would be followed.

Under Michigan law, the agriculture department can, upon the recommendation of the M.S.U. Agricultural Experiment Station, cancel the license under which a pesticide is sold in the state. The department can't prohibit the use of a pesticide, but the cancellation of its license has the same effect. When the department moved against DDT in April, those involved in its sale appealed to the state agriculture commission. The commission has agreed to only three minor exceptions to the ban: it said DDT powder could be used against bats or mice in buildings, against body lice or in "emergency" conditions (an encephalitis epidemic, for instance). The sale of DDT for all other uses was forbidden, and the order became final on June 27. Michigan conservationists expected, however, that the chemical companies would ultimately test the prohibition in the courts.

As DDT was taking its toll in Michigan and the other Great Lakes states, the area was suffering another—and totally unrelated—ecological disaster. Since the glacial era, sea lampreys—sucker-mouthed eels that feed on fish—had lived in Lake Ontario. Until the opening of Welland Canal in 1833, the lamprey and another ocean resident, the herring-like alewife, had been unable to bypass Niagara Falls and enter the upper Great Lakes. The lampreys didn't reach Lakes Huron and Michigan until the nineteen-thirties, but within a decade they and overfishing had virtually eliminated the lakes' large commercial and sport fish. In the process, the lampreys killed off the predators that would have controlled the alewives, which multiplied rapidly. When the alewives died (from the stresses of overpopulation, not from DDT, as some have suggested), their bodies washed up by the millions on beaches. The problem reached its peak in 1967.

Meanwhile, aquatic biologists at the University of Michigan discovered that they could control the lamprey by pouring the pesticide TFM (which is not related to DDT and does not, if properly used, harm other fish) into its spawning streams. With the lamprey threat eliminated, biologists sought to restock Lake Michigan with sport fish: coho salmon, Chinook salmon and lake trout. The quickly maturing coho salmon, released as fingerlings in the spring of 1966, found a ready source of food in the alewives, all part of the plan. By the following spring the coho had grown to a size of two to four pounds. When the ice broke in 1967 they were congregated, along with the alewives, in the warmer southern waters of Lake Michigan. Through the summer they moved gradually north toward their spawning streams. They grew rapidly, and that fall fishermen pulled in 15-pound and 20-pound fish. The word spread fast. By 1968 most of the fishermen in the Midwest had been transformed into coho maniacs.

The result was a bonanza for the Great Lakes states, particularly Michigan. Fishermen descended by the thousands on Michigan lake villages, buying bait, tackle and

gasoline, renting boats and motel rooms. One survey by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources indicated that expenses for the average angler amounted to $19.50 a day. The department estimated that by 1972 the sport would bring close to $100-million into the state, largely because of the coho salmon. The coho would also control the alewife population, which would no longer wash up on the beaches.

But that optimistic prediction failed to take into account the factor of biological magnification. The coho fed on the alewives, which fed on the micro-organisms that lived in the mud that came from the house that DDT built. In the spring coho salmon contain relatively low concentrations of DDT—around 1 or 2 parts per million—but the fat cohos of the fall may have DDT levels as high as 20 parts per million. (The Food and Drug Administration had not then set up maximum allowable levels for DDT in salmon, but the established level for the fat of beef and pork was 7 parts per million.) And while large coho don't die of DDT poisoning, in early 1968 11 per cent of the salmon fry in Michigan hatcheries (or 700,000 young fish) *did* die at a time when the mortality was expected to be low. The "most probable cause": DDT. Of the three fish newly introduced to Lake Michigan, the coho had spawned first. Marine biologists theorized that the lake trout and Chinook salmon, which have longer lives, would eventually absorb sufficient quantities of DDT to prevent a natural reproduction cycle.

A few dead robins or eagle eggs without shells are one thing, but $100-million worth of tourist trade is another, and that's what seemed to be at stake when state and Federal officials seized the fish that Marvin Blackport harvested last September under contract with the state.

Seven months later, on April 20, when the Governors of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana and Michigan met in a motel near O'Hare International Airport outside Chicago, visions of cranberries danced in their heads—the cranberries that, having been sprayed with a cancer-inducing chemical, caused the bottom to drop out of the cranberry market for Thanksgiving, 1959. Each governor drank a glass of water reportedly drawn from Lake Michigan to prove he had no fear of high DDT levels. What the Governors did fear was a diminishing of the coho mania. They requested that the Food and Drug Administration not establish maximum levels for DDT in coho salmon until it had received "all available scientific information." They also asked the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert H. Finch, to meet with them at the Republican Governors' Conference in Lexington, Ky., on May 1. Finch chose to ignore their request.

When the Governors met, they had no one to complain to but poor old Spiro Agnew. Harsh words were said to have filled the air at a closed meeting with the Vice President, Governor Harold LeVander of Minnesota pounded the table; Governor Richard Ogilvie of Illinois said he'd been made to look like an ass before his constituents. An aide to another Governor grumbled: "This is one of the first breakdowns between the states and the Nixon Administration." All the Governors could get was a commitment from Under Secretary John Veneman of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare that they would be consulted before permanent tolerance levels were set.

On May 23 the F.D.A. established 5 parts per million as a temporary "action" level; until a permanent level can be established, in about six months, no fish containing more than 5 parts per million of DDT can be transported across state lines. Should the temporary level become fixed, and should DDT levels in the lake remain constant, it could eliminate about 80 per cent of the commercial catch in Lake Michigan.

In February, three months before the Governors besieged the Vice President, the staff at M.S.U.'s Agricultural Experiment Station agreed that DDT should be eliminated from agricultural recommendations. Gordon Guyer expected to complete the phasing out of DDT gradually over a period of six months. As the station's publications were reprinted, DDT would simply disappear from the recommendations; and as Michigan farmers followed the recommendations, DDT would disappear. It had already disappeared as a Dutch elm disease control and mosquito spray. In time the compound might even decompose and disappear from the lake. Purity would reign. But when Guyer notified the Michigan Department of Agriculture of this plan, its director, Dale Ball, assumed the initiative; his department announced the cancellation of all DDT licenses. Except for the three minor exclusions agreed upon later, DDT is dead in Michigan.

According to Dr. C. T. Black of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources: "If we knew as much about DDT in 1945 as we know now, it probably would not have been registered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. But it was the miracle chemical of the war. It was in use and people were not dropping dead. We had to learn slowly." Dan Reed of the Michigan Farm Bureau says farmers will not mourn the passing of DDT: "It was an important pesticide for a long time, but we now have other means of control." And Governor William G. Milliken says: "Certainly pesticides have been a boon, to civilization as well as a potential threat. Our problem is to understand that threat and to deal with it in a responsible way. There can be a danger of overreaction, but up to this time I think we have tended to underestimate the threat rather than overestimate it."

The concern of the five American manufacturers of DDT is not merely over a loss of business in one state. DDT sales in Michigan have been declining severely for the last few years. The question is whether the elimination of DDT in Michigan will have a domino effect. Wisconsin seems on the verge of declaring the pesticide a pollutant. The other Great Lakes states will almost have to follow their lead. This could ultimately mean a national ban on DDT for most uses, and other countries may have second thoughts about purchasing it. Moreover, if DDT falls, can the other chlorinated hydrocarbons be far behind?"

The other members of the group (among them are lindane, toxaphene, dieldrin, aldrin, chlordane, heptachlor and endrin) vary in toxicity and persistence. Dieldrin and endrin, for instance, are markedly more toxic than DDT and probably as persistent, while heptachlor and chlordane are both less toxic and less persistent. Even the worst offenders, however, present a lesser threat than DDT because they are specialized and more expensive compounds and are therefore much less widely used.

One example of the specialized pesticide is endosulfan, the chlorinated hydrocarbon detected in the Rhine after millions of dead fish floated to the surface. Unlike DDT, endosulfan breaks down quickly when it is applied properly. It is used by growers of fruit, vegetables and other specialty crops to combat aphids and peach tree borers, among other things. Dr. Black of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources calls it "a Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde chemical." On the one hand, he says it is possible in some cases to market the produce a few days after endosulfan has been applied. But workers are advised to use protective clothing for 24 hours in a field where the pesticide has been used. "It's hazardous if it get out of hand," Black says, "and it's terrifically toxic to fish."

Outside the chlorinated hydrocarbon family, there are highly toxic pesticides—some of them more hazardous than DDT's relatives to the person using them—but, in Dr. Black's words, "they don't have this devilish persistence. They do their job and get out." Offensive pesticides are still used, Black says, where adequate substitutes have not been found. Termites and such soil insects as white grubs can at this stage be controlled only by persistent chemicals, according to the experts, and dieldrin and chlordane are the answers.

"I can see DDT out of the picture within a decade," says Black, "and we should be able to get most of the others reduced sharply by then. We're preparing to move on dieldrin shortly—we're gathering evidence to present to the responsible officials."

The critical factor, says another expert, is the availability of substitute compounds: "I'd rather die of DDT poisoning at 70 than of malaria or encephalitis—or even starvation, which is possible if you ban the effective pesticides—at 35. We can't ban chlordane until we find another way to control the white grub." Like everything else, Black explains, it becomes a question of economics: "The cost of developing and bringing out a substitute is now up in the millions of dollars. Only massive public pressure will drive the chemical industry to produce a new pesticide, and unfortunately industry is not yet convinced that it will come to that. Businessmen may feel that they can't afford to develop costly substitutes, but we feel that society can't afford the incalculable costs of the havoc produced in our environment by persistent pesticides."

Gordon Guyer believes that we will be using twice as many pesticides in 1975 as we are now, although generally they will be different groups. "We're not banning DDT," he emphasizes. "We're just putting it on the shelf. There may very well be situations down the road where we need it for specific pest-control problems. I feel we should avoid any legislation which would tend to categorically prohibit DDT."

Despite such reservations, if Rachel Carson is looking down from an unpolluted heaven, she is probably smiling.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 4, 1969]

AIR FORCE TO BAN PESTICIDE DIELDRIN

The Air Force has agreed to suspend all further use of the pesticide dieldrin to control insects at major Air Force bases, pending further study, Senate Interior Committee Chairman Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.) announced yesterday.

Jackson, who said dieldrin is "five to fifty times as toxic as DDT," asserted that an earlier recommendation by a regional office of the Department of Agriculture called for dieldrin applications at Kelly Air Force Base, Texas, in highly dangerous amounts.

"Previous applications of this chemical in substantially the same dosages recommended for use at Kelly AFB have been shown to have devastating effects upon fish, wildlife, poultry and livestock," said Jackson.

In another suspension action, the Agriculture has cautioned that insect strips like Shell's No-Pest Strip Insecticide should not be hung where infants or ill or aged people are confined.

Shell has been notified to include on all future strips a cautionary statement to this effect, and to stop distributing any already-manufactured strips that do not carry such a statement.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have consulted with the Senator from Nebraska and we are willing to take the amendment to conference except that we want an understanding of the words in the fourth line of the Senator's amendment, "or substantially affected."

If we understand the Senator wants this to apply to the use of these pro-

hibited pesticides within States, that is all right. However, what does he mean by the words, "or substantially affected."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, that language is intended to respond to the problem—and let me localize it to Michigan—where if there were a national forest immediately adjoining the State of Michigan in Ohio, and there was no prohibition in Ohio against DDT, for example, and the application of DDT that close to our border would substantially affect the fish and wildlife in Michigan, then Michigan would be able to object to its use and persuade the Department to seek an alternative.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I doubt if we could go that far in conference. However, I am willing to take the whole amendment to conference, having voiced my doubts about the words, "or substantially affected."

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I know the amendment comes at a late hour, but I do not object to its being accepted with the understanding that we might refine it further if necessary.

Mr. HART. I am very grateful.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 34, line 15, strike out "$2,000,000" and insert "$3,000,000."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I have discussed the amendment with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican member, both of whom have agreed to its merit and I think they are willing to accept it.

In the 1970 budget the administration recommended an appropriation of $3 million to enlarge the important new phase of the rural housing program, the so-called mutual self-help housing program for low income rural people.

The House reduced that amount to $1,250,000. In our committee it was increased to $2 million. My amendment brings the amount to the $3 million recommended by the budget.

I point out that this is a new program and that about 3,000 additional low-income families can be helped if we provide the $3 million.

In this housing, a lot of "sweat equity" is involved because farmers for low income land people not only take the assistance that is made available to them, but they also put into the housing a lot of their own effort, collectively and individually. I think that in terms of pride and dignity it is a very small investment in responsible citizenship. I heartily recommend that we increase the amount to the $3 million recommended by the budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska and I are willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

I recently had a communication from the county agent of Collier County, Fla., in which Immokalee is located. The county agent tells me that the principal help in the way of housing for the migrant workers there in the last year has been from this particular program. He gave me the number of new homes created through this self-help machinery. Perhaps it has real meaning in places that are not big enough to have housing authorities.

I am glad to take the amendment to conference. I understand that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Nebraska, joins me.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I am glad to join the distinguished Senator from Florida in accepting the amendment. I believe the matter should be given further consideration.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senators.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator that the amendment would not be in order at this time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the former action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendment be reconsidered so that the Mundt amendment may be considered at this time.

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

The question is now on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Dakota to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

TEXAS LEGISLATURE ASKS $220 MILLION FOR AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the agricultural conservation program is one of the most worthwhile programs I know, and I have supported it fully from the time I first came to the Senate in 1957. It reaches over a million farms each year and results in the application of the greatest amount of conservation measures to the land at the lowest cost per acre of any similar program.

I pointed out on July 2 in my statement before the Senate on the agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970 that the $185 million recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations was too low and that at least $220 million should have been recommended. However, I also pointed out that the committee's recommendation was $185 million over the administration's request, but lower than the House allowance.

I have a duly authenticated copy of Senate Concurrent Resolution 116 from the State of Texas which was passed and properly certified by both the senate and the house of the Texas Legislature. This resolution shows the value of this program to Texas and the Nation. It also questions the wisdom of the attempted elimination of this program by the present administration and asks that the agricultural conservation program be reinstated at its former allocation level of $220 million for fiscal year 1970. I agree with this resolution from the Texas Legislature, and think the $220 million should have been allowed for the agricultural conservation program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Concurrent Resolution 116 as passed and certified by the Texas Legislature be printed in its entirety along with the names of its signers at this point in the RECORD.

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

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 116

Whereas, President Nixon's 1970 fiscal year Budget proposes complete elimination of funds for the National Agricultural Conservation Program; and

Whereas, The Texas Legislature, through their appropriation and law making processes have always recognized the absolute necessity for state and national conservation programs; and

Whereas, The National ACP is the only conservation program available to all farms and ranches of the nation with its cost-share provisions designed to get widespread conservation participation from a maximum number of farmers and ranchers; and

Whereas, Spiraling population growth emphasizes the urgency for our land uses to be in accordance with the very best conservation measures; and

Whereas, This program more specifically affects approximately 300,000 Texas Farms and Ranches, consisting of approximately 150,000,000 acres of land; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, By the Senate of the 61st Legislature, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Agricultural Conservation Program of the United States be reinstated at its former allocation level of $220,000,000 for the year 1970, that funds for this program be updated annually to meet the increasing costs of carrying out conservation measures, and that emphasis be placed on the need for these funds to reach as many farmers as possible in order to assure that the conservation message is fully reflected to the entire nation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, Members of the House and Senate Agricultural Committees and to the entire Texas Congressional Delegation.

BEN BARNES,
Lieutenant Governor.

———, ———,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that S.C.R. No. 116 was adopted by the Senate on May 30, 1969.

CHARLES SCHNABEL,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that S.C.R. No. 116 was adopted by the House on May 31, 1969.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 11612) was read the third time.

THE MILITARY AUTHORIZATION BILL

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate. However, for the information of Senators present, the majority leader, the Senator from Montana, as I understand, if the pending bill is completed today, will be ready to make an announcement that the military authorization bill, with one slight exception, will be the next order of business. I would rather he make the announcement.

I shall have a few remarks to make about the debate on that bill. I hope that the Senators will stay after the rollcall.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 1, 1969, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AUTOMOTIVE PRODUCTS TRADE ACT OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I hereby transmit the third annual report on the implementation of the Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965. The report contains information with respect to the United States-Canada Automotive Products Agreement, including automotive trade, production, prices and employment in 1968. Also included is other information relating to activities under the Act.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 7, 1969.*

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 11612) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) is paired with the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). If present and voting, the Senator from Alaska would vote "yea," and the Senator from Connecticut would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) is necessarily absent, and if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 88, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 55 Leg.]

YEAS—88

Aiken	Fulbright	Moss
Allen	Goldwater	Mundt
Allott	Gore	Murphy
Baker	Gurney	Muskie
Bayh	Hansen	Packwood
Bellmon	Harris	Pastore
Bennett	Hart	Pearson
Bible	Hartke	Pell
Boggs	Hatfield	Percy
Brooke	Holland	Proxmire
Burdick	Hollings	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Russell
Byrd, W. Va.	Hughes	Schweiker
Case	Jackson	Scott
Church	Javits	Smith
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Spong
Cotton	Kennedy	Stennis
Cranston	Long	Stevens
Curtis	Mansfield	Symington
Dirksen	Mathias	Talmadge
Dodd	McCarthy	Thurmond
Dole	McClellan	Tower
Dominick	McGee	Tydings
Eagleton	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Eastland	McIntyre	Yarborough
Ellender	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Ervin	Miller	Young, Ohio
Fannin	Mondale	
Fong	Montoya	

NAYS—2

Goodell	Saxbe

NOT VOTING—10

Anderson	Inouye	Ribicoff
Cannon	Magnuson	Williams, Del.
Gravel	Nelson	
Griffin	Prouty	

So the bill (H.R. 11612) was passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. MUNDT conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it has been a great pleasure to witness again the handling of a measure by the distinguished senior Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND). As the chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, he has exhibited once more his superior managerial skill and ability.

This funding measure is designed to maintain our present farm program. May I say that as extensive and broad as that program is, every one of its many facets and features are thoroughly known and well understood by Senator HOLLAND. His outstanding advocacy, his great legislative skill and ability, his strong persuasive capacities were exhibited on this measure as they have been on all proposals that gain his endorsement. The Senate is grateful once again to Senator HOLLAND. The Senate's overwhelming approval of this funding bill adds another outstanding achievement to his already abundant record of public service.

Of course the swift and efficient disposition of this measure was aided immensely by the senior Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA). His strong advocacy and his splendid cooperation were essential to this great success.

Others, too, should be singled out for their participation. The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) is to be commended especially for his contribution in offering and urging his amendment. That may also be said for the distinguished Senators from New York (Mr. GOODELL and Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART). These and other Senators joined to assure expeditious and efficient action today on this measure. The Senate is deeply grateful.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970 FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT, RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, AND FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF MISSILE TEST FACILITIES AT KWAJALEIN MISSILE RANGE, AND RESERVE COMPONENT STRENGTH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 281, S. 2546.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2546) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1970 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to authorize the construction of test facilities at Kwajalein Missile Range, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement about what the committee has done in connection with this bill.

I think we are going to have a good solid debate about the bill on the floor, but I merely wish to point out now that it is a most important bill not only because it involves $20 billion or more but also because it will necessarily greatly affect, perhaps to a large extent, the level of our national security in years to come.

During several months the Committee on Armed Services held hearings on the bill and then for several days, over a period of 2 weeks, the committee carefully considered the entire testimony, all of the items in the bill of any substance were passed on separately, and the committee has reported the bill to the Senate. The full test of the hearings, the index, together with the report and the bill in final form have been passed by the committee. This is a Senate bill which was delivered this morning at 10 o'clock or at 10:30 to the office of each Senator.

I shall present this matter tomorrow, and in a reasonable time, but going somewhat into detail as to the high points. I shall present the entire matter to the Senate.

We heard a great deal of testimony that was classified. That is true with respect to any bill that has important items in it such as this bill, which pertain to our security and conditions all over the world. There was a great deal of classified testimony of necessity about what may be the trend and success or failure of weapons developments by our potential adversaries or those that might be aggressors against us. The committee went into those matters more fully than usual. We received classified documents. Much of the testimony and debate had within the committee could be of the greatest benefit to any potential enemy.

It is apparent from press reports that there will be attacks on certain provisions of the bill. There are provisions in the bill which some Senators oppose, and there are provisions which some Senators favor. Other Senators oppose generally the military amounts, the general total amount; and they have expressed an intention to move to reduce that military authorization.

I wish to emphasize that I believe in the right of every Senator to oppose any bill in its entirety or any part of any bill. There is nothing finer than to have a real and genuine debate. Each Senator is entitled to all relevant facts. Each Senator is not only entitled to know the relevant and pertinent facts to reach a decision on how to vote, but each Senator has a duty to become informed of the facts. Likewise, I have a duty as the so-called floor manager of the bill to inform Senators of anything I know to help them fully understand the reasons, circumstances, and justification of the authorization request.

What I am leading up to is this. Unfortunately, it is not possible to present all of those matters in open session. We cannot present fully the testimony we acted on in making these recommendations, and I say that for the same reason I have stated heretofore: This material would be of great benefit to our adversaries and compromise security to the extent that our military forces might now or in the future be placed in jeopardy.

It is for that reason that after I make my best efforts to bring out the whole issue and place it on the table, so to speak, I will make a motion under rule XXXV for a closed session. I have no doubt that a closed session will expedite the debate greatly, so that we may get all the facts before the Senate. As far as I am concerned, a closed session would not have to be extended, but the duration would be determined by Members of the Senate.

To refresh the recollection of Senators, rule XXXV merely provides:

> On a motion made and seconded to close the doors of the Senate, on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed.

Mr. President, it will be with some reluctance that I shall make that motion. I have never done so before, but the comprehensive facts that have been developed and the far-reaching questions that are involved, the development of far-reaching weapons, the air and sea missiles all involve extremely sensitive testimony. For that reason I will make that motion at the proper time. I thought I should bring that to the attention of Senators today.

I have one other point that will involve a matter of security. The general rule, as Senators will recall, is that only those persons can be present in the Chamber who meet security requirements and have approval. Of course, that includes all Senators. Some of this information will be of the highest classification. Therefore, I give that notice now.

I thank the Senator from Montana for his consideration in yielding.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I shall yield to the Senator in a moment.

I thank the Senator from Montana for yielding so that this matter may be placed before the Senate. I am not going to try to rush it but I hope we can have attendance that is better than average. I hope we can have nearly full attendance. I believe if we really get the facts we can pass on them in view of the enlightenment we have. I believe sound decisions will prevail. The committee membership is familiar with this matter and they will help present the bill. We have subcommittees that conducted hearings and they will be called on.

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

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the chairman of the committee in charge of the bill which has just been laid before the Senate has indicated that he intends to move for an executive session. It will be my pleasure to second that motion because I think it is almost mandatory that there be a motion to that effect in view of developments which have occurred over the past several years, and not just this year.

I am pleased also to note that on this day 91 Senators are present. I would hope, health permitting, we would have attendance of nearly 100 Senators until the bill is disposed of one way or the other, because this will be the most important bill which will come before Congress this session. It therefore behooves all Senators, regardless of their feelings, to be here and if they feel like it to participate in the debate which will be undertaken.

The bill will not be disposed of this week. I doubt that it will be disposed of next week. I hope it will be disposed of before the end of the month.

Thus, I join the distinguished Senator from Mississippi in what he had to say in urging that all Senators be here, because this is a most important and worthwhile bill and certainly merits the attention of every Senator.

I thank the gracious Senator from Mississippi for making the announcement he did today so that the Senate is now on notice as to what to expect in the days and perhaps the weeks ahead.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, may I ask the distinguished Senator from Mississippi if he plans to give his position on the bill and, before there is further discussion, to ask for a closed session. I ask that because if there is to be a closed session, those of us who are apprehensive about certain aspects of the bill might like to present charts which could not be presented in an open session. Of course, it will take a little time to prepare those charts.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I was going to make a motion as the final part of my presentation of the bill on the major items in the bill that we would go on into a closed session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Then would the able Senator yield for this further question: After he has presented the bill and had the closed session, would he have any objection if we had another closed session based on the testimony taken up to that time?

Mr. STENNIS. Well, does the Senator mean an additional closed session?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Yes.

Mr. STENNIS. I could not object to that. I would have no basis on which to object, even if I wanted to, but I would not object to that at all. I want a closed session for the reasons I have already given.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I appreciate the sentiments of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I have one brief question. I also commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the procedure he has adopted. It will be extremely helpful.

My question is: We have staff members with classified clearance who could be of great help to us. In previous executive sessions, the Chamber has been cleared of all staff members. Would it be the intention of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services to have staff members present if they have been cleared for classified material, and if so, whether classified, secret, top secret, whatever it may be?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would have to object, much as I would dislike doing so. If anyone aside from those under the rules of the Senate were to be in attenance, I would wish to put him on notice now that I will object to any such consideration. I hate to do that, but I think there is no choice.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, first I wish to express thanks to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for clearing today so that we could dispose of the agriculture bill. My question is:

How long a notice does the Senator think we will have about a closed session? I ask this question because a week from Wednesday of this week is the beginning of the Apollo 11 voyage to the moon. I happen to know that many Senators have already indicated—and this would include the Senator from Florida—that they want to be there. Hence, we would like to have a couple of days notice ahead of time, because it would aid us materially in making our plans.

The Senator from Mississippi knows that I am not one to be away from the Senate, but I would certainly want to be on hand for that particular occasion so that I could plan with reference to the time limit ahead of the actual closed session.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, with all deference to the Apollo 11 mission's going to the moon, I do not wish to offer a way we can stop some time next week. That is a matter to be worked out by the Senate. I think, I do not contemplate any secret session that will last later on into next week. My time will be fairly limited; but as to the other 99 Senators, of course, that would have to be determined by the Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I am suggesting is that a couple of days' leeway or notice would be very helpful to me and to other Senators. If I have to be here, I shall be here. The Senator knows that. But a couple of days' notice would enable us to make our plans. We have all been asked. We have all been requested. Each Senator has been allowed to bring one member of his family if he cares to do so. I wish to bring my oldest son, who happens to be a marine veteran, subject to possible clearances, of course. But I would want to know if I could have a couple of days' notice ahead of time, because it would be very helpful to me and I know to other Senators.

Mr. STENNIS. That does not come until the middle of next week, does it?

Mr. HOLLAND. A week from Wednesday.

Mr. STENNIS. I think that is a matter solely for the Senate to determine, as to whether we recess for that day or what the Senate will do. I know that the secret session to which I refer will not last that long. At least I think it will not. I do not think there is any likelihood of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. All I am suggesting is that we have a day or two notice. It would be very helpful to me. I hope that the Senator will make some advance notice available to us.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. If the Senator from Mississippi will yield for just one more question, I was impressed with the suggestion made by the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), because this is a complicated matter. The books which are roughly comparable to the books now on Senator's desks today on the subject of the agriculture bill present in considerable detail the pros and cons of all the weapons systems. Those Senators who have the good fortune—as do I—to have listened to the hearings, and to have had the opportunity to study these weapons systems, and the pros and cons incident thereto, are in a fortunate position. But those Senators and their staffs who may not have been interested in it are in a less fortunate position. Therefore, if there is a closed session prior to discussion of the bill, it would appear to me that some Senators would not have the same advantage as others do in considering this very important bill.

Therefore, although I am entirely willing to accede, of course, to the position taken by the majority leader, I am in full agreement with the logic of the suggestion made by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Missouri that the matter which he raised will, of course, be given consideration. I am fearful, however, that if we break the rule for one, we must break the rule for all. Hence, I am sure the Senator will understand, because of the peculiar situation in which a Member of the Senate finds himself in a closed session.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My position is not one of disagreement, but one of distress, because as we move to consideration of the bill on the floor, many Members are not as cognizant of the bill as members of the committee are.

Mr. MANSFIELD. With Senators like the Senator from Missouri, our experts will be available.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would hope that staff people could be considered. Nevertheless, I accept the position of the Senator from Montana. My position was one of sympathy for the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished minority leader, concerning the request that the Senate come in tomorrow at 11:30 a.m., because both parties will have policy luncheons, I think it is better to ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

S. 1647—AUTHORIZATION FOR RELEASE OF 100,000 SHORT TONS OF LEAD FROM THE NATIONAL STOCKPILE AND THE SUPPLEMENTARY STOCKPILE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the prayer and the reading of the Journal tomorrow, the Senate proceed to the consideration of House amendment to S. 1647, a bill having to do with the release of 100,000 tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplementary stockpile. The bill passed this body but was amended in the House.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

I ask unanimous consent that consideration of this amendment take place for not to exceed one-half hour, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) and the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would ask the Senator from Montana, does that include any amendments thereto?

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, there is a possibility that there may be a rollcall vote on the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would inquire of the Senator from Montana if it is a 1-hour limitation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a one-half hour limitation, with 15 minutes to a side. There is only one amendment. That will be it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That during the consideration of the House amendment to S. 1647, an Act to authorize the release of 100,000 short tons of lead from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile, on Tuesday, July 8, 1969, after the prayer and approval of the Journal, debate on that amendment and all amendments thereto shall be limited to one-half hour to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS ON TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after disposal of the House amendment to S. 1647, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements in relation thereto to be limited to 3 minutes.

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

"WHY ABM?"—A FORTHCOMING BOOK BY HUDSON INSTITUTE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, later this month, on July 17, Pergamon Press plans to publish a book entitled "Why ABM?" The book is authored largely by members of the Hudson Institute of Croton-on-Hudson, New York.

All of us involved in the debate on the Safeguard ABM welcome additions to the already extensive literature on ABM. This literature includes numerous statements by the Department of Defense before the appropriate congressional committees; a detailed series of questions-and-answers releases by the White House office; an extensive nongovernment analysis organized by Dr. Jerome Wiesner and Prof. Abram Chayes; continued reports by the Council for a Livable World; a pamphlet by the American Security Council; and numerous others.

We are best served at this point in the debate over ABM, I think, by credible, independent analyses seeking to answer the troublesome questions raised over the past 5 months. These include the ABM's workability; its arms race implications; its necessity; and other matters. Unfortunately, however, the Hudson Institute book does not appear to be an independent analysis. Rather, it appears to be one financed in part by the Department of Defense.

On March 27, 1969, the Hudson Institute signed a contract with the Pentagon's Safeguard Systems Command for a study effort entitled "Strategic Implications of BMD Response." The letters "BMD" stand for ballistic missile defense; the ABM, of course, is the principal measure proposed as a defense against ballistic missiles. The price of this study was set at $34,973. Three months later, on June 20, 1969, this same contract was extended for an additional 4 months period, at a further cost of $35,280. Thus, the Pentagon has contracted with the Hudson Institute for some $70,253 for a short-range study of the strategic implications of responses to ballistic missile defenses. In other words, the Hudson Institute is examining, in part, what steps our adversaries might take in response to our ABM, and then what steps we would be forced to take in response to their steps, et cetera. Actually, the scope of work under this contract is classified secret—and thus not subject to public discussion.

This raises a number of serious questions.

Mr. Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute testified in favor of the ABM before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 28, 1969, ostensibly as an independent expert. Yet at that time the institute was under contract to the Pentagon for studies relating to the ABM.

The Hudson Institute, while under a Pentagon contract for this study, has apparently sponsored a book in favor of ABM deployment. Yet nowhere in the press reports is there an indication that Hudson Institute prepared this book while under Pentagon contract.

Only a few years ago there were revelations that the Government had, through contracts of this sort, arranged for the publication of books favorable to its positions without indicating the fact of Government support. The Congress acted at that time with an intent to forestall similar abuses in the future.

I do not think that the efficacy of the ABM debate is raised by this activity. We do not need more imformation from vested interests; rather, we need independent, objective, and skilled judgments. The Hudson ABM book does not appear to reflect this need.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. When I read in this morning's paper that a book on behalf of the ABM was being published by the Hudson Institute, I recalled that, for at least a decade, and very likely more, this institute has been under contract for research projects with the Pentagon. I have asked for some figures as to just how much the Hudson Institute has received as remuneration. Let me make it clear that I have no fault to find with the institute's publishing this book. But, at the same time, I think the special connection involved ought to be made very clear also. In going back only 3 years, including this year, the figures show that in 1967, this organization received from the Department of Defense $713,000. In 1968 it received $444,000, under a Democratic administration, I might say. So far in 1969, under both a Democratic and Republican administration, I would assume, it received $873,000. That comes to about $2 million covering 3 years, and the third year has not been completed.

I am wondering how much the Hudson Institute has received over the past decade or more, and I wonder how much it has produced in return. Aside from books and monographs such as this, I wonder what it has given to the Government for the money expended. I wonder how much of the research money, which comes to $8 billion last year for the Department of Defense alone, has been siphoned to the Hudson Institute, the Rand Corp., colleges and universities, and other institutes in this country. I think that would make a most interesting study. And I would like to know the results, not to mention the subjects covered.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in brief response, I think the figures that were placed in the RECORD by the majority leader are extremely important and significant. What troubled me in this regard, and what led me to comment on this matter, was the fact that Mr. Donald Brennan, of the Hudson Institute, testified on the question of the ABM before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, ostensibly as an independent expert. I am sure some very serious questions are raised in the minds of all of us with respect to the relationship between the studies of the institute on the strategic implications of the ABM response for the Pentagon, which services were contracted for, and then the States given the later testimony of Mr. Brennan as an independent expert when he testified in support of the ABM. Now we have the announcement that the institute is going to publish this book.

As we begin what the majority leader has described as perhaps the most significant and important matter that will come before the Senate this year, we must come to grips with the problem of evaluation of evidence. It is timely that those questions be raised in order to evaluate the weight we ought to give various documents, statistics, and data as they are presented to us.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. In regard to the comments of both the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Montana, I am sure they do not imply that we cannot trust the Hudson Institute. If we take that approach during the course of the debate, the Senate is going to be rather shocked at the tremendous amount of money that, under the guise of research and development, has been pumped into institutions in this country. From what I know about it, we might even talk about a 30-percent cut across the board without being hurt at all.

For example, Dr. Wiesner, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, is one of the receivers of Government money, but I do not for one moment regard Dr. Wiesner as having his judgment affected by the fact that he is one of the biggest contractors under the research and development funds.

I would feel very remiss in my concern about this whole question if I allowed the influence to stand that the Hudson Institute had done something under the table or something bad. Dr. Wiesner has testified in opposition to the ABM, I know Herman Kahn is for it and has testified in that manner.

It would be very difficult, in fact, at this stage of the game, to find some academic type who has not been on record publicly either for or against the ABM.

I am glad that the majority leader mentioned this matter. I hope I shall be able to present a complete inventory of these funds. I doubt that I shall be able to, because I can assure the Senator it is a tremendous outlay. But I think it is subject to some of the biggest cuts we can make in the military outlay.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Arizona. I hope that he will not gather the impression that what was said by the distinguished assistant majority leader and the Senator from Montana carried any imputation or implication along the lines which the Senator thought he detected.

I was one of those who tried last year, and tried mightily, to bring about a 25-percent reduction in overhead cost for all of such research activity carried on by corporations and by universities and colleges. I had sweeping success in the Appropriations Committee, and resounding success on the Senate floor; but when the bill came back from conference, it was just another amendment which had lost its way.

The Massachusetts Institute of Technology is, I think, the recipient of the largest overall grant total for research from the Department of Defense; but I daresay that it is a rare university in this country which has not participated to some extent, which may or may not be a good thing. I should be happy to join the Senator this year in an effort to bring about a sizable reduction in cost of the research and development aspect of the Defense Department's activities, aside from missile projects and the like, and I would be hopeful that what the Committee on Armed Services has already accomplished—that is, to cut research by approximately $1 billion—could be doubled on the floor this week or next.

I think the Senator understands the situation clearly. It is not a matter of imputation or implication; it is a matter of interest in how these funds are being spent, and what is achieved as a result of the spending.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might say for the information of the Senate, and this will be brought out if it has not already been, that the full Senate Committee on Armed Services is divided into a number of subcommittees this year for the first time; and the Subcommittee on Research and Development, under the able leadership of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE), has turned in what in my opinion has been an outstanding job; but there is so much to uncover and to cover that it could not be done, in my opinion, in the time we have spent on it, which is about 5 months.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have boxes of documents this high, this long, and this wide [indicating]. I think it costs the Pentagon something on the order of $100,000 to collect this information. May I say that when the Appropriations Committee became interested last year in the subject it did not know at the time what was being done in the middle and lower echelons as far as research was concerned. That was how widespread the problem was. It is very difficult to look into, because we can only make a start. There are as the Senator has pointed out, a terrific number of research projects which, in years gone by, the Pentagon has undertaken.

I do not blame the Pentagon. The blame must rest with us, here in the Congress, because all that had to be done, up until this year, was to ask, and the Pentagon received.

I am delighted that the subcommittee of which the distinguished Senator from Arizona is a member, and the full Armed Services Committee, were able to cut approximately $1 billion from the research funds this year.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I should like to make a slight correction. I am not a member of that subcommittee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator should be.

Mr. GOLDWATER. But I am very much intrigued by it, because I had no idea of the extent of it. During my self-imposed sabbatical for 4 years, my former colleagues seemingly went rather wild on this subject of academic research and development. I do not mean research and development on such matters as bending iron or aluminum, or building things, but the kind of research and development for which I can find no relationship to the needs of the Defense Department. I hope—and this suggestion has been made to the chairman of the committee, who has shown great willingness to cooperate—that this subcommittee will be made permanent, with an adequate staff to go into these things, not just every year, but on a day-by-day basis.

I do not want the Senator from Massachusetts or the Senator from Montana to think I was reading into their comments anything that might imply dishonesty on the part of the Hudson Institute, but this can become a very emotional issue. I hope and pray it will not.

I think this is probably the most important issue this body will vote upon in many years. I believe the whole future of our country, nationally and internationally, rests upon what we can wisely do here, without permitting emotion to get into it.

I recall just the other day a citizen of our country, at his own expense, ran a full page advertisement in the newspapers, and was bitterly attacked on the floor of the Senate, even being called a liar. I hope we can discuss this matter in a gentle and scholarly way. It will have to be discussed, and I know it will be.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. In regard to the earlier reference to Mr. Weisner and MIT, the RECORD should reflect, that if there is a conflict of interest, Mr. Weisner's position on this subject would be likely to be against his own professional interests and those of MIT. In regard to Mr. Brennan and Mr. Kahn on the other hand, the record indicates that they decided matters consistent with the position and interests of the institution they represent.

I should also like to make just a further brief comment about MIT. Just last week, as a matter of fact, President Johnson and Dr. Killian came down to see me about the results of a rather extensive report that had been prepared by members of the student body, the faculty and certain select members of the alumni relative to the institute's position to the Lincoln Laboratories. The Lincoln Laboratories, as a matter of record, receives extensive funding from the Defense Department. The study indicates great interest in trying to find new directions to move in, away from the heavy dependence upon the Defense Department for funding of its activities. Many other great universities have similar connections with institutions which depend in significant measure upon Defense Department Research and Development funds and it is a source of concern to students, faculty and alumni.

Another example of this conflict is Stanford University and the Stanford Research Institute, with the latter receiving approximately half its operating budget of $64 million from the Department of Defense.

I think it was to the credit of MIT, the faculty, and student body as well as the alumni, that they have really taken the bit in their teeth in seeking to determine what can be done to solve this dilemma. I think the position they have taken is a wise one, and the universities should be assured that we who are in Congress are going to have to try to find ways that we can help assist those institutions which have developed this dependency, to move out into other fields.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator has that attitude. I know that MIT has it; and I know that Stanford and many of our top universities engaged in nuclear research, physical research, and so forth, will want to take another look at the problem.

But I think we also have to keep in mind that a lot of weapons are being dreamed up in the laboratories of these institutions. Though rarely do weapons systems come flowering full blown off the drawing boards of astronomical or aeronautical researchers, I think the future of our country will depend more and more upon the academic sector. I think our job is to help them determine what their guidelines should be as to their participation and what they should do, and get along further with handling the buck which, to paraphase an old friend, stops here.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to add one thing to what the Senator from Arizona has said, and that is that, while I can understand why we should oversee carefully the work carried on by the academic community under Defense Department auspices, I think it well to remember that until we can achieve a world in which everyone lays down his arms, we will have to continue doing research and development work.

If we do not have the academic community for assistance, it means we will have to do it in haste which, once again, means that the cost and the imagination and the ability to get this done as economically and feasibly as possible would be lost.

I would hate to see us do that. I have heard it said on the floor that we ought to get the ROTC out of the colleges. Yet young people whom I have talked to say they do not want the military, because they do not think the people are educated enough. I say, "If you want that, why do you not let the ROTC go through the colleges and get them into the military?"

It makes no sense to me to throw them out when we need educated officers.

We have to be careful in our analysis and not let emotion run away with us and say that we do not want a war and so we are going to get out of the whole situation.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in connection with what portion of the Hudson Institute funds comes from the Department of Defense, I happened to ask Dr. Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute that very question when he appeared before us in open session.

Dr. Brennan's reply quoted on page 383 of the hearings before the Subcommittee on International Organizational Disarmament Affairs for March 28, 1969, was:

> The proportion would be perhaps three-fourths.

That would mean that only one-fourth of the funds of the Hudson Institute come from any sources anywhere, private or governmental, in the United States other than from the Defense Department.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the more Senators know about the ABM question, the more Senators in my opinion will oppose the deployment of an ABM weapon system.

When the question was before Congress heretofore, my subcommittee held extensive secret hearings. So far as I know, no secrets were withheld from the committee. But much information essential for a public judgment upon the issue was withheld from the public and from the Senate generally, except that any Senator, of course, could go to the committee rooms and obtain from the vaults the secret testimony and there read it.

This year, upon my recommendation, the subcommittee concluded to have public hearings. We felt that it was essential to involve the American people in this very important, very basic decision.

The hearings, as Senators know, have been extended. Members of the intelligence community and the universities,

scientists, engineers, and authorities made themselves available by the hundreds to testify.

It has been, I believe, truly an educational experience. At the beginning of that hearing the opposition to the deployment of ABM was very much in the minority. As information accumulated, so did opposition.

So far as I know, no secret information has now been withheld from my committee. Therefore, we are fully prepared to debate it in secret session. I shall bring to the floor of the Senate numerous secret documents, including the testimony of the CIA. Nothing will be withheld from the Chamber. The more Senators kr.ow about the ABM, the more Senators will be opposed to it. I intend to afford them the opportunity to know the full story.

I know what the secrets are. What are they? They involve intelligence, intelligence estimates, sources of intelligence. They involve the yield of weapons, the geometry of weapons, trajectory, time elements, details of computers, radar, and so forth.

The secret information is largely technical.

Mr. President, there is ample information available not only to the Senate but also to the American people with which to reach a decision upon the central issue involved.

What is the central issue? It is whether or not it is necessary to deploy an antiballistic defensive weapon system, the ABM, in order to preserve the integrity of the U.S. deterrence against a nuclear war.

This is the principal basis upon which this deployment is advanced. In the words of both the President and the Secretary of Defense, ABM deployment is necessary, "to preserve the integrity of our deterrence."

Is it? Is it? That is the central issue, and on that we have joined issue. It is neither necessary nor advisable.

Why is it not necessary? It is not necessary because our country has massive power of retaliation in a variety of categories—Minutemen, the ICBM's in our Minute silos, intercontinental airplane bombers, our nuclear submarine fleet, missiles on foreign bases, planes on foreign bases, tactical weapons under our command in the NATO forces, nuclear missile launches aboard surface vessels

There are so many and so much that our country has the power to lay 48 weapons—each one 50 times as powerful as the one that destroyed Hiroshima—on each of Russia's 50 largest cities. But Mr. Laird in public testimony on television before the American people, with millions of people listening and watching, said the Soviets are going for a first strike capability. Then he added, "There is no question about that."

Mr. President, there has been no intelligence estimate of the National Board of Intelligence to support that conclusion. And that information will be brought here in detail before the Senate.

Throughout this fight, there has been an attempt to spread an aura around the ABM, an aura of secrecy and thus win by secrecy what cannot be won in public debate in the light for all to see.

The Pentagon and the Pentagon projects thrive on secrecy. But Senators shall know.

I say the essential facts necessary to reach a judgment upon the central issue are publicly known, and I am proud to have had a part in making them publicly known.

Oh, yes. Mr. Laird says that deployment of ABM is necessary to preserve the integrity of our deterrence; therefore, he says, we must deploy ABM.

Is it necessary? The answer is "No," because of the magnitude of this country's retaliatory capacity. Deterrence has two parts: First, the power to retaliate with devastation upon an enemy who should attack the United States; second, the will to use that power. There is no question that the United States has the power; and if this country should be attacked with nuclear weapons, I have no doubt that it has the will to use that power. The important question is, What is the estimate of the Soviets of these two elements? What is their estimate of our power to retaliate if they should launch a nuclear war against us? I think they know what our power is.

What is their estimate of our will? This I do not know. But I surely do not wish to plant any questions in their mind. They are not frightened with ABM's. ABM's are not a deterrent.

Right in the beginning of this debate, let it be known that the senior Senator from Tennessee believes that we need to preserve the integrity of our deterrents. There will be no victory in a nuclear war. We would lose; they would lose; civilization would lose; everything would be lost in a nuclear exchange between Russia and the United States.

The way to win this battle is to prevent nuclear war; and to prevent it we need to have a deterrent—an unquestioned deterrent—not only the power to retaliate, but the will to retaliate. The important place for that to be rested is in the mind of anyone thinking to attack the United States with nuclear weapons. This is the central question.

Secretary Laird, in more recent testimony, has not again repeated his view that the Soviets were going for a first-strike capability. A first-strike capability, as the senior Senator from Missouri knows, is a word or term of art to the military. I placed in the RECORD an official interpretation of the term. It means, in laymen's language, the capability of striking a country a first blow with such devastation that that country will not have the power to retaliate with unacceptable risk.

I ask the Senator from Missouri if that is a correct statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I would say that it is a correct interpretation.

If the Senator from Tennessee will yield to me for a brief remark, I would hope that every Member of the Senate would realize that for many years the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has been a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Missouri. I was a member of a small subcommittee that handled the appropriation for the Manhattan District when Oak Ridge, Tenn., was still a wilderness. I have been involved in nuclear energy since its very beginning. So far as I know, no secrets have ever been withheld from me. No secrets will be withheld from the Senate in this debate.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad that the able Senator brought up that fact, because he was deeply interested in the atomic picture when he was a Member of the House of Representatives for many years prior to his coming to the Senate. Therefore, I say without fear of contradiction that his position in this matter is at least as experienced as that of any other Member of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

I wanted to say at this time, right in the very beginning, that we need to keep our minds on the central question: Is the deployment of ABM necessary to preserve the integrity of our deterrence? I think the answer, unquestionably, is No. Then the question is, If unnecessary, or though unnecessary, is it advisable? This leads to the involvement of our will and the estimate of our will. But more important, perhaps, it leads to the third point, which is that our deployment of ABM will stimulate and accelerate another round in the nuclear armaments race, out of which will come not more but less security for our country; less opportunity, not more, to avoid a nuclear war. So let us start the debate on this level.

I know there are questions as to whether it will work; questions about the computers; questions about the radar; questions about accidental detonations; many questions and doubts. These are mostly tangential and secondary issues.

The fundamental issue, let me repeat, is this: Is the deployment of ABM necessary for the Soviets to know that we have the power to retaliate with devastation if they should level an atomic attack against us? And is it necessary or advisable to deploy ABM to convince them of our will to do so if they start a war? Or would ABM deployment affect their estimate of our will to retaliate?

We have no intention of starting nuclear war. Our strategy has been postulated on the thesis that the way to prevent a nuclear war is to have the power to retaliate. This is the deterrence. This is what Winston Churchill called the balance of terror.

So, Mr. President, let the Senate examine these basic questions. We can argue all day and all week about the technicalities, about the computers, about the programing of computers, about the geometry of the weapons, the yield of weapons, projectile timing, and so forth. These things will have a bearing upon the issue. But the essential facts are already available, not only to the Senate, but, fortunately, to the American people, to reach a decision on the basic question.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HART. I merely wish to thank the Senator for opening the debate in the fashion he has—effective, restrained, thoughtful, and, I think, magnificent. I wish all Senators could have heard it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Michigan.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I wish to add my own word of accord and to add that I wish all Senators could read the thrust of the argument of the Senator from Tennessee which, I think, is well digested from many hours of testimony.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that the secret hearing with Secretary Laird on the question of intelligence estimates, after the making of certain deletions, is going to the printer tonight.

It will be available to the public on Wednesday or Thursday and then the Senate and, fortunately, the American people can determine for themselves whether the Secretary now maintains that the "Soviets are going for a first-strike capability."

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to join with Senators in commending the distinguished Senator from Tennessee on his most eloquent and well-reasoned presentation this evening. I think the Senator, not only this evening but also during the conduct of the hearings he held, with the quality of the witnesses and the thrust of his questions, performed an extremely important service to this body and to the people.

I wish to join him and commend him this evening. I wish to say that I am certainly hopeful that his voice will be heard often during the course of discussion and debate because there are few Members of the Senate who have his understanding, background, and experience in this subject.

I thank the Senator for his comments. My only regret is that more Senators did not hear him.

GREECE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak have written three excellent columns that appeared in the Washington Post on the present situation in Greece. The first of these articles, entitled "Greece Facing Grim Alternatives: Salazar-Type Rule or Bloody Revolt," appeared in the Post on June 19. The second, entitled "U.S. Action Against Greek Junta Is Prevented by Military Needs," appeared on June 23. The third, entitled "Nature of Greek Junta Underscored by Arrest of Distinguished General," appeared on June 26.

I ask unanimous consent that these three articles be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Mr. Evans and Mr. Novak make statements that deserve close attention. They note that if the colonels who seized power in 1967 ever intended any partial return to representative government, that intention is dead. They quote the Deputy Premier as saying, when asked about popular elections, "Nobody wants elections" and theorize that this attitude may be due to the fact that the military regime's popular base is so low that calling elections "would be equivalent to surrendering power." They characterize Greece as a "huge political pressure cooker" which they say may explode into insurrection with Communists in leading roles. Messrs, Evans and Novak argue that the need for a tough U.S. stand against the military dictatorship "is being undermined by the Pentagon's military requirements in the eastern Mediterranean." They report that the commander of the U.S. Military Advisory Group and his subordinate officers "have exercised little discretion in telling their Greek counterparts how they oppose the Embassy's fastidiousness about democracy." In their last column, they point to the case of the imprisoned General Koumanakos against whom no formal charge is pending, no trial is scheduled, and no limit of imprisonment has been placed. The implications of the sentiments aroused by the Koumanakos case, according to Messrs. Evans and Novak, include the possibility that many Greeks who have viewed Communists as their blood enemies now see the colonels ruling Greece as their real foes.

The three columns by Messrs. Evans and Novak do not paint a pretty picture but they do portray the political situation in Greece today with its very real dangers for Greece tomorrow.

This also brings to our minds the need that there be appointed to Athens a tough-minded, strong-willed, civilian-oriented ambassador who will express the wishes of the United States the best he can and will nudge Greece a little further along toward democracy.

EXHIBIT 1

GREECE FACING GRIM ALTERNATIVES: SALAZAR-TYPE RULE OR BLOODY REVOLT

ATHENS.—The Greek military dictatorship, after two years of bland assurances to Washington about restoring democracy, intends to retain power indefinitely without free elections—posing immense danger to long-range stability in the strategic eastern Mediterranean.

If the colonels who seized power April 21, 1967, on the pretext of preventing communism here ever intended any partial return to representative government, that intention is dead. Even the few politicians who have tried to cooperate with the colonels now concede that Col. George Papadopoulos, the Premier, envisions an institutionalized tyranny modeled after Salazar's 37-year dictatorship in Portugal.

Unlike our last visit there two years ago when the freshly installed junta pledged an early return to constitutional forms, the regime now regards itself as permanent. Brig. Gen. Stylianos Pattakos, Deputy Premier and the junta's No. 2 man, bristled when we asked about popular elections. "That is an internal matter that you cannot inquire about," he said. "Go ask the people on the street. Nobody wants elections."

Indeed, all objective sources here agree that the military regime would lose badly in free elections. The colonels' "revolution," attempting by edict to transform the Greeks into work-oriented puritans, has depleted what popularity the regime enjoyed in 1967. Although past Greek governments have had excellent success in rigging elections, the military regime's popular base is so low—perhaps 10 per cent—that calling elections would be equivalent to surrendering power.

Unwilling to surrender power, the colonels have turned Greece into a huge political pressure-cooker with the true feeling of the Greeks suppressed by the local gendarmerie's watchful eye. An election today probably would show a sharp leftward swing. More ominously, after two or three additional years, the pressure-cooker may explode into insurrection with Communists in leading roles.

These ominous prospects have their source in perhaps the tightest police state this side of Moscow. Violating the colonels' own new constitution, non-Communist potential foes of the regime—mainly army officers and intellectuals—are imprisoned without indictment or trials. Reports of torture are impossible to verify in detail, but maltreatment and brutalization of law-level political prisoners continue.

Former political leaders are watched constantly. They cannot speak their view, are denied passports to travel abroad, and have their mail and telephone calls monitored. One former Premier cannot move without a car full of police agents following him. All former cabinet members are tailed when they visit their old constituencies.

The regime's iron vise is even tighter on the academic world. So many teachers have been purged that the educational system is crippled. Distinguished professors are subject to humiliating interrogation by Col. John Ladas, hard-line secretary general of the Interior Ministry. University students, solidly against the regime, are intimidated by police agents attending their very classes. A further deterrent is formed by severe prison sentences given six young teaching assistants (two of whom later were tortured) for distributing anti-junta propaganda.

The first armed resistance against this tyranny has come from the right: clandestine supporters of exiled King Constantine. Infrequently reported in the controlled Greek press are daily bombing incidents in the heart of Athens (forcing the government court martial to change buildings): There have been unconfirmed reports that the royalist resistance was responsible for the recent deaths of three pro-junta officers.

Thus, 16 retired officers arrested recently are all royalists with anti-Communist records (two of them with service in the Korean war). The regime's contention that the arrested officers participated in a left-wing army plot is only a propaganda smokescreen.

Harassing though it may be, however, the royalist resistance is incapable of overthrowing a regime so vigilant against potential opposition. Remembering the existence of the anti-Nazi resistance in World War II, Greeks fear that the Communists—better organized than ever—will dominate if and when the resistance assumes major proportions.

That day remains relatively distant. Greek Communists, badly fragmented into rival segments, are passive. The Soviet Ambassador here is circumspect, declining to discuss Greek internal affairs during a recent two-hour luncheon with an anti-junta politician. The Communists know the time is not ripe for insurrection.

But heavy government borrowing and stagnant investment here the last two years are storm signals for the modest prosperity now enjoyed by Greece. If an economic recession and rising discontent with dictatorship intersect some years from now, the dismal alternatives may be these: an institutionalized police state along Salazar lines or a bloody insurrection with Red overtones. Before that happens, however, the colonels might yet be

turned out by a strong stand against them from Washington—a prospect, even though unlikely, worthy of discussion in a later column.

U.S. ACTION AGAINST GREEK JUNTA IS PREVENTED BY MILITARY NEEDS

ATHENS.—The growing need by U.S. foreign policy for a tough stand against the Greek military dictatorship to avert ultimate political tragedy here is being undermined by the Pentagon's military requirements in the eastern Mediterranean.

Indeed, Greece poses a critical dilemma in American foreign policy. A return to Greek democracy may well depend upon U.S. repudiation of the colonels and halting all military aid. But such action conceivably could deprive the U.S., in the short run at least, of naval bases and communications guidance for the 6th Fleet and Polaris submarines vital to the nuclear deterrent.

Those military considerations prevent sharp U.S. action against the junta. But the long-run cost could be immense. At worst, perpetuated dictatorship here could trigger a popular insurrection led by the Communists. At best, U.S. permissiveness toward the military regime already is building intense anti-American sentiment which will surface in any regime that replaces the colonels without Washington's help. Thus, the long-range U.S. military position in the eastern Mediterranean is becoming dependent on permanent tyranny in Athens.

Even though military needs inhibit American diplomats, relations between the Greek government and the U.S. Embassy here—so intimate for 20 years—are icy. The junta deeply resents the absence of an American ambassador since January. U.S. diplomats do not hide their displeasure with the colonels' aim of institutionalized dictatorship.

But whatever impact this official American frigidity might have is counteracted by the U.S. Military Advisory Group here whose commander, Maj. Gen. Samuel Eaton and his subordinate officers have exercised little discretion in telling their Greek counterparts how they oppose the Embassy's fastidiousness about democracy.

Any psychological influence of the vacant Ambassador's chair is obliterated by constant shuttling in and out of Athens by U.S. officers assigned to NATO. Their photographs in friendly poses with Col. George Papadopoulos, the Prime Minister, almost daily adorn the controlled Greek newspapers. Most notorious was the reply to a Papadopoulos toast by Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, retiring NATO commander, in which Lemnitzer conveniently omitted phrases about democracy and the rule of law while quoting from the NATO Treaty's preamble.

The same impression was given by President Nixon's shabby treatment of King Constantine, self-exiled in Rome since his bungled counter-coup in December, 1967. A tentative visit with the King during Mr. Nixon's visit to Rome early this year was cancelled after pressure from the junta. Constantine was denied a meeting with the President while in Washington for the Eisenhower funeral (although Brig. Gen. Stylianos Pattakos, the Deputy Prime Minister, had a few minutes with Mr. Nixon).

Moreover, the Greek colonels are expert at disregarding signs of displeasure from Washington. In an interview, Gen. Pattakos told us that the portion of military aid which has remained suspended since the coup of April 21 will be resumed soon. When we asked the basis for this forecast, Pattakos replied with a statement that simply is untrue: "President Nixon has promised it."

In fact, Pattakos's triumphant account of his Washington visit was so removed from reality that the State Department on April 24 issued a sharp statement indicating Pattakos had been urged to restore representative government and civil liberties. When we asked about that statement, Pattakos told us it did not represent the U.S. Government's position. Then who wrote it? "Some Communists," he snapped.

Summoning up, a conservative Greek politician says: "Everybody I know thinks the American Government participated in the coup." Old-line politicians such as former Prime Minister Panagiotis Canellopoulos argue with friends that Washington cannot be blamed. But among the younger generation and particularly students, anti-American feeling is rising steadily in a land where once it was almost unknown.

Nevertheless, the United States might yet put itself on the side of democracy. The three elements whose maneuvering degraded Greek political life before the coup—the King and the two major political parties—are belatedly cooperating and ready to form an interim unity government.

Tentatively, King Constantine would return as rallying point for all Greeks with the government headed by conservative Constantine Karamanlis, who provided stability during eight years as Prime Minister and is now exiled in Paris. But neither the King, nor, more important, Karamanlis will return to Athens without Washington's repudiation of the junta.

Few realistic Greeks, however, believe the Nixon Administration will move decisively against the colonels. That accounts for skepticism among gloomy Greek democrats that the dictatorship can be terminated peacefully. Worse yet, they feel preoccupation with naval bases is wedding the United States to the fate of the colonels, be it a generation of tyranny or their violent overthrow and the dangerous days that would lie beyond.

NATURE OF GREEK JUNTA UNDERSCORED BY ARREST OF DISTINGUISHED GENERAL

ATHENS.—The true nature of the Greek military dictatorship is revealed in the fate of Maj. Gen. George E. Koumanakos, who gained international renown fighting Communists on the field of battle and is now completing his 17th month of imprisonment by the colonels who claim they have saved Greece from communism.

The Koumanakos case is another example, dismally frequent in this generation, of Kafka come to life. No formal charge is pending, no trial is scheduled, no fixed limit has been put on his captivity. Underlining the Kafkaesque touch, Koumanakos had kept scrupulously free of political connections—unlike many fellow Greek officers.

Why then is he imprisoned? For precautionary reasons. Koumanakos, a living legend in the Korean War as the fearless commander of the Hellenic Expeditionary Forces, is a patriot who some day conceivably might oppose the present tyrants. Thus, the junta took no chances with a potential rebel.

Koumanakos is one of many. The distinguished Adm. Athanasios Spanides, 66, is beginning his 14th consecutive month of detention in a Greek village. A brigadier, one of the army's most daring officers, is in poor health after suffering head injuries (supposedly in a diving accident) while in captivity. A highly respected retired major general who responded to his recent early morning arrest by slapping the face of the arresting officer was beaten bloody by security troops.

But the case of Koumanakos is perhaps closest to Kafka because of his valorous and wholly nonpolitical career. As a youth in World War II, Koumanakos won a battlefield commission and later escaped the Nazi occupation to join Free Greek bombing squadrons. He was in combat against the Communists throughout the bloody Greek Civil War of 1947–49, winning special commendation from Lt. Gen. James Van Fleet as the conqueror of Mount Cleftis.

But Koumanakos's greatest fame as a soldier came in the mountains of Korea in exploits that inspired his U.S. comrades in an official report of March 25, 1953. Koumanakos's American superior officer, Col. R. E. Akers, Jr., said:

"The Greeks are truly fierce soldiers . . . Yet all their individual courage and resolution is best symbolized in their commander, Lt. Col. Koumanakos. He has constructed for himself an outlook . . . which is higher and nearer the enemy than any other post of a senior commander in Korea. Col. Koumanakos is my eagle. He goes to his battle position high above his soldiers each evening . . . Col. Koumanakos would welcome a Communist attack."

After winning the U.S. Silver Star and Legion of Merit, Koumanakos commanded the Greek military detachment on Cyprus in the 1960 crisis, headed general staff operations in 1964–65, and then retired. So circumspect was he about keeping out of politics that he purposely went abroad in the spring of 1967 to avoid the national election campaign that was canceled by the colonels' coup of April 27, 1967.

Assuming that he had nothing to fear from anti-Communist fellow officers, Koumanakos returned to Greece May 17. Seven days later he was arrested at his home without charge. The General was held for five months at the police station, then transferred to a small, damp prison cell for common criminals where he suffered a heart attack three days later. After a week in the prison hospital, Koumanakos was released in a Christmas amnesty. The charge, made five months after his arrest and never substantiated, was a misdemeanor: "calumniating another officer in 1963."

Koumanakos lived quietly after his release, still refraining from politics. Nevertheless, he was pulled from his bed last Aug. 13 and rearrested following the assassination attempt against Col. George Papadopoulos, the Prime Minister. Charged only with being "dangerous for the country's security," Koumanakos has spent nine months in closely-guarded exile in three villages.

He is now at Deskati in northern Thessaly, sometimes confined for days to his room in a peasant house. He is forbidden to talk to officers or foreigners and the local gendarmerie warns the villagers not to talk to the General. He is given a private soldier's pay of 17 drachmae (about 60 cents) a day for food and shelter.

Col. Nicholas Makarezos, a key member of the junta who served under Koumanakos against the Communist guerrillas, has privately expressed shock at his imprisonment but has done nothing about it. When Koumanakos's wife appealed to the U.S. Embassy, she was informed by a high-ranking diplomat that this was not an American concern. Koumanakos has refused to write his old American comrades-in-arms because he does not want to criticize Greek officers to foreigners.

Those sentiments reveal an officer of the old school, which may be why the colonels have imprisoned him. But the precautionary detention is producing one side effect. Gen. Koumanakos's friends and family for a generation have viewed the Communists as their blood enemies, but now see their real foes as the colonels reigning in Athens. The profound implications of that change in outlook are yet to be felt.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 8, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.