

All major crimes in the District rose 21.9 per cent while the increase for the nation was 9 per cent, according to the tabulations of reports voluntarily submitted by police departments throughout the country.

Murder and non-negligent man-slaughter in the District climbed from 88 in the first half of 1968 to 125 in the first half of 1969, a rise of 42 per cent. The national increase was 8 per cent while the increase for the 18 cities similar to Washington in size was 18 per cent.

Rape increased by 50 per cent, rising from 100 in 1968 to 150 this year. The increase was 15 per cent nationally and 34 per cent in Washington's class of cities.

Robberies in the District climbed from 3,491 in 1968 to 5,098 in 1969, a 46 per cent rise. The increase for the nation was 17 per cent and for Washington-sized cities 21 per cent.

Aggravated assault here rose 15.9 per cent, from 1,489 incidents to 1,725; burglary was up 14.5 per cent, from 8,829 to 10,107; larceny \$50 and over rose 57.9 per cent, 3,138 to 4,794; and auto theft dropped 4 per cent with 4,673 reported in the first half of this year compared to 4,878 last year.

Washington, the nation's ninth largest city, ranked sixth in murders after passing Baltimore and Houston which had more in the first half of 1968.

The District moved from sixth to fifth in robberies, again passing Baltimore. The District ranked eighth in assaults and 14th in rapes.

However, Washingtonians can take gloomy comfort from the two cities closest to theirs in size. In Cleveland, murder was up 53.9 per cent, rape 59.3 per cent and robbery 61.6 per cent. In St. Louis, murder jumped 50.6 per cent, rape 63.8 per cent and robbery 27.3 per cent.

Even more startling was San Francisco where murder jumped 102.8 per cent and rape rose 183.5 per cent.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1969]  
RECTOR SAYS RAPISTS SHOULD BE STERILIZED

The rector of Washington's fourth largest Episcopal church this week advocated compulsory sterilization for convicted rapists.

The Rev. Frank Blackwelder, rector of All Souls' Memorial Church, Cathedral Avenue

and Woodley Place NW, proposed such a legal penalty as a part of what he called "drastic action" to combat the rise of serious crimes in Washington.

In his congregation's weekly bulletin, Dr. Blackwelder also advocated a nightly curfew, National Guard street patrols and special protection in areas where cultural, athletic and religious affairs are being held.

The rector spoke sharply of "one group of Christian ministers" whom he said "has contributed more to stirring up people, leading them to think that they have a right to retaliate if they believe they have been suppressed or frustrated."

"If the Christian churches of Washington were all devoted to suggesting that people become better, not worse . . . that individuals earn their way by honest toil, not by armed coercion, a better city may evolve," he said.

All Souls' has frequently expressed differences with the social action policies endorsed by the Episcopal Diocese of Washington. This year it declined to pledge or pay any part of the \$14,083 it was asked to contribute to the diocesan mission program.

#### AMENDMENT TO CONSTITUTION POSES DANGERS

**HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 23, 1969

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I voted for House Joint Resolution 681 proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the direct election of the President and Vice President. Much soul-searching went into this vote, for I disliked several things about the legislation and the effects it would have on the political system in the United States. The amendment poses the following dangers:

First. That it is not only possible, but altogether probable that no President of the future will represent the majority will of the people. Written into this legislation

is the factor that a man becoming President can take office with nearly 60 percent of the voters expressing no preference for him.

Second. That our present federal system of representative government will be replaced by the kind of popular democracy such as exists in France. This type of system has created much instability in that country.

Third. That a multiplicity of political parties will be created. The proliferation of splinter parties could have a divisive effect on national politics and ultimately result in a government of deals rather than a government of the people.

Fourth. That there is a danger of a costly runoff election process in which almost anything could happen. Furthermore, House Joint Resolution 681 does not establish the procedure whereby the runoff election would be carried out.

Fifth. That there is a real possibility, expressed by even the most avid supporters of this legislation, that even if it is approved by two-thirds of both Houses of Congress, it could not be ratified by the necessary three-fourths of the States as required by the Constitution. This would result in the retention of the present system which, in my opinion, poses dangers greater than are inherent in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, although these dangers are serious, I voted for the resolution in order that it can be immediately received by the State legislative bodies in time for ratification by the next presidential election. Once there, the public, now aware of the relative values of the proposed amendment and the present electoral system, can make their views known through their State representatives. In the true sense of the Federal system, the people of the United States will be able to express their direct will, and speak on the issue of whether or not they want a direct election system.

## SENATE—Wednesday, September 24, 1969

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Vice President.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** This morning we are very honored to have a guest chaplain, the Reverend William J. Reiss, D.D., executive secretary, the Division of Service to Military Personnel, Lutheran Council in the United States of America, Washington, D.C. We are also very pleased to welcome the guest chaplains from the Lutheran Church.

The Reverend William J. Reiss, D.D., executive secretary, the Division of Service to Military Personnel, Lutheran Council in the United States of America, offered the following prayer:

Almighty and everlasting God, we implore Thee graciously to regard this assembled group of chosen Senators, and all others in authority, that, guided by Thee, they may be high in purpose, wise in counsel, and unwavering in duty; and in the administration of their solemn charge may serve Thy will, uphold the honor of our Nation, secure the protection of our people, and set forward every righteous cause. We would also ask Thy

blessing upon the millions of our men and women in the military service of our Nation, sustain all chaplains in whose hands rest the responsibility for the moral and spiritual welfare of these service people and bless their ministry.

And now may we all address ourselves to the duties of this day with renewed vigor and zeal. We ask it in Jesus' name. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, September 23, 1969, be dispensed with.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-162)

**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 Public Works:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

In accordance with Section 10(a) of Public Law 358, 83d Congress, as amended, I am transmitting the Annual Report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1968.

**RICHARD NIXON.**  
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1969.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations,

which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the colloquy between the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

#### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of State.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these nominations be considered en bloc. But before the Chair makes a ruling, may I say that I am delighted especially with the promotion of Mr. William B. Macomber, Jr., who has been an outstanding, impartial, and first-rate liaison man between the Department of State and Congress, who has conducted himself with impeccable integrity and dedication, and whose understanding is unquestioned.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should like to add my commendation to the President and the Secretary for recognizing the achievements of Mr. Macomber. He served with great distinction as an Ambassador to Jordan during the Eisenhower administration, he served with great effectiveness in the Department of State during President Kennedy's administration, and he served later during the administration of President Johnson.

In every contact I have had with Mr. Macomber, regardless of the question or the administration in which he was serving, I have found him to be a man of great integrity, industry, and intelligence, and I think he is an outstanding selection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his kind remarks about William Macomber.

I do not know Assistant Secretary Meyer or Ambassador Humes, but I was much impressed on seeing them for the first time on yesterday.

Also, I am delighted that the nomination of Graham A. Martin, our former Ambassador to Thailand, likewise has been reported favorably by the committee, because I think he has done an outstanding job in the various posts to which he has been assigned.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am very happy that William B. Macomber, Jr., nominated by President Nixon to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State, has been recommended for confirmation by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and will be confirmed shortly by the Senate.

Mr. Macomber has served under President Eisenhower when he was an assistant to the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, by whom he was held in the highest regard, and he served in important posts under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. In every position he has rendered great service to our country. He is a man of great ability, whose loyalty, good judgment, and unquestioned integrity attract the confidence of all.

I am sure that he will make an important contribution to his new office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

#### REPRESENTATIVE TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Idar Rimestad to be the representative of the United States of America to the European office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I also take this opportunity to say how pleased I am that Idar Rimestad, from my neighboring State of North Dakota, has been selected to represent our country in Geneva, where he succeeds a most able Ambassador, Roger Tutty, of Vermont.

Mr. Rimestad has performed the functions of his office with dedication and integrity, and I think he is receiving a well deserved assignment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### MARKETING QUOTA REVIEW COMMITTEES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, notwithstanding the previous order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 417, S. 2226.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2226) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 as amended, to provide that review committee members may be appointed from any county within a State and that the Secretary of Agriculture may institute proceedings in court to obtain a review of any committee determination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 2, line 6, after the word "proceedings", insert "against the farmer as defendant"; so as to make the bill read:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:*

(1) Section 363 is amended by changing first sentence to read, "Any farmer who is dissatisfied with his farm marketing quota may, within fifteen days after mailing to him of notice as provided in section 362, have such quota reviewed by a local review committee composed of three farmers from the State appointed by the Secretary".

(2) Section 365 is amended (A) by adding after the third sentence thereof, "The Secretary may, within forty-five days after notice of the determination is mailed to the farmer, institute proceedings *against the farmer as defendant* in the United States district court to obtain a review of any review committee determination"; and (B) by changing "Thereupon" at the beginning of the fourth sentence to "Upon the institution of court proceedings under this section."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 90-421), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

#### EXPLANATION OF BILL

This bill would amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 to—

(1) permit farm marketing quota review committee members to be appointed from any county in the State (instead of from only the county in which the farm subject to the quota being reviewed is located or nearby counties); and

(2) permit the Secretary to obtain a court review of the review committee's determination.

#### COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

Existing law provides that the bill of complaint (in a proceeding brought by a farmer) shall be served upon a member of the review committee. The bill is silent as to who shall be served in a proceeding brought by the Secretary. The Committee amendment would clarify this situation by specifying that review proceedings instituted by the Secretary shall be "against the farmer as defendant".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, with the permission of the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), and while awaiting the arrival of another Senator, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the unanimous-consent agreement, I may proceed for 6 or 7 minutes.

**THE VICE PRESIDENT.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TAX LEGISLATION

**Mr. MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, conflicting reports, statements, and stories make it necessary to set the record straight on the matter of tax legislation. It will be recalled that last July, pursuant to the urging of the administration, the Senate extended the 10-percent surcharge on the income tax. The extension was for 6 months—that is, through the remainder of 1969—but not until June 30, 1970, as had been sought by the administration.

Frankly, as one Senator, I would have preferred not to see any extension of the surcharge except as part of a here-and-now tax reform and relief measure. Nevertheless, together with the other members of the majority policy committee I concurred in the scheduling of the 6-month extension because of certain conditions and understandings which occurred at the time.

In agreeing to a callup of the surtax, the majority policy committee insisted that tax reform and relief should not be left in a pigeonhole. It sought and received assurances that such a measure would be brought forth with dispatch for consideration by the Senate. In this connection, it was made clear that there would be reported to the Senate either the far-reaching bill then in the House, that bill as amended, or some other bill dealing, en bloc, with the more flagrant escape hatches which benefit a few in the present income tax law and providing some relief for millions of others.

May I say that the wage earners and other moderate and lower income groups are properly impatient for a more equitable distribution of the tax burden. They have a right to expect changes in the present income tax law after years of inertia in the face of the accumulating inequities—inequities which have placed on their shoulders an inordinate share of the cost of government.

Insofar as the majority leadership of the Senate is concerned there will be no countenancing of a back-door effort to put off or delay tax reform and tax relief. In all frankness, I must express concern, therefore, with the reports which have recently appeared in the press. I am astonished at some stories which indicate, for example, that I have agreed to take up now the repeal of the investment credit as distinct and separate from a general tax bill.

A clamor for repeal of the investment credit raises a lot of dust because the reform is a desirable one. I think Senators

should be wary lest other essential tax reforms and tax relief be lost in the resulting obscurity. Insofar as the leadership is concerned, it will always try to be reasonable but reasonable does not include being a party to smokescreens.

A specific representation was made to the Senate last July when it was agreed to call up the extension of the 10-percent surtax through 1969. That representation was made on the strength of a decision of the majority policy committee. The decision, in turn, was influenced by strong statements by the administration in support of prompt action on tax reform and relief and by many Members of the Senate along the same lines. It was made, finally, on the basis of innumerable conversations and several meetings with the chairman and Democratic members of the Finance Committee—the committee in which the tax legislation was being considered.

On that basis, the leadership represented to the Senate, without contradiction from any source, but rather with at least the tacit concurrence of the Finance Committee and the minority leadership, that a full tax reform package—to go along with the investment tax credit and the final 6-month extension of the surtax at 5 percent which was requested by the administration—a full tax reform and tax relief package would be reported by the Finance Committee no later than October 31, 1969.

A promise of general tax reform has been made to the Nation by the President and his administration and it has been echoed by Members of Congress. Taxpayers will be reminded of that promise when tax forms are received next January. These forms will require payment of the 10-percent surtax for the 6 months extension voted last July by a Senate which has also held out great promise of tax reform and tax relief. I would hope, therefore, that those who pay the surtax will be able to say, in the end, that the 6 months extension at least purchased a fairer and more equitable tax system.

That is the promise which has been held out to the American taxpayer—I repeat—by the administration and by Members of Congress. To date, only the House has delivered on that promise. It would be my expectation that on the basis of the understandings of last July, the Finance Committee will also deliver in the next few weeks and that the Senate will follow suit as soon as possible thereafter.

In considering tax reform and relief when it is reported by the committee, the Senate will also consider repeal of the investment tax credit, retroactive to April 18, 1969. That is what was understood at the time the tax surcharge was extended last July. That is still the case today and I cannot understand why there should be any doubts or uncertainties on that score. Indeed, if one wishes to pursue this business of uncertainty as a basis for urgent action, one might well ask of the uncertainty which confronts tens of millions of the Nation's moderate and lower income taxpayers who are still waiting for the long-promised general tax reform and tax relief.

The fact is that the central problem which faces the Senate in this matter is

not the repeal of the investment tax credit. The central problem has been and remains: When and in what context should the investment credit be repealed in order also to assure prompt consideration of a general tax reform and relief measure? In essence, the problem is the same that confronted the leadership in the case of extension of the tax surcharge a few months ago. It is the practical problem of how best to proceed in the light of the procedural realities of the Congress. To refresh memories on this point, let me quote the remarks of Senator PASTORE, a member of the majority policy committee, who put it so well last July when he said on the Senate floor:

The thing that disturbs me is not so much the 6 months as against the 12 months. As a matter of fact, I would be for the 12-month extension providing I would have assurance that we are going to have tax reform. There is no Member of the Senate who knows more about the parliamentary gimmicks than does the Senator from Delaware. And he knows that if we dispose permanently of the surtax problem and then treat the tax reform independently, we will have no chance to have tax reform.

In a similar vein, to dispose of the investment tax credit at this time, in my judgment, might well diminish the prospects of a meaningful general tax reform and tax relief during this Congress which would most benefit middle and lower income taxpayers. That was also the judgment of the majority policy committee last July. That is still my judgment and I have no indication whatsoever that it is not still the judgment of the policy committee.

For those who have concerns about the investment credit, I repeat that, as far as I am concerned, any repeal will be retroactive to April 18, 1969; the date is firm. Repeal of the investment credit, as of April 18, is on the calendar now. It was on the calendar last July as part of a House-passed bill and remained there when the surtax was extended. Repeal, as of April 18, will be on the calendar when the Finance Committee reports the tax reform and tax relief bill, as expected, no later than October 31.

It has been my understanding all along that the investment credit was not to be brought up and disposed of before the general tax reform bill was available to the Senate. That was pledged to the majority policy committee last July and it was, in part, on that basis that the Committee agreed, at that time to taking up the extension of the income surtax, even for 6 months.

That is the whole story. There have been no deals, no agreements, and no commitments to the contrary. So let me dispel any doubts which may have arisen because of recent reports. The leadership has not broken its pledge nor has the chairman of the Finance Committee (Mr. LONG). The leadership has not agreed to schedule the investment credit repeal now, as a separate tax item. Nor has the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee (Mr. LONG) or anyone else, so far as I am aware, abandoned the understanding.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Harris survey dealing with this question be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey

September 24, 1969

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Sept. 22, 1969]  
EIGHTY-THREE PERCENT OBJECT TO SPECIAL TAX BREAKS FOR RICH

Passage by Congress of legislation to close "tax loopholes for the rich" would be important toward making 62 percent of the rank and file of Americans "feel better" about the taxes they pay.

High taxes are second only to high food prices on the public's list of current financial problems. And by an overwhelming 83 to 7 percent, the public is critical of special benefits for wealthy individuals.

The issue of tax "loopholes" is one of the main orders of business now before Congress. The public outcry against extending the 10 percent surcharge on incomes taxes, opposed 69 to 17 percent nationwide, was so great that Democratic leadership in both the House and Senate has insisted on tax reforms aimed at spreading the tax load more evenly.

In a recent survey of a cross-section of 2074 people across the nation, the public was asked:

"Do you feel there are a lot of tax loopholes for the rich to avoid taxes or do you think the rich have to pay higher proportionate taxes under our tax system?"

*Fairness of tax system*

	[In percent]	Total public
Rich avoid taxes.....	83	
Rich pay proportionately.....	7	
Not sure.....	10	

There is little doubt that most taxpayers in America are resentful over a system which they believe "allows the rich to avoid high taxes." The degree to which the "loopholes" have fueled the growing tax revolt was evident in the result of this question:

"If many of the tax loopholes for the rich were closed, would you feel better about the taxes you pay or would you still feel the same?"

*Impact of closing tax loopholes*

	[In percent]	Total public
Would feel better about my taxes.....	62	
Still feel the same.....	29	
Not sure.....	9	

Some economists have pointed out that the added revenues to be derived from closing the so-called loopholes would not bring in an appreciable amount of new money to the Federal government. Clearly, these results show, however, that the loophole legislation would have a rather important psychological effect on a taxpaying public which now feels put upon financially. The chief target of the people's ire is the inflationary spiral, but taxes and government spending are viewed as major culprits.

The public concern over the high cost of living was evident when the cross-section was asked:

"What are the two or three major financial problems facing you and your family these days? Any others?"

*Major family financial problems*

	[In percent]	Total public
High food prices, mainly meat.....	36	
High taxes.....	27	
High rent, mortgage payments.....	24	
High cost of everything.....	19	
High medical, dental costs.....	17	
Cost of educating children.....	16	
Clothing costs.....	11	
Auto installment payments.....	11	
Insurance premiums too high.....	8	
High interest rates.....	6	
High labor costs for help.....	6	

NOTE.—Percentages add to more than 100 percent because most people named more than one financial worry.

The irony of the tax situation, of course, is that both the Administration and Congress are aware of the argument that one of the ways to halt rising prices is to take consumer money out of circulation through higher taxes and by raising interest rates. The public is adamantly opposed to either solution. To the contrary, higher taxes are viewed as an added burden on the individual family in a period when it cannot make ends meet.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to comment on the Senator's statement. As a member of the Committee on Finance, I am very much in accord with what the majority leader has said. I commend him for his excellent leadership on the issue. I believe he has been headed in the right direction, and still is. I applaud him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I wish to reiterate that the purpose in making these full remarks this morning was to set the record straight.

**RESTORATION OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE PROGRAM TO THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT**

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, in line with the generous cooperation of the distinguished Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), who is willing that the Senate fully consider this matter before acting upon it, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of my motion of September 12, 1969, to reconsider the passage of S. 2315.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the votes by which S. 2315 was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2315) to restore the golden eagle program to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oklahoma? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

**PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dale Shaffer, who is a member of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, be permitted in the Chamber during the consideration of S. 2315.

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be read.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) proposes an amendment on page 2, beginning with line 20, strike out all of line 20 and all of line 21.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I am glad the Senate has this opportunity to reconsider S. 2315, the bill which calls for the reinstatement of the golden eagle passport program and the Federal recreation fee system as a part of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965.

As I have stated previously, I have no objection to the golden eagle passport program as it applies to national parks and national forests. I do, however, object to the collection of fees for entrance or access—as distinguished from user fees for special facilities—to Federal lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I, therefore, have sent to the desk an amendment to S. 2315 which strikes that portion of the bill calling for repeal of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968.

Under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act as passed in 1964, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers was required to collect fees at lakes and reservoirs. However, this same act stated that there could be no charge for the use of waters at these projects. This created a dilemma for the Corps of Engineers because the collection of an entrance fee from persons passing through a public recreation area to reach the water was tantamount to charging for the use of the water. Congress, recognizing this dilemma, adopted section 210 of the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1968 which states:

No entrance or admission fees shall be collected after March 31, 1970, by any officer or employee of the United States at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, United States Army. User fees at these lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees of the United States only from users of highly developed facilities requiring continuous presence of personnel for maintenance and supervision of the facilities, and shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

Section 3 of S. 2315 would repeal section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 and would thus once again authorize the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation to require the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to collect fees for the use of recreation areas in conjunction with lakes and reservoirs under their jurisdiction.

The matter of fee collection at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has been the subject of a great deal of debate both in the Public Works and Interior Committees of the House and Senate and on the floor of both bodies. I feel that the evidence is overwhelming in opposition to the collection of entrance or user fees at these lakes and reservoirs.

First, it has been the longstanding and established public policy in this country that access to and use of inland waters should be free to the general public. This policy was first set forth in the Northwest Ordinance of July 1787 and was reaffirmed when the Congress adopted that ordinance in August of 1789. Through the years freedom of access to and use of the inland waters of the United States has been restated by the Congress on numerous occasions. In the Flood Control Act of 1944, of 1946, of 1954, and again in the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1962, the Congress expanded this doctrine when it said:

The water areas of such projects shall be open to public use generally without charges

for boating, swimming, bathing, fishing and other recreational purposes.

Also, in the Rivers and Harbors and Flood Control Act of 1968 the Congress once again restated that entrance and admission to Federal lakes and reservoirs should be free to the general public.

My distinguished colleague, Representative Ed EDMONDSON, of Oklahoma, said during the consideration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act:

The Congress has consistently been saying since 1944 to the areas in the country where these reservoirs are built or authorized to be built, if you will cooperate with us for the building of these reservoirs, if you will give up your bottomland, and if you will assist us and work with us on the local contribution angles that are necessary for the construction of these reservoirs, we will provide access without charge to the general public.

Although Congressman EDMONDSON was unsuccessful in his efforts to guarantee freedom of access to and use of Federal lakes and reservoirs during consideration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, he was later successful in bringing about the adoption of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 which prohibits the collection of entrance and access fees at these projects.

The amendment I offer today would make clear once again the public policy of this country and the sense of the Congress that there must not be and shall not be any fees charged for the use of Federal waters or the access thereto. The adoption of my amendment today will be a clear statement by us of the furtherance of the longstanding public policy of this country for free recreation use of our lakes and reservoirs.

Second, Mr. President, experience has shown that the collection of entrance and user fees at Corps of Engineers lakes and reservoirs is extremely costly and

very difficult to administer. For instance, in 1967, the last year for which detailed costs figures are available, the Corps of Engineers collected fees at 168 areas at 65 projects for a total of \$703,000. The cost for collection of these fees in the same year, 1967, was \$769,176. So, as you can see, the Corps of Engineers actually lost approximately \$66,000 as a result of collecting fees in the year 1967. Not only did the corps collect less than it cost them to administer this program, but that money which was collected was turned over to the Land and Water Conservation Fund and was not utilized for recreational improvement at the reservoirs where it was collected. Thus we actually appropriated to the Corps of Engineers more money to enable them to collect fees than they were able to collect and the meager amount they were able to collect could not be used to offset their expenses. This certainly does not appear to be very sound business practice to me.

Third, entrance fees are impossible to collect efficiently and fairly at most Corps of Engineers reservoir areas. For instance, the Corps of Engineers administers reservoirs with a total shoreline of approximately 28,000 miles. The fact is that without thousands of miles of barbed wire and a new army of fee collectors there is no practical and efficient way to collect entrance fees in these areas. The Army Corps of Engineers knows this, the general public knows this, the Congress knows this. In fact, as Congressman EDMONDSON has said:

Everybody with any familiarity with Army Engineers reservoirs knows that a facility use fee limited to beaches and camp sites or to launch facilities where mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided, is the only practical, fair and economical system for these reservoirs.

I fully agree with this statement, and I wholeheartedly feel that we must continue the policies against the collection of entrance fees at these projects.

Fourth. Mr. President, entrance fees at Army Corps of Engineers lakes do not contribute to maintenance or improvements of lakes where they are collected. Under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, all fees collected at Federal recreation areas are deposited in the land and water conservation fund. The Federal share of this fund goes to acquire additional lands for recreational purposes, generally parks. Not one single dollar of the land and water conservation fund has been allocated or can be allocated to the Army Engineers for maintenance and improvement of the lakes or the recreation areas where the fees are collected. Therefore, although the Army Engineers have been collecting fees at 168 recreation areas at 65 projects under their administration, they have yet to receive \$1 for their efforts. This is not true of the National Park Service, the National Forest Service, or the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. For example, Mr. President, if the Interior appropriations bill as passed by the Senate becomes law, the National Park Service in fiscal year 1970 will receive \$13,700,000 and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife will receive \$1 million. Yet, the Army Corps of Engineers will not receive one dime.

Mr. President, to illustrate this point I ask unanimous consent that the table appearing on page 10 of the Senate Report No. 91-420, the Interior Department and related agencies appropriations bill for 1970, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation	Activity	Budget estimate	House allowance	Committee recommendation
1. Assistance to States.....	\$77,000,000	\$75,000,000	\$62,000,000	2. Federal land acquisition program—Continued			
2. Federal land acquisition program:				Liquidation of fiscal year 1969 contracts—Continued			
National Park Service (new areas):				Saugus Iron Works.....	\$47,500	\$47,500	\$47,500
Assateague Island National Seashore.....	1,789,718	1,789,718	2,789,718	Whiskeytown National Recreation Area.....	239,000	239,000	239,000
Biscayne National Monument.....	1,000,000	1,650,000	2,500,000	Inholdings.....	359,500	359,500	359,500
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.....				Subtotal, liquidation appropriation.....	15,528,000	15,528,000	15,528,000
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore.....	1,500,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	Total, National Park Service.....	30,300,000	33,300,000	44,100,000
North Cascades National Park.....	250,000	250,000	5,000,000				
Ozark National Scenic Riverway.....	558,100	558,100	1,058,100				
Guadalupe Mountains National Park.....							
Glen Canyon National Recreation Area.....							
San Juan Island National Historic Park.....							
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.....							
Subtotal, new areas.....	5,097,818	8,247,818	15,632,218				
Inholdings.....	674,182	674,182	674,182				
Grand Teton National Park (JY Ranch).....	1,050,000	1,050,000					
Court awards (Padre Island National Seashore).....	7,800,000	7,800,000	12,115,600				
Wild and scenic rivers.....	100,000		100,000				
National trails system.....	50,000		50,000				
Subtotal, remaining areas.....	9,674,182	9,524,182	12,939,782				
Liquidation of fiscal year 1969 contracts:							
Assateague Island National Seashore.....	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000				
Biscayne National Monument.....	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000				
Carl Sandburg Farm National Historic Site.....	203,000	203,000	203,000				
Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area.....	2,561,000	2,561,000	2,561,000				
Guadalupe Mountain National Park.....	1,015,000	1,015,000	1,015,000				
Herbert Hoover National Historic Site.....	150,000	150,000	150,000				
Indian Dunes National Lakeshore.....	4,000,000	4,000,000	4,000,000				
Ozark National Scenic Riverway.....	500,000	500,000	500,000				
Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore.....	420,000	420,000	420,000				
San Juan Island National Historic Park.....	33,000	33,000	33,000				

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, last, I feel that we must reaffirm our position on continuing the free access to and use of our lakes and reservoirs in order to avoid excluding many people of modest income from the enjoyment of these projects. I have stated over and over that I have no opposition to the charging of a small fee for the use of a particular facility such as a bathhouse, so long as the fee is commensurate with the service available and the cost of collection will not eat up a good portion of the amount collected.

But what about the person who comes onto public land, simply to enjoy the wonders of nature, to walk or sit or lie among them and marvel at the beauties God has built? What about the person who uses no bathhouse or diving board or other facilities especially constructed, but comes onto the land with his wife and children to go swimming, already in bathing suit or changing elsewhere? What about the person who comes in and uses no especially constructed boat dock or boat ramp or other facilities, and boats or fishes on public waters? What about the person who comes out just to see or photograph the wonders of such a public area, its flora and its fauna?

Shall we charge fees of these people in areas where none now are collected? I submit, that if we do, if we go back to the policy in effect prior to the enactment of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, we break faith with the great public policy and traditions of this country and with our obligations to future generations. Congress can guard against this being done now or in the future by enactment of my amendment which would strike section 3 of S. 2315.

I could provide the Senate with numerous letters supporting the fact that the Army Engineers are not providing utilities nor are they providing police or fire protection even in those areas where they would be forced to collect fees if S. 2315 passed without my amendment. I feel that the general public, if required to pay a fee should be guaranteed some additional services in return.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, before I proceed to discuss the points raised by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), in connection with which I intend to offer a substitute amendment, that I hope he will find satisfactory, I should like to discuss briefly the purpose of S. 2315.

This bill was reported by the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. In the opinion of the committee, which received no unfavorable testimony, the bill has great merit. I believe this is apparent by the fact that the bill passed the Senate once without opposition. However, I want to assure the Senator from Oklahoma that if the committee had been advised of his desire to discuss the provisions of this measure, we would have accommodated him at the time the bill was first cleared for passage.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho yield at that point?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I trust that it comes as no surprise to members of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee that

I vigorously objected to repeal of that portion of the act, that my presence was not necessary to put people on notice about that, as this has been a matter on which I and Representative EDMONDSON of Oklahoma and others have spoken out vigorously in the past.

Mr. CHURCH. Yes; I appreciate that fact and, of course, it is because of the Senator's concern that we have called the measure back to reconsider the provision to which he has raised his objection this morning.

Mr. President, the primary objective of the bill as introduced by Senator JACKSON and amended by the committee, is to retain the extremely popular golden eagle program created by the original enactment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended. The legislation would restore the golden eagle passport program due to expire next March, while also increasing the annual fee from \$7 to \$10. The bill also continues the advance contract authority of the Secretary of the Interior to deal with the increasingly serious problem of land-cost escalation. He had this authority for fiscal years 1969 and 1970 for the acquisition of certain land, water, or interests therein.

Other provisions of S. 2315, as amended, include: First, authorization for the Secretary of the Interior to advertise and promote entrance or user fee programs currently in operation and; second, repeal of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, which, as interpreted, precludes the sale of golden eagle passports in recreation areas under the administrative jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

It is the second matter relating to the repeal of section 210 of the Flood Control Act which has concerned the Senator from Oklahoma and others.

When the Senate Interior Committee ordered S. 2315 reported last August 12, it was the consensus that recreation areas under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers should be an active part of the general fee collection program. Therefore, S. 2315 was amended by the committee to repeal section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968. This action was taken because exclusion of the corps areas from the golden eagle passport program could well undermine the whole concept of special fees for special services rendered. Since we were restoring the golden eagle program, the committee also felt that it would be unwise to allow different treatment of the fee program between different agencies of the Government.

In view of the objections raised, and the amendment offered, by the Senator from Oklahoma to section 3 of S. 2315, namely, the section repealing section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, I will propose a substitute to an amendment to the bill in an attempt to maintain the integrity of the land and water conservation fund. I have discussed the language with the Senator from Oklahoma, and Chairman JACKSON has done likewise with the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the distinguished senior Senator from West Vir-

ginia, who, I believe, concurs with the language of the proposed amendment.

When I propose is to incorporate the essence of the provisions of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 into the basic land and water conservation fund law. This language would supplement the provisions of section 2(c) of the fund act and would make our intent abundantly clear that entrance or access to, or use of, any water shall be free. The amended language specifies in part that—

Fees shall not be collected for access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided. The fee collection provisions would apply only to those highly developed facilities constructed for reasons of public health, safety, and convenience, and which require a schedule of regular maintenance and supervision.

I want to make it absolutely clear that under no circumstances would user or admission fees be collected for the use of waters at federally operated or maintained recreation areas, and more particularly at Federal multiple-use lakes and reservoirs, whether constructed by the Bureau of Reclamation or the Corps of Engineers. In fact, section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act states:

No fee of any kind shall be charged by a Federal agency under any provision of this Act for the use of any waters.

In my opinion, the original Land and Water Conservation Fund Act called for fees to be collected at all federally operated and maintained recreational, scenic, scientific, historic, or cultural areas where special benefits are provided at Federal expense to identifiable recipients above and beyond those which accrue to the general public. I believe this system should be uniform in its applicability—it should apply to all Federal agencies upon whose lands these recreational facilities are provided.

Mr. President, when the Congress enacted the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, it was the intention to have it operate on a pay-as-you-go principle in contributing to the Nation's outdoor recreation needs. This was to be accomplished, in part, by providing a system of charging uniform fees at Federal recreation areas. It was considered only fair that individual users pay for the special benefits provided. The principle of making collections where special benefits are provided is well established. For example, collections are made where recreational facilities such as bathhouses, cabins, overnight shelter, electricity, fuel, and winter sports equipment are provided. This same principle applies to other Federal programs where identifiable beneficiaries pay a user charge, including those who cut timber, graze cattle, or use water for irrigation.

The point I wish to emphasize is that if user charges are warranted, they should be applied uniformly by all agencies.

Therefore, I send to the desk an amendment intended as a substitute for that offered by the Senator from Oklahoma. I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 2, add a new section 4 as follows: "Sec. 4. Section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) is amended by inserting, immediately after the words 'for use of any waters,' in the second paragraph of such section 2(a) the following: 'User fees at recreation areas administered by the United States at Federal lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees only from users of highly developed facilities constructed for reasons of public health, safety, and convenience, and which require a schedule of regular maintenance and supervision. Fees shall not be collected for entrance or access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.'

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma that the language of the amendment I have offered to take the place of his amendment accomplishes the central objective he has in mind. I hope he would find it possible to withdraw his amendment and accept the amendment I have offered instead.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I certainly commend the distinguished Senator from Idaho, and also the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the chairman of the full committee, for trying to work this matter out. As they know, I would prefer the amendment which I have offered, but I believe the general thrust of the amendment the Senator offered is the same as I had desired to accomplish. There is not any way, in my opinion, that we can rightly charge a fee for someone who is not using some kind of special facilities. That, I take it, is the thrust of the substitute amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho. Its intent is not to have fees charged for lightly developed or undeveloped areas or to charge purely for entrance or access to waters.

It is my understanding that the distinguished chairman of the Public Works Committee (Mr. RANDOLPH) has agreed to the wording of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Idaho. Therefore, I withdraw my amendment so that the amendment of the Senator from Idaho may be offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma is withdrawn. The amendment offered by the Senator from Idaho is offered and is before the Senate.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I want to commend the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) for his alertness and timeliness and also for his fine work in connection with this matter, which is a problem for all of us. It is a problem for those who put the bill together.

He is due a great deal of credit. I

would have supported his amendment vigorously, had it not received the consideration it did. I certainly appreciate his efforts.

I appreciate also what the Senator from Idaho has done on this bill, and his consideration of the problem. I hope that the members of the committee are now satisfied with the provision, and that it will become law.

Mr. CHURCH. I thank the Senator from Mississippi very much. I join with him in commanding the Senator from Oklahoma for his tenacity in working this problem out to the general satisfaction of all concerned.

I move the adoption of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma having been withdrawn, the amendment of the Senator from Idaho is in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

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

Mr. CHURCH. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I compliment the able Senator from Oklahoma for the thorough way in which he has gone into this matter. He has made a very fine contribution, I think, in trying to define and separate a line of demarcation between the use of facilities in which the Federal Government has not made a substantial investment, and facilities where there has been such an investment.

Needless to say, I am most grateful to the able Senator from Idaho for the amendment that he has worked out and offered in lieu of that withdrawn by the Senator from Oklahoma, to accomplish this purpose.

Mr. President, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks a booklet and also an extensive explanation of the criteria developed by the outdoor recreation agencies regarding fee collections. I should point out that, if enacted, S. 2315 will necessitate that this criteria be modified somewhat by the executive agencies to reflect the new provisions included in my bill as it is about to be amended.

The booklet I am enclosing is entitled the "1969 Directory of Federal Recreation, Entrance, Admission, and User Fee Areas," which is distributed by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. This informative booklet fully explains the fee systems administered by several Federal agencies, and answers important questions frequently asked by recreationalists about the golden eagle and other fee programs.

I should emphasize, however, that if S. 2315 is enacted, it will modify certain of the statements made in this booklet.

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

THE 1969 DIRECTORY OF FEDERAL RECREATION  
ENTRANCE, ADMISSION, AND USER FEE AREAS  
ABOUT OPERATION GOLDEN EAGLE

America needs space for walking, riding, hiking, camping, fishing, hunting, boating, skiing, nature study, and other forms of outdoor recreation necessary to the health

and happiness of our people—space to be preserved as part of our National Parks, Forests, Wildlife Refuges, Lakeshores and Seashores, and other Federal recreation areas.

The need is to act now—before it is too late—to make available land and water areas for recreation use by this and future generations.

Through Operation Golden Eagle you can help.

Operation Golden Eagle is the name given to the Federal recreation fee program. It is identified by the symbolic golden eagle and the family motif displayed on the face of the annual Federal Recreation Area Entrance Permit, popularly known as the Golden Eagle Passport, and on official signs posted at Federal recreation areas where fees are charged.

Revenue from sale of the Golden Eagle Passport and the receipts from other Federal outdoor recreation fees are deposited in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This Fund also receives revenue from sales of surplus Federal real property, Federal motorboat fuels taxes, general receipts of the Treasury, and may receive receipts from mineral leases on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Since the Fund was established in 1965, apportionments totaling \$259 million have been made to States and Territories to help them acquire and develop some 3,300 local and State parks and recreation areas. Approximately \$226 million have been appropriated from the Fund to acquire recreation lands for the National Park System, National Forest System and National Wildlife Refuge System and to acquire lands needed to protect rare and endangered wildlife species.

The Golden Eagle Passport ends after March 31, 1970. Public Law 90-401 substantially amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to (1) authorize a guaranteed minimum fund level of \$200 million per year and (2) delete authority under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act for collection of recreation fees, effective March 31, 1970.

The first action assures that substantially more funds will be available in the Fund for all purposes of the Act because receipts from general revenues or from offshore mineral leases will go into the Fund as needed to bring the Fund up to the \$200 million annual level.

The second action means that effective March 31, 1970 there is no authority to collect recreation fees on a Government-wide basis. Hence, The Golden Eagle Passport, as it is presently known, will not be available after the 1969 season. Public Law 90-401 does not repeal other existing authorities of Federal agencies to collect fees after March 31, 1970. Each Federal agency managing outdoor recreation areas may fix the amounts and determine where and how to collect fees.

Recreation fees collected after March 31, 1970, will no longer go into the general account of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Instead, revenue from fees will be deposited in a special account which may be appropriated directly to the collecting agency for use in support of its authorized outdoor recreation function.

1. What is the annual Golden Eagle Passport?

Answer: It is a gold and blue, wallet-size card which is a year-long passport to designated Federal recreation areas throughout the Nation where entrance fees are charged under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. The annual permit, or "Golden Eagle Passport," sells for \$7. When signed by the owner, it is valid from April 1, 1969, to March 31, 1970.

A valid Golden Eagle Passport will admit the purchaser, regardless of his mode of transportation, to designated Federal recreation areas where entrance or admission fees

are charged. In addition, it will admit all persons who accompany the holder in a private noncommercial vehicle to designated Federal recreation areas commonly entered by vehicles where entrance fees are charged.

The Golden Eagle Passport does not cover user fees or service charges that might be required at some designated Federal recreation areas (see Question 8).

2. Where can a Golden Eagle Passport be purchased?

Answer: The Golden Eagle Passport can be purchased at most entrances to Federal recreation areas, at offices of the Federal agencies shown on the back of this pamphlet, and at county offices of the Federal Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service throughout the Nation. It can also be purchased at most offices of the American Automobile Association, from many department and sporting goods stores, by credit card order from a number of petroleum companies, and from Operation Golden Eagle, Post Office Box 7763, Washington, D.C. 20044. Purchasing an annual \$7 permit in advance will save you time.

3. What other entrance permits are available?

Answer: If you do not have an annual permit, a \$1 daily single area carload permit may be purchased where carload entrance fees are charged. Where overnight use is permitted, the \$1 daily carload permit is valid until noon the day following purchase, unless such an area is posted for an earlier departure time. If an individual is not entering a Federal recreation area in a private noncommercial vehicle, he may purchase a 50-cent daily permit. The owner of a \$7 Golden Eagle Passport may use the passport in lieu of paying the 50-cent daily fee.

4. With respect to Federal recreation fees, what is a private noncommercial vehicle?

Answer: A "private noncommercial vehicle" is any passenger car, station wagon, pickup camper, motorcycle, or other motor vehicle that is conventionally used for private recreation purposes by an individual or a family. This includes company-owned automobiles, or vehicles an individual or family has leased or rented and is using for private recreation purposes.

5. Do carload entry permits cover the entry of towed motor vehicles, boats or camping trailers?

Answer: Yes, provided that a towed motor vehicle is not operated within the designated area.

6. How are entry permits validated and displayed?

Answer: The \$7 annual permit is validated when the purchaser signs his name on the face of the permit. When inside a designated recreation area, the purchaser, unless otherwise notified, must display the permit in full view on the dashboard or on the sun visor of his vehicle. The \$1 daily permits are displayed in the same manner.

7. Are entry permits transferable?

Answer: Permits are transferable only to the purchaser's immediate family (spouse and children), when driving a private noncommercial vehicle which is either registered or under rental contract in the name of a member of that family.

8. Will more than one kind of fee be charged at a Federal recreation area?

Answer: Yes, user or service fees may be charged singly or in addition to entrance or admission fees. For example, user fees may be charged for family camping, group camping or picnicking, bathhouses, lockers, boat launching facilities, cabins or overnight shelters, electrical outlets, cut firewood or other fuels, duck blinds, and winter sport facilities. Service fees may be charged for items such as use of boats, guided tours, and elevators.

9. What qualifications must an area have before Federal recreation fees may be charged?

Answer: Four conditions must be met before an area may be designated (1) the area must be under direct Federal management; (2) the specific area must be managed primarily for scenic, scientific, historical, cultural, or recreational purposes; (3) the area must have recreation facilities or services provided at Federal expense; and (4) collection of fees must be administratively and economically practical. Collection of recreation fees is determined by each Federal land managing agency participating in Operation Golden Eagle for the recreation areas which it manages.

10. How does a person know if fees are charged at a Federal recreation area?

Answer: The entrance to each designated Federal recreation area is posted with a sign showing that it is a "U.S. Fee Area."

11. Are Federal recreation permits hunting or fishing licenses?

Answer: No, Federal recreation fees in no way constitute a hunting or fishing license. Persons hunting or fishing on Federal recreation areas must comply with applicable State regulations requiring possession of a hunting or fishing license.

Hunters and fishermen are charged the same fees as other users of Federal recreation areas. Hunters and fishermen, as well as other recreationists, benefit from the Land and Water Conservation Fund program, since it helps expand opportunities for all types of outdoor recreation, including hunting and fishing.

12. Are Federal recreation fees charged for the use of water?

Answer: No, the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act specifically prohibits charges for the use of water. Where an individual gains access to the water through a designated Federal recreation area, he will be required to pay the appropriate fee. Such a fee is not based on the availability of water, but on the existence of federally provided outdoor recreation facilities. In some instances boaters, swimmers, and other persons are required to pay user fees for boat launching facilities, bathhouses, and other special services or facilities.

13. Is a Federal fee required of persons entering official National Wilderness areas?

Answer: No, Federal entrance or admission fees to enter units of the Wilderness System are prohibited. However, if an individual gains access to a Wilderness through a designated Federal recreation area, he will be required to pay the appropriate fee for entering the designated recreation area.

14. Are recreation charges made at Federal recreation areas where the Golden Eagle Passport is not valid?

Answer: Yes, some Federal areas are operated and managed by private concessionaires or by public recreation departments under contract with the Federal Government. In these instances, the contractors are permitted to collect fees for the use of facilities and other services they may provide. Fees collected by concession operators or non-Federal public recreation departments, are not deposited to the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

In addition, some Federal recreation areas operated and managed by the Federal Government are designated only for the collection of user or service fees not covered by the passport.

15. Are any individuals or groups exempt from paying required Federal recreation entrance or admission fees?

Answer: Yes, persons under 16 years of age and persons or groups entering designated fee areas for other than outdoor recreation purposes are exempt. This includes those visiting an area for a commercial reason, such as salesmen; concessionaires and their employees, bus and taxi drivers; doctors, firemen and ambulance operators on a call; church groups engaged in religious services; and individuals traveling to private

residences on roads which require crossing or entering designated fee areas. Groups of persons on educational visits sponsored by bona fide educational institutions also are exempt. In this last instance, a school group accompanied by a bona fide instructor studying conservation practices, natural history, geology, ecology, etc., would be exempt; whereas, a school picnic or similar outing would not.

16. Are lost Golden Eagle Passports replaceable? Are refunds for Golden Eagle Passports obtainable?

Answer: Upon purchase, the Passport becomes the responsibility and property of the purchaser. Replacement or refund for a Golden Eagle Passport can be provided only where the purchaser has been denied the use of the Passport through some fault or neglect on the part of the Government. Passports are accountable property and each replacement or refund must be supported by a valid, accountable document. A damaged Passport normally is replaceable upon return of the originally purchased Passport.

17. Is the Golden Eagle Passport a camping permit?

Answer: No, the Golden Eagle Passport is an annual entrance permit for designated Federal outdoor recreation areas. Camping facilities are available at most, but not all Federal recreation areas. All persons entering designated fee areas pay the same entrance fees without regard to their use of camping facilities. Many well-developed campgrounds are designated for collection of user fees not covered by the Golden Eagle Passport. In addition, some campgrounds are administered as private concessions. The Passport is not valid for any concession fees.

18. Is the Golden Eagle Passport to be discontinued?

Answer: Yes, amendments to the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act which were passed by the Congress during 1968 terminate the authority with an effective date of March 31, 1970. These amendments do not repeal other existing authorities of Federal agencies to collect recreation fees. Policies and procedures for the collection of Federal outdoor recreation fees after March 31, 1970, will be announced to the public as they are developed.

#### TYPES OF FEES

##### *Entrance and admission fees*

An annual Federal recreation fee area entrance permit, popularly known as the Golden Eagle Passport, will admit the purchaser, regardless of his mode of transportation, any number of times to designated Federal recreation areas collecting entrance or admission fees. It also will admit all those who accompany the purchaser in a private, noncommercial vehicle to designated Federal recreation areas commonly entered by such vehicles where entrance fees are charged.

Persons who do not desire to purchase the \$7 annual permit may buy a \$1 daily permit. This will admit the purchaser and all those accompanying him in a private, noncommercial vehicle only at the area for which it was purchased.

A daily 50¢ per person admission fee is available to an individual on a commercial or tour bus, on foot, horseback, or bicycle entering areas where entrance fees are charged.

##### *User or service fees*

Special user fees may be charged for the use of well-developed recreation facilities. Service fees may be charged for items such as guided tours. User or service fees may be charged regardless of whether entrance or admission fees are charged at a particular area.

Neither the annual permit nor other short-term permits will substitute for user or service charges required at particular designated Federal recreation areas.

For information on specific user or service fees, inquiry should be made of the man-

aging agency. (See the list of addresses on the inside back cover of this publication.)

## CHANGES IN AREA DESIGNATION

The Directory of Federal Recreation Fee Areas is assembled several months in advance of the recreation season in order to provide time for printing and distribution. The Directory is accurate only at the time of its assembly. The agencies administering Federal recreation areas may designate additional areas, cease collection at designated areas, close an area to public use, or license an area for concession operation at any time.

Restrictions on number of employees and funds contained in the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of June 28, 1968, have resulted in closings or reductions in periods of service in many National Park System areas. The National Park Service is expected to license to concessionnaires many of the campgrounds designated for user fee collection. Fees collected by concessionnaires are expected to be comparable to existing Federal fees. Concession fees are not deposited in the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but a percentage or annual rental is paid into the Federal Treasury from concession operations.

It is suggested that visitors to Federal recreation areas check with administering officials to determine the status of specific areas they plan to visit. A list of Regional Office administering agency addresses is provided at the back of this publication for that purpose.

## KEY TO ABBREVIATIONS

## TYPES OF AREAS

- NF—National Forest.
- NG—National Grassland.
- NWR—National Wildlife Refuge.
- NFH—National Fish Hatchery.
- NP—National Park.
- NM—National Monument.
- NRA—National Recreation Area.
- NHS—National Historical Site.
- NMP—National Military Park.
- NBP—National Battlefield Park.
- NS—National Seashore.
- NHP—National Historical Park.
- RA—Recreation Area.
- NMem—National Memorial.
- NMemP—National Memorial Park.
- \*Entrance and Admission Fees.
- †User or Service Fees.

## — ALABAMA

## (Designated area)

## FOREST SERVICE

## Bankhead NF

\*Brushy Lake.

\*Corinth.

\*Natural Bridge.

\*Sipsey River.

## Conecuh NF

\*Blue Pond.

\*Open Pond.

## Talladega NF

\*Coleman Lake.

\*Lake Chinnabee.

\*Payne Lake.

\*Pine Glenn.

## EUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

†Eufaula NWR.

†Wheeler NWR.

## ALASKA

## Chugach NF

†Anderson Bay.

\*Beaver Pond.

\*Bertha Creek.

\*Black Bear.

†Canoe Pass.

†Caribou Creek.

\*Cooper Creek.

\*Crescent Creek.

†Crescent Lake.

†Devils Pass.

- †East Creek.
- †Eyak Lake.
- †Galena Bay.
- \*Granite Creek.
- †Juneau Lake.
- †McKinley Lake.
- †Paradise Lake.
- †Pigot Bay.
- \*Porcupine.
- \*Primrose Landing.
- \*Ptarmigan Creek.
- \*Quartz Creek.
- \*Russian River
- †Sawmill Bay.
- †Shrode Lake.
- †Simpson Bay.
- †Swan Lake.
- \*Tenderfoot Creek.
- †Tiedeman Slough.
- \*Trail River.
- †Trout Lake.
- †Upper Russian Lake.
- \*Williwaw.

## North Tongass NF

- †Alexander Lake.
- †Anan.
- †Anan Lake.
- †Avoss Lake.
- \*Auke Village.
- †Baranof Lake.
- †Berg Bay.
- †Big John Bay.
- †Binkley Slough.
- †Breland Slough.
- †Camp Kathleen.
- †Camp Pybus.
- †Camp Sha Heen.
- †Castle Flats.
- †Castle River.
- †Church Bight.
- †Davidoff Lake.
- †Deboer Lake.
- †Devils Elbow.
- †Eagle Lake.
- †Fair Island.
- †Florence Lake 2.
- †Garnet.
- †Goulding Lake.
- †Gut Island.
- †Gut Lake 2.
- †Harvey Lake.
- †Jims Lake.
- †Koknuk.
- †Kook Lake.
- †Little Dry Island.
- †Mallard Slough.
- †Marten Lake.
- \*Mendenhall.
- †Mount Flemer.
- †Mount Rynda.
- †Petersburg Lake 2.
- †Plotnikof Lake.
- †Redoubt Lake.
- †Rezanof Lake.
- †Salt Chuck 2.
- †Sergrief Island.
- †Seymour Canal.
- †Shakes Slough 1.
- †Shakes Slough 2.
- †Shelikof.
- †Sitkoh Lake.
- †Sportsmen Camp.
- †Spruce Camp.
- †Steamer Bay.
- †Swan Lake.
- †Thoms Lake.
- †Tower Arm.
- †Tower Lake.
- †Turner Lake 1.
- †Twin Lakes.
- †Virginia Lake.
- †Zimovia.

## South Tongass NF

- †Bakewell Lake.
- †Barnes Lake.
- †Beaver.
- †Big Goat Lake.
- †Big Salt Lake.
- †Billy Goat Creek.
- †Black Bear Lake.
- †Checats Lake.
- †Ella Narrows.
- †Fisheries.
- †Heckman Lake.
- †Honker Lake.
- †Hugh Smith.
- †Jordan Lake.
- †Josephine Lake.
- †Karta Lake.
- †Karta River.
- †Kegan Cove.
- †Kegan Creek.
- †Low Lake.
- †Luck Lake.
- †Manzanita Lake.
- †Marguerita Bay.
- †McGilvery Creek.
- †Naha River.
- †Orchard Lake.
- †Fatching Lake.
- †Plenty Cutthroat.
- †Paint Amargura.
- †Portage.
- †Rainbow Lake.
- †Red Alders.
- †Red Bay Lake.
- †Salmon Bay Lake.
- †Sarkar Lake.
- †Shipley Bay.
- †Short Creek.
- \*Signal Creek.
- †Staney Creek.
- †St. Nicholas Lake.
- †Sweetwater Lake.
- †Wilson Narrows.
- †Wilson View.
- †Winston Lake.
- †Wolverine Island.

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

†Glacier Bay NM.

## Mount McKinley NP

- †Igloo Cmpgd.
- †Riley Creek Cmpgd.
- †Sanctuary Cmpgd.
- †Savage Cmpgd.
- †Teklanika Cmpgd.
- †Toklat Cmpgd.
- †Wonder Lake Cmpgd.

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## Fairbanks District

\*Delta Cmpgd.

## ARIZONA

## FOREST SERVICE

## Apache NF

- \*Alpine Divide.
- \*Aspen.
- \*Beaver Dam.
- \*Big Lake Rec. Area.
- \*Crescent Lake.
- \*Diamond Rock.
- \*East Fork.
- \*Greer.
- \*Greer Lakes.
- \*Hall.
- \*Sheep Crossing.
- \*South Fork.

## Coconino NF

- \*Allens' Bend.
- \*Ashurst Lake.
- \*Banjo Bill.
- \*Beaver Creek.
- \*Blue Ridge.
- \*Bonita.
- \*Cave Spring.
- \*Chavez Crossing.
- \*Clear Creek.
- \*Clints Well.
- \*Dairy Springs.
- \*Double Springs.
- \*Encinoso.
- \*Forked Pine.
- \*Half Way Point.
- \*Kendrick Park.
- \*Kinnikinnick.
- \*Knoll Lake.
- \*Lakeview.
- \*Lower Manzonita.
- \*Manzonita.

September 24, 1969

- \*Midgely Bridge.
- \*Pine Flat.
- \*Pine Flat Trailer.
- \*Pine Grove.
- \*Red Rock Crossing.
- \*Rock Crossing.
- \*Slide Rock.

*Coronado NF*

- \*Arcadia.
- \*Bathtub.
- \*Bear Canyon.
- \*Bear Wallow.
- \*Bog Springs.
- \*Calabasas.
- \*Camp Rucker.
- \*Cochise Stronghold.
- \*Cypress Park.
- \*General Hitchcock.
- \*Herb Martyr.
- \*Hospital Flat.
- \*Idlewild.
- \*Inspiration Rock.
- \*John Hands.
- \*Lakeview 1.
- \*Lakeview 2.
- \*Loma Linda.
- \*Madera Canyon.
- \*Marshall Gulch.
- \*Molino Basin.
- \*Noon Creek.
- \*Peppersauce.
- \*Piney Canyon.
- \*Red Rock.
- \*Riggs Flat.
- \*Rose Canyon.
- \*Roundup Park.
- \*Rucker.
- \*Rucker Lake.
- \*Rustler Park.
- \*Sabino Canyon Rec. Area.
- \*Shannon.
- \*Showers Point.
- \*Soldier Creek.
- \*South Fork.
- \*Spencer Canyon.
- \*Stewart.
- \*Stockton Pass.
- \*Sunny Flat.
- \*Sycamore.
- \*Sykes Knob.
- \*Thumb Rock.
- \*West Rubkey Creek.
- \*Wet Canyon.
- \*White Rock.

*Kaibab NF*

- \*DeMotte.
- \*Jacob Lake.
- \*Kaibab Lake.
- \*Ox.
- \*Parks.
- \*White Horse.

*Prescott NF*

- \*Granite Basin.
- \*Hazlett Hollow.
- \*Hilltop.
- \*Indian Creek.
- \*Kentuck Springs.
- \*Lower Wolf Creek.
- \*Lynx Lake.
- \*Mingus Mountain.
- \*Playground.
- \*Potato Patch.
- \*Powell Springs.
- \*St. Agatha.
- \*Thumb Butte.
- \*Turney Gulch.
- \*White Spar.

*Sitgreaves NF*

- \*Canyon Point.
- \*Gentry.
- \*Lakeside.
- \*Woods Canyon Rec. Area.

*Tonto NF*

- \*Acacia.
- \*Apache Lake.
- \*Boulder Creek.
- \*Burnt Corral.
- \*Butcher Jones.
- \*Cave Creek.

- \*Christopher Creek.
- \*Coons Bluff.
- \*Granite Reef.
- \*Jones Water.

- \*Laguna.
- \*Oak Flat.
- \*Palo Verde.
- \*Phon D. Sutton.
- \*Pinal.
- \*Pine.
- \*Pioneer Pass.
- \*Ponderosa.
- \*Saguaro del Norte.
- \*Seven Springs.
- \*Sycamore.
- \*The Point.
- \*Tonto Creek.
- \*Tortilla.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
\*Casa Grande Ruins NM

*Chiricahua NW*

- +Bonita Canyon Cmpgd.
- Glen Canyon NRA (*also listed under Utah*)
- +Bullfrog Cmpgd.
- +Lees Ferry Cmpgd.
- +Wahweep Cmpgd.
- \*Grand Canyon NP.
- +Bright Angel Point Cmpgd.
- +Desert View Cmpgd.
- +Mother (Grand Canyon Village) Cmpgd.
- +Hubbell Trading Post NHS

*Lake Mead NRA (*also listed under Nevada*)*

*Lake Mead NRA*

- +Boulder Beach Cmpgd.
- +Cottonwood Cove Cmpgd.
- +Echo Bay Cmpgd.
- +Hemenway Cmpgd.
- +Katherine Cmpgd.
- +Las Vegas Bay Cmpgd.
- +Temple Bar Cmpgd.
- +Willow Beach Cmpgd.
- \*Montezuma Castle NW.

*Organ Pipe Cactus NM*

- +Headquarters Cmpgd.
- \*Petrified Forest NP
- +Pipe Springs NM
- \*Tonto NM
- \*Tumacacori NM
- \*Tuzigoot NM
- \*Walnut Canyon NM

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

+Hoover Dam & Power Plant (*also listed under Nevada*)

ARKANSAS

FOREST SERVICE

*Ouachita NF*

- \*Albert Pike.
- \*Charlton.
- \*Lake Sylvia.
- \*Mill Creek.
- +Shady Lake.

*Ozark NF*

- \*Barkshed.
- \*Blanchard Springs.
- +Cove Lake.
- \*Gunner Pool.
- \*Horsehead Lake.
- \*Lake Wedington.
- \*Long Pool.
- +Shores Lake.
- \*Spring Lake.

*St. Francis NF*

- \*Bear Creek Lake.
- \*Beaver Point.
- \*Beech Point.
- \*Lone Point.
- +Maple Flat.
- \*Storm Creek Lake.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
+White River NWR.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

*Hot Springs NP*

+Gulpha Gorge Cmpgd.

CALIFORNIA  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Angeles NF*

- \*Apple Tree.
- +Bandido.
- \*Basin.
- \*Big Oak.
- \*Buckhorn.
- \*Chantry Flats.
- \*Charlton Flat.
- \*Chipmunk Hollow.
- \*Cienequa.
- \*Coldbrook.
- \*Cottonwood.
- +Crystal Lake.
- \*Glacier.
- \*Grassy Hollow.
- \*Joshua Tree.
- \*Juniper Grove.
- \*Lake.
- \*Lakeside.
- \*Little Dalton.
- \*Live Oak.
- \*Lower Chilao.
- \*Lower Switzer.
- \*Manker.
- \*Millard Canyon.
- \*Oak Flat.
- \*Peavine.
- \*Rocky Point.
- \*Shady Slope.
- \*South Fork.
- \*South Portal.
- \*Streamsides.
- \*Sugar Pine.
- \*Sycamore Flat.
- \*Table Mountain.
- \*The Falls.
- \*Upper Chilao.
- \*Valley Forge.
- \*Vogel Flat.
- \*Zuni.

*Cleveland NF*

- +Agua Dulce.
- \*Black Canyon.
- \*Blue Jay.
- \*Burnt Rancheria.
- \*Dripping Springs.
- \*El Cariso.
- +El Prado.
- +Falcon.
- +Horse Haven.
- \*Indian Flats.
- \*Laguna 1.
- \*Laguna 2.
- \*Lower San Juan.
- \*Oak Grove.
- \*Observatory.
- \*Tenaja.
- \*Upper San Juan.
- +Wooded Hill.

*Eldorado NF*

- \*Alpine.
- +Baldwin Beach Parking.
- \*Bayview.
- +Bear River.
- \*Big Meadow.
- +Black Oak.
- \*China Flat.
- \*Eagle Falls.
- \*Fallen Leaf.
- \*Fashoda.
- +Fashoda Boat Ramp.
- \*Gerle Creek.
- \*Gobbi.
- \*Icehouse.
- +Icehouse Boat Ramp.
- \*Kirkwood Lake.
- +Kiva Parking.
- \*Loon Lake.
- +Loon Lake Boat Ramp.
- +Middle Meadow.
- +Pope Beach Parking.
- \*Pyramid.
- \*Silver Lake.
- \*South Shore.
- \*Stumpy Meadows.
- \*Sunset.
- +Tahoe Mountain.

\*Twin Lakes.  
\*Union Valley.  
\*West Wrights Lake.  
\*Woods Lake.  
\*Wrights Lake.

*Inyo NF*

\*†Agnew Meadow.  
\*Aspen Park.  
\*Big Bend.  
\*Big Meadow.  
\*Big Springs.  
\*Big Trees.  
\*Birch Trees.  
\*Bishop Park Intake.  
\*Carson.  
\*Coldwater.  
\*Convict Lake.  
\*Cottonwood.  
\*Creekside.  
\*East Fork.  
\*Ellery Lake.  
†Fern Creek.  
\*First Bridge.  
†First Falls.  
\*Fishermans Rest.  
\*Forks.  
\*Grandview.  
\*Greys Meadow.  
\*Hartley Springs.  
†Horseshoe Lake.  
\*Intake.  
\*Iris Meadow.  
\*June Lake.  
\*La Hupp.  
\*Lake.  
\*Lake George.  
\*Lake Mary.  
\*Lake Sabrina.  
\*Lee Vining.  
\*Lone Pine.  
\*Lower Deadman.  
\*Lower Grey's Meadow.  
\*Lower Gull Lake.  
\*Lower Oak Creek.  
\*Mammoth Creek.  
\*McGee Creek.  
\*Middle McGee Creek.  
\*Mill City.  
\*Minaret Falls.  
\*Mosquito Flat.  
\*North Big Pine Creek.  
\*North Lake.  
\*Oak Creek.  
\*Onion Valley.  
\*Pallades.  
\*Pine Grove.  
\*Pinyon Creek.  
†Pumic Flat.  
\*Reds Meadow.  
\*Rock Creek.  
\*Rock Creek Lake Inlet.  
\*Rock Creek Lake Outlet.  
\*Rush Creek.  
\*Saddlebag.  
\*Sage Flat.  
\*Sawmill.  
\*Second Falls.  
\*Shady Rest.  
\*Shady Rest Extension.  
\*Sherwin Creek.  
\*Silver Lake.  
\*South Fork 1.  
\*South Fork 2.  
\*South Fork 3.  
\*South Fork 5.  
\*South Lake.  
\*Tioga Junction.  
\*Tioga Lake.  
\*Tuff.  
\*Twin Lakes.  
\*Upper Gulf Lake.  
\*Upper McGee Creek.  
\*Upper Oak Creek.  
\*Upper Soda.  
\*Whitney Portal.

*Klamath NF*

\*Bacon Rind.  
\*Beaver Creek.  
\*Bridge Flat.  
\*Curley Jack.  
\*Dillon Creek.  
\*East Fork.

\*Etna.  
\*Fort Goff.  
\*Idlewild.  
\*Indian Scotty.  
\*Juanita Lake.  
\*Kangaroo Lake.  
\*Little North Fork.  
\*Martins Dairy.  
\*Matthews Creek.  
\*Oak Bottom.  
\*O'Neill Creek.  
\*Sarah Toffen.  
\*Scott Mountain.  
\*Shadow Creek.  
\*Shafter.  
\*Spring Flat.  
\*Sulphur Springs.  
\*West Branch.

*Lassen NF*

\*Alder.  
\*Almanor.  
\*Aspen.  
\*Battle Creek.  
\*Big Pine.  
\*Big Springs.  
\*Boundary.  
\*Bridge.  
\*Butte Meadows.  
\*Cave.  
\*Cherry Hill.  
\*Domingo Springs.  
\*Eagle.  
\*Elam Creek.  
\*†Gallatin Beach.  
\*Gurnsey Creek.  
\*Hat Creek.  
\*High Bridge.  
\*Honn.  
\*Lower Hole-in-the-ground.  
\*†Merrill Creek.  
\*Mill Creek.  
\*Mineral.  
\*Potato Patch.  
\*Rice Creek.  
\*Rocky.  
\*Rocky Knoll.  
\*Silver Bowl.

*Los Padres NF*

\*Arroyo.  
\*Arroyo Seco.  
†Arroyo Seco Group.  
\*Cerro Alto.  
\*Chuchupate.  
\*Davy Brown.  
\*Figueroa.  
\*Fremont.  
\*Hi Mountain.  
\*Kirk Creek.  
\*La Panza.  
\*Lion.  
\*Los Prietos.  
\*Lower Oso.  
\*McGill.  
†McGill Group.  
\*Mt. Pinos.  
\*†Plasket Creek.  
†Plasket Creek Group.  
†Ponderosa.  
\*Reyes Creek 1.  
\*Reyes Creek 2.  
\*Sand Dollar.  
\*Santa Ynez.  
\*Upper Oso.  
\*Wheeler Gorge.

*Mendocino NF*

\*Bear Creek.  
\*Cedar Camp.  
\*Deer Valley.  
\*Digger Pine.  
\*Eel River.  
\*Hammerhorn Lake.  
\*Lakeview.  
\*Little Doe.  
\*Masterson.  
\*Middle Creek.  
\*Mill Valley.  
\*North Fork.  
\*Old Mill.  
\*Pacific Ridge.  
\*Pilot Grove.  
\*Plaskett.  
\*Pogie Point.

\*Saddle.  
\*Sunset.  
\*Telephone.  
\*Upper Letts Valley.  
\*Wells Cabin.  
\*Whitlock.

*Modoc NF*

\*Blue Lake.  
\*Cave Lake.  
\*Cedar Pass.  
\*Howard Gulch.  
\*Little Meadows.  
\*Lower Rush Creek.  
\*Medicine Lake 1.  
\*Medicine Lake 2.  
\*Medicine Lake West.  
\*Stowe Reservoir.  
\*Upper Rush Creek.  
\*Willow Creek.

*Plumas NF*

\*Belden.  
\*Big Cove.  
\*Boulder Creek-Lone Rock.  
\*Chilcoot 1.  
\*Chilcoot 2.  
\*Crocker.  
\*Deanes Valley.  
\*Frenchman 1.  
\*Frenchman 2.  
\*Gansner Bar.  
\*Grasshopper Flat.  
\*Grizzly.  
\*Halstead.  
\*Injun Jim.  
\*Jackson Creek 1.  
\*Jackson Creek 2.  
\*Laufman.  
\*Little North Fork.  
\*Lone Rock.  
\*Milsap Bar.  
\*North Fork.  
\*Peninsula.  
\*Queen Lily.  
\*Rock Creek.  
\*White Horse.

*San Bernardino NF*

\*Applewhite 1.  
\*Applewhite 2.  
\*Barton Flats.  
\*Baylis Park.  
\*Big Horn.  
\*Big Pines.  
\*Big Pine Flats.  
\*Black Mountain.  
†Camp Pow Wow Group.  
\*Coldbrook.  
†Council Camp Group.  
\*Crap Flats.  
\*Dark Canyon.  
\*Dogwood.  
\*Falls.  
\*Fern Basin.  
\*Fishermans Camp.  
\*Fuller Mill Creek.  
\*Green Valley.  
\*Grout Bay.  
\*Hanna Flats.  
\*Holcomb Valley.  
\*Horse Springs.  
\*Marion Mountain.  
\*Mill Creek.  
\*North Shore.  
\*Pine Knot.  
\*Pinyon Flats.  
\*Pipes Canyon.  
\*San Gorgonio.  
\*Santa Rosa Spring.  
\*South Fork.  
\*Stockton Flats.  
\*Strawberry Flats.  
\*Switzer Park.  
\*Thomas Mountain.  
\*Thurman Flats.  
\*Toll Road.  
\*Tool Box Springs.

*Sequoia NF*

\*Camp 3.  
\*Fish Creek.  
\*Gold Lodge.  
\*Headquarters.  
\*Hobo.

- \*Horse Meadow.
- \*Hospital Flat.
- \*Hume Lake.
- \*Kennedy.
- \*Leavis Flat.
- \*Limestone.
- \*Quaking Aspen.
- \*Redwood Meadow.
- \*Stony Creek.
- \*Troy Meadow.
- \*Wishon.

*Shasta-Trinity NF*

- \*Ackerman.
- \*Ah-Di-Na.
- \*Allie Cove.
- \*Alpine View.
- \*Antlers.
- \*Arbuckle Flat.
- \*Bailey Cove.
- \*Basin Gulch Middle Fork.
- \*Reegum Gorge.
- \*Big Bar.
- \*Big Flat.
- \*Big French Creek.
- \*Big Slide.
- \*Bridge Camp.
- \*Burnt Ranch.
- \*Captains Point.
- \*Castle Creek.
- \*Castle Lake.
- †Centimudi Boat Ramp.
- \*Chirpchatter.
- \*Clarks Spring 1.
- \*Clarks Spring 2.
- \*Clear Creek.
- \*Cold Springs.
- \*Cooper Gulch.
- \*Deadlum Creek.
- \*Deep Creek.
- \*Deerlick Junction.
- \*Deerlick Springs.
- \*Dekkas Rock.
- \*Denny.
- \*Eagle Creek.
- \*East Weaver.
- \*Ellery Creek.
- †Fairview Boat Ramp.
- \*Fawn.
- \*Forest Glen.
- \*Fowler.
- \*Gooseneck Cove.
- \*Grasshopper.
- \*Greens Creek.
- \*Gregary Creek.
- \*Hayden Flat.
- \*Hells Gate.
- \*Hirz Bay.
- †Hirz Bay Group.
- \*Horse Flat.
- \*Jackass Springs.
- \*Jennings Creek.
- \*Jones Valley.
- \*Knob Peak.
- \*Kokanee.
- \*Lakeshore.
- \*Lower Salt Creek.
- \*Madrone.
- \*Mariners Point.
- \*Mariners Roost.
- \*Mary Smith.
- \*McBride Spring.
- \*McCloud Bridge.
- \*Moore Creek.
- \*Mott.
- \*Nelson Point.
- \*North Fork Beegum.
- \*Oak Grove.
- \*Panther Creek.
- \*Panther Meadows.
- \*Philpot.
- \*Pine Point.
- \*Pollard Flat.
- \*Preacher Meadows.
- \*Reagan Meadows.
- \*Rend Island.
- \*Ridgeville.
- \*Ridgeville Island.
- \*Rocky Ridge.
- \*Rush Creek.
- \*Saddle Camp.
- \*Salt Creek.
- \*Salt Creek Point.
- \*Ski Island.

- \*Slaughterhouse Island.
- \*Slide Creek.
- \*Stein Creek.
- \*Stoney Point.
- †Stuart Fort Boat Ramp.
- \*Tanbark.
- \*Tannery Gulch.
- \*Tomhead Saddle.
- \*Trinity River.
- \*Tunnel Rock.
- \*White Rock.
- \*Winton.

*Sierra NF*

- \*Badger Flat.
- †Boss Lake Scout Area.
- \*Bosillo.
- \*Buck Meadow.
- \*Cataree.
- \*College Creek.
- \*Crows Foot.
- \*Denver Church.
- \*Dorabelle.
- \*Fish Creek.
- \*Florence Lake.
- \*Forks.
- \*Indian Flat.
- \*Jerseydale.
- \*Kirch Creek and Kirch Flat.
- †Kokanee.
- \*Lily Pad.
- \*Lower Billy Creek.
- \*Lower Deer Creek.
- \*Lower Dinkey Creek.
- \*Lower Rancheria.
- \*Lupine.
- \*Mammoth Pool.
- \*Marmot Rock.
- \*Mono Hot Springs.
- †Mugler Forks Group.
- \*Pine Point.
- \*Pine Slope.
- \*Placer.
- \*Portal Forebay.
- \*Rancheria.
- †Recreation Center.
- \*Red Bud.
- \*Rock Creek.
- \*Rocky Point.
- \*Spring Cave.
- \*Summerdale.
- \*Summit.
- \*Sycamore Flat 1.
- \*Sycamore Flat 2.
- \*Swanson Meadow.
- \*Sweetwater.
- \*Upper Billy Creek.
- \*Upper Chiquito.
- \*Upper Deer Creek.
- \*Upper Dinkey Creek.
- \*Vermillion.
- \*Ward Lake.
- \*Westfall.
- \*West Kaiser.
- \*Wishon.

*Six Rivers NF*

- \*Bailey Canyon.
- \*Big Flat.
- \*Bluff Creek.
- \*Boise Creek.
- \*Cedar Rustic.
- \*Fir Cove.
- \*Fish Lake.
- \*Grassy Flats.
- \*Gray Falls.
- \*Mad River.
- \*Panther Flat.
- \*Patrick Creek.
- \*Peach Creek.
- \*Tish Tang.

*Stanislaus NF*

- \*Arnot Bridge.
- \*Baker Station.
- \*Big Meadows.
- \*Boards Crossing.
- \*Brightman Flat.
- \*Cascade Creek.
- \*Carlton.
- \*Cherry Valley.
- \*Clark Fork.
- \*Cottonwood.
- \*Cow Creek.
- \*Dardanelle.

- \*Deadman.
- \*Disaster Creek.
- \*Eureka Valley.
- \*Fraser Flat.
- \*Hermit Valley.
- \*Lake Alpine.
- \*Lodgepole.
- \*Lost Claim.
- \*Lumsden.
- \*Lumsden Bridge.
- \*Meadow View.
- \*Middle Fork.
- \*Pacific Valley.
- \*Pigeon Flat.
- \*Pinecrest.
- †Pioneer Trail.
- \*Fed Fir.
- \*Riverview.
- \*Rush Creek.
- \*Sand Flat.
- \*Silver Creek.
- \*Silver Tip.
- \*The Pines.
- \*Upper Baker.

*Tahoe NF*

- \*Ahart.
- \*Aspen.
- †Aspen Group.
- \*Bear Valley.
- \*Chapman Creek.
- \*Coldstream.
- \*Cottonwood.
- †Coyote Group.
- \*East Meadow.
- \*Fiddle Creek.
- \*French Meadow 1.
- \*French Meadow 2.
- \*Hampshire Rocks.
- \*Indian Springs.
- \*Indian Valley.
- \*Lewis.
- \*McGuire 1.
- \*Pass Creek.
- \*Prosser.
- \*Ramshorn.
- \*Salmon Creek.
- \*Sardine.
- \*Silver Creek.
- †Silver Tip Group.
- \*Skilman.
- \*Union Flat.
- \*White Cloud.
- \*Wild Plum.
- \*William Kent.
- \*Wood Camp 1.
- \*Wood Camp 2.
- \*Yuba Pass.

*Toiyabe NF*

- \*Buckeye.
- \*Chris Flat.
- \*Crystal Peak.
- \*Crystal Spring.
- \*Dog Valley.
- \*Green Creek.
- \*Hope Valley.
- \*Kit Carson.
- \*Leavitt Meadows.
- \*Markleeville.
- \*Moles Station.
- \*Opal-Obsidian.
- \*Robinson Creek.
- \*Silver Creek.
- \*Snowshoe Springs.
- \*Sonora Bridge.
- \*Virginia Lake.

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

†Kern NWR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Death Valley NM (Also listed under Nevada)

†Mesquite Springs Cmpgd.

## Devils Postpile NM

†Campground.

## John Muir NHS

\*Muir Home

## Joshua Tree NM

†Cottonwood Spring Cmpgd.

\*Kings Canyon NP

(Combined with Sequoia NP)

†Azalea Cmpgd.

†Cedar Grove 1 Cmpgd.

\*Cedar Grove 2 Cmpgd.  
†Cedar Grove 3 Cmpgd.  
†Cedar Grove 4 Cmpgd.  
†Sunset Cmpgd.  
†Swale Cmpgd.

## \*Lassen Volcanic NP

†Butte Lake Cmpgd.  
†Manzanita Lake Cmpgd.  
†Summit Lake Cmpgd.

## Lava Beds NM

†Indian Wells Cmpgd.

## \*Muir Woods NM

## \*Pinnacles NM

## \*Sequoia NP

(Combined with Kings Canyon NP)

†Buckeye Flat Cmpgd.

†Crystal Cave

†Dorst 1-4 Cmpgd.

†Lodgepole Cmpgd.

†Paradise Cmpgd.

†Potwisha Cmpgd.

†Sunset Rock Cmpgd.

## Whiskeytown NRA

†Oak Bottom Cmpgd.

†Whiskey Creek Boat Launching

## \*Yosemite NP

†Camp 4 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 7 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 9 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 11 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 12 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 14 (Yosemite Valley)

†Camp 15 (Yosemite Valley)

†Bridal Veil Creek Cmpgd.

†Crane Flat Cmpgd.

†Hodgdon Meadow Cmpgd.

†Tenaya Lake Cmpgd.

†Tuolumne Meadows Cmpgd.

†Wawona Cmpgd.

†White Wolf Cmpgd.

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

## Bakersfield district

\*Chimney Creek  
\*Crowley Lake  
\*Goodale Creek  
\*Horton Creek  
\*Long Valley  
\*Symmes Creek  
\*Tuttle Creek

## Redding district

\*†Douglas City  
\*Junction City

## Riverside district

\*Afton Canyon  
\*Coon Hollow  
\*Corn Springs  
\*Rainbow Basin-Owl Canyon  
\*Wiley Well

## Susanville district

\*Eagle Lake

## Ukiah district

\*Horse Mountain  
\*Nadelos  
\*Tolkan  
\*Wailaki

## COLORADO

## FOREST SERVICE

## Arapaho NF

\*Bethol  
\*Big Bend  
\*Blue River  
\*Byers Creek  
\*Cold Creek  
\*Cold Springs  
\*Columbine  
\*Denver Creek  
\*Heaton Bay  
\*Horseshoe  
\*Idlewild  
\*Jim Creek  
\*Meadow Creek  
\*Mispa  
\*Officers Gulch  
\*Peak One Area  
†Pickle Gulch 1

\*Pickle Gulch 2  
\*Prospector  
\*Robbers Roost  
\*Sawmill Gulch  
\*Silvertip  
\*South Fork  
\*St. Louis Creek  
\*Sugarloaf  
\*Tabernash  
\*Tenderfoot Mountain  
\*Trail Creek  
\*West Chicago Creek  
\*Winter Park

## Grand Mesa Uncompahgre NF

\*Amphitheater  
\*Beaver Lake  
\*Big Cimarron  
\*Carp Lake  
\*Cottonwood Lake  
\*Crag Crest  
\*Eggleson Lake  
\*Glacier Springs  
\*Island Lake  
\*Jumbo  
\*Kiser Creek  
\*Little Bear  
\*Matterhorn  
\*Mesa Lake  
\*Spruce Grove  
\*Sunshine  
\*Valley View  
\*Ward Lake

## Gunnison NF

\*Agate  
\*Almont  
\*Avery  
\*Cebolla  
\*Cement Creek  
\*Cold Spring  
\*Deer Lakes  
\*Dinner Station  
\*Dorchester  
\*Erickson Springs  
\*Gold Creek  
\*Gothic  
\*Hidden Valley  
\*Lake Irwin  
\*Lakeview  
\*Lodgepole  
\*Lost Lake  
\*Lotus Creek  
\*Middle Quartz  
\*Mirror Lake  
\*Mosca Creek  
\*North Bank  
\*One Mile  
\*Pitkin  
\*Quartz  
\*Rivers Bend  
\*Rosy Lane  
\*Slumgullion  
\*Snowblind  
\*Spring Creek  
\*Spring Creek Area  
\*Spruce  
\*Williams Creek

## Pike NF

\*Bailey  
\*Beaver Creek  
\*Blue Mountain  
\*Bridge Crossing  
\*Buffalo  
\*Buffalo Creek  
\*Buffalo Springs  
\*Burning Bear  
\*Cabin Ridge  
\*Chaseville  
\*Clyde  
\*Colorado  
\*Cove  
\*Deer Creek  
\*Devils Head 1  
\*Devils Head 2  
\*Duck Creek  
\*Eleven Mile  
\*Fallen Rocks  
\*Flat Rocks  
\*Fourmile  
\*Geneva Creek  
\*Goose Creek  
\*Green Mountain

\*Hall Valley  
\*Handcart  
\*Happy Meadows  
\*Idlewild  
\*Indian Creek  
\*Jefferson Creek  
\*Kelsey  
\*Kenosha Pass  
\*Kite Lake  
\*Lone Rock  
\*Lost Park  
\*Manitou  
\*Meridian  
\*Messenger Gulch  
\*Michigan Creek  
\*Molly Gulch  
\*O'Brien Gulch  
\*Painted Rocks  
\*Pike Community  
\*Pipe Spring  
\*Platte River  
\*Reservoir  
\*Round Mountain  
\*Scraggy View  
\*Selkirk  
\*South Meadows  
\*Springer Gulch  
\*Spruce Grove  
\*Stage Road  
\*St. Peter's Dome  
\*The Crags  
\*Top-of-the-World  
\*Trail Creek  
\*Tramway  
\*Twin Eagles  
\*Wagon Tongue  
\*Weston Pass  
\*Whiteside  
\*Wigwam  
\*Wildhorn  
\*Willow Bend  
\*Wye

## Rio Grande NF

\*Alamosa  
\*Aspen Glade 1  
\*†Aspen Glade 2  
\*Beaver Creek 1  
\*Beaver Creek 2  
\*Big Meadows  
\*Buffalo Pass  
\*Cathedral  
\*Comstock  
\*Conejos  
\*Cross Creek  
\*Elk Creek 1  
\*†Elk Creek 2  
\*Highway Springs  
\*Lake Fork  
\*Lost Trail  
\*Luders Creek  
\*Marshall Park  
\*Mix Lake 1  
\*North Clear Creek  
\*North Crestone Creek  
\*Palisade  
\*Park Creek  
\*Poso 1  
\*†Poso 2  
\*River Hill  
\*Road Canyon  
\*Rock Creek 1  
\*†Rock Creek 2  
\*South Clear Creek  
\*South Clear Creek Falls  
\*South Fork  
\*Spectacle Lake  
\*Stormking  
\*Stunner  
\*Thirty Mile  
\*Trujillo Meadows  
\*Tucker Ponds 1  
\*Tucker Ponds 2

## Roosevelt, NF

\*Ansel Watrous  
\*Bellaire Lake  
\*Big South  
\*Camp Dick  
\*Chambers Lake 1  
\*Chambers Lake 2  
\*Diamond Rock  
\*Kelly Dahl 1  
\*Kelly Dahl 2

- \*Kelly Flats
- \*Mountain Park 1
- \*Mountain Park 2
- †Mountain Park 3
- \*Narrows
- \*Olive Ridge
- \*Pawnee 1
- \*Pawnee 2
- \*Peaceful Valley
- \*Poudre Tunnel
- \*Rainbow Lakes
- \*Sleeping Elephant
- \*South Shore Dowdy Lake
- \*West Lake
- \*West Shore Dowdy Lake

*Routt NF*

- \*Aspen
- \*Big Creek Lake
- \*Blacktail Creek
- \*Box Canyon
- \*Cold Springs
- \*Dry Lake
- \*Dumont Lake
- \*Ferndale
- \*Gore Pass
- \*Grizzly Creek
- \*Hahn's Peak Lake
- \*Hidden Lake
- \*Hinman
- \*Horseshoe
- \*Lynx Pass
- \*Meadows
- \*Pines
- \*Seedhouse
- \*Still Water
- \*Summit Lake
- \*Toponas Creek
- \*Walton Creek

*San Isabel NF*

- \*Alvarado
- \*Bear Lake
- \*Blue Lake
- \*Cascade
- \*Collegiate Peak
- \*Cottonwood Lake 1
- \*Cottonwood Lake 2
- \*Cuchara
- \*Davenport
- \*Florence
- \*Garfield
- \*Half Moon
- \*Hadyen Creek 1
- \*Hayden Creek 2
- \*Lake Creek
- \*Lake Isabel
- \*Monarch Park
- \*Mt. Princeton 1
- \*Mt. Princeton 2
- \*North Creek
- \*North Fork Reservoir
- \*Oak Creek
- \*O'Haver Lake
- \*Ophir
- \*Perry Mountain
- \*Shavano
- \*Smith Creek
- \*Spring Creek
- \*Tennessee Pass

*San Juan NF*

- \*Bridge
- \*Burro Bridge
- \*Cayton
- \*Cherry Creek
- †Chris Park
- \*Comarrona
- \*East Fork
- \*Emerson 1
- †Emerson 2
- \*Florida 1
- †Florida 2
- \*Forks
- \*Graham Creek
- \*Haviland Lake
- \*Kroeger
- \*Lower Piedra
- \*Mavreeso
- \*Middle Mountain
- \*Miller Creek
- \*North Canyon
- \*Old Timers

- \*Pine Point
- \*Priest Gulch
- \*Purgatory
- \*Sig Creek
- \*South Mineral
- \*Teal
- \*Thompson Park
- \*Transfer
- \*Transfer Park
- \*Vallecito
- \*West Dolores
- \*West Fork
- \*Williams Creek
- \*Wolf Creek

*White River NF*

- \*Avalanche
- \*Blodgett
- \*Boggs Flats
- \*Chapman
- \*Cutthroat
- \*Deep Lake 1
- \*Deep Lake 2
- \*Difficult
- \*Marvine
- \*Elk Wallow
- \*Fulford Cave
- \*Gold Park
- \*Gore Creek
- \*Half Moon
- \*Himes Peak
- \*Homestake
- \*Hornsilver
- \*Janeway
- \*Klines Folly
- \*Lincoln Gulch
- \*Little Box Canyon
- \*Little Mattie
- \*Little Maud
- \*Lostman
- \*Maroon Lake
- \*Meadow Creek Lake
- \*Mollie B
- \*North Fork
- \*Portal
- \*Redstone
- \*Shepard's Rim
- \*Silver Bar
- \*Silver Bell
- \*Silver Queen
- \*Snowmass Creek
- \*South Fork
- \*Supply Basin
- \*Sweetwater Lake
- \*Tigwon
- \*Three Forks
- \*Trapline
- \*Trappers Lake
- \*Weller
- \*Yeoman Park

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

- \*Black Canyon of the Gunnison NM

- †North Rim Cmpgd.

- †South Rim Cmpgd.

*Colorado NM*

- †Saddle Horn Cmpgd.

*Curecanti RA*

- †Center Point Cmpgd.

- †Center Point Boat Launching

- †Lola Boat launching

- Dinosaur NM (Also listed under Utah)

- †Green River Cmpgd.

- †Split Mountain cmpgd.

*Great Sand Dunes NM*

- †Pinyon Flats Cmpgd.

- Hovenweep NM (Also listed under Utah)

- †Square Tower House Cmpgd.

*Mesa Verde NP*

- †Guide Fee

- †Moorefield Canyon Cmpgd.

*Rocky Mountain NP*

- †Aspenglen Cmpgd.

- †Endovalley Cmpgd.

- †Glacier Basin Cmpgd.

- †Longs Peak Cmpgd.

- †Moraine Park Cmpgd.

- †Timber Creek Cmpgd.

*Shadow Mountain RA*

- †Green Ridge Cmpgd.

- †Roaring Fork Cmpgd.

- †Shadow Mountain Cmpgd.

- †Stillwater Cmpgd.

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

*Glenwood Springs District*

- \*Gypsum

*Montrose District*

- \*Mill Creek

## DELAWARE

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

- \*†Bombay Hook NWR

## DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

- \*House where Lincoln died NM

- (Combined with Lincoln Museum NM)

*(Ford's Theater)**\*Lincoln Museum NM*

- (Combined with House where Lincoln Died NM)

*(Ford's Theater)**\*Washington Monument NM*

## FLORIDA

## FOREST SERVICE

*Apalachicola NF*

- \*Camel Lake

- \*†Silver Lake

- \*Wright Lake

*Ocala NF*

- \*†Alexander Spring

- \*Clearwater Lake

- \*Fore Lake

- \*†Juniper Springs

- \*Lake Dorr

- \*Mill Dam

*Osceola NF*

- \*Ocean Pond

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

*\*Merrit Island NWR*

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

- \*Castillo de San Marcos NM

*\*Everglades NP**Fort Matanzas NM*

- \*Boat Transportation

## GEORGIA

## FOREST SERVICE

*Chattahoochee NF*

- \*Cooper Creek

- \*Deep Hole

- \*†DeSoto Falls

- \*Dockery Lake

- \*Frank Gross

- \*Lake Blueridge

- \*Lake Chatuge

- \*Lake Russell

- \*Morganton Point

- \*Mulky

- \*Nancytown Lake

- \*Rabun Beach

*Oconee NF*

- \*Lake Sinclair

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

*Blackbeard Island NWR*

- †Cmpgd.

- †Millen NFH

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

- \*Fort Pulaski NM

- \*Kennesaw Mountain NBP

*Ocmulgee NM*

- \*Museum and Earthlodge

## HAWAII

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

*\*Haleakala NP*

- †Cabin Rental

## IDAHO

## FOREST SERVICE

*Boise NF*

- \*Alexander Flat

- \*Antelope

\*Bad Bear  
 \*Badger Creek  
 \*Banks  
 \*Barneys  
 \*Bear Creek  
 \*Bear Valley  
 \*Big Eddy  
 \*Big Roaring River  
 \*Big Trinity  
 \*Black Rock  
 \*Boiling Springs  
 \*Boundary Creek  
 \*Buck Mountain  
 \*Bull Trout Lake  
 \*Bunch Grass  
 \*Canyon  
 \*Cold Springs  
 \*Cottonwood  
 \*Cow Creek  
 \*Crazy Cove  
 \*Daggar Falls 1  
 \*Daggar Falls 2  
 \*Deadwood  
 \*Deer Flat  
 \*Deer Park  
 \*Dog Creek  
 \*Eastside  
 \*Edna Creek  
 \*Elk Creek  
 \*Fir Creek  
 \*Fir Springs  
 \*Four Mile  
 \*French Creek  
 \*Golden Gate  
 \*Grandjean  
 \*Granite Creek  
 \*Grayback Gulch  
 \*Hardscrabble  
 \*Hayfork  
 \*Helenoe  
 \*Hollywood Point  
 \*Hot Springs  
 \*Howers  
 \*Ice Hole  
 \*Ice Springs  
 \*Idaho Outdoor Association  
 \*Kirkham Hot Springs  
 \*Lick Creek  
 \*Little Roaring River  
 \*Little Trinity  
 \*Mountain View  
 \*Neinmeyer  
 \*Park Creek  
 \*Pen Basin  
 \*Picnic Point  
 \*Pine Creek  
 \*Pine Flats  
 \*Poker Meadows  
 \*Power Plant  
 \*Prospect Point  
 \*Queens River  
 \*Rattlesnake  
 \*Repeat Creek  
 \*Riverside 1  
 \*Riverside 2  
 \*Robert E. Lee  
 \*Sack Creek  
 \*Sagehen Creek  
 \*Sagehen Picnic Ground  
 \*Shafer Butte  
 \*Shoreline  
 \*Silver Creek  
 \*South Fork Salmon River  
 \*Swinging Bridge  
 \*Ten Mile  
 \*Tennessee Creek  
 \*Tie Creek  
 \*Trail Creek  
 \*Troutdale  
 \*Twin Bridges  
 \*Wapita Creek  
 \*Warm Lake  
 \*Warm Springs Creek  
 \*Willow Creek  
 \*Yellowpine

*Cache NF*

\*Beaver Creek  
 \*Cloverleaf  
 \*Cold Springs  
 \*Community  
 \*Eight Mile  
 \*Emmigration

\*Minnetonka Cave  
 \*Paris Spring  
 \*Porcupine  
 \*St. Charles  
 \*†Willow Flat

*Caribou NF*

\*Bear Creek  
 \*Calamity  
 \*†Cherry Springs  
 \*Curlew  
 \*Falls  
 \*Hoffman  
 \*Home Canyon  
 \*Mill Canyon  
 \*†Montpelier Canyon  
 \*Pine Bar  
 \*†Scout Mountain  
 \*Spring Creek  
 \*†Summit  
 \*†Summit View  
 \*Tincup

*Challis NF*

\*Basin Creek  
 \*Bench Creek  
 \*Blind Creek  
 \*Dutchmans Flat  
 \*Flat Rock  
 \*Holman  
 \*Inlet  
 \*Iron Bog  
 \*Iron Creek  
 \*Lakeview  
 \*Lola Creek  
 \*Lower O'Brien  
 \*Mormon Bend  
 \*Park Creek  
 \*Phi Kappa  
 \*Polecamp Flat  
 \*Riverside  
 \*Salmon River  
 \*Stanley Lake  
 \*Starhope  
 \*Sunny Gulch  
 \*Thatcher Creek  
 \*Upper O'Brien  
 \*Wild Horse

*Clearwater NF*

\*Apgar Creek  
 \*Glade Creek  
 \*Green Flat  
 \*Jerry Johnson  
 \*Kelly Forks  
 \*Noo Creek  
 \*Powell  
 \*Washington Creek  
 \*Wendover  
 \*Whitehouse  
 \*White Sand  
 \*Wild Goose

*Coeur D'Alene NF*

\*Avery Creek  
 \*Beauty Creek  
 \*Bella Bay  
 \*Bumblebee  
 \*Devils Elbow  
 \*Honeysuckle  
 \*Lindross Hill  
 \*Mokins Bay  
 \*Rainy Hill  
 \*Senator

*Kaniksu NF*

\*Luby Bay  
 \*Osprey  
 \*Outlet  
 \*Reeder Bay  
 \*Robinson Lake  
 \*Samowen 1  
 \*Samowen 2

*Payette NF*

\*Amanita  
 \*Brownlee  
 \*Burgdorf  
 \*Cabin Creek  
 \*Cold Springs  
 \*Evergreen  
 \*Grouse  
 \*Hazard Lake  
 \*Huckleberry  
 \*Justrite  
 \*Kiwanis  
 \*Lake Fork

\*Last Chance  
 \*Lower Buckhorn  
 \*Lower Spring Creek  
 \*Paradise  
 \*Ponderosa  
 \*Rainbow Point  
 \*Teepee Creek  
 \*Upper Buckhorn  
 \*Upper Payette Lake

*Salmon NF*

\*Cache Bar  
 \*Corn Creek  
 \*†Cougar Point  
 \*Deadwater Spring  
 \*Ebenezer Bar  
 \*Horse Creek Hot Springs  
 \*Iron Lake  
 \*Long Tom  
 \*Lost Spring  
 \*†Meadow Lake  
 \*Middle Fork  
 \*†Twin Creek  
 \*Wallace Lake  
 \*Yellowjacket Lake

*St. Joe NF*

\*Emerald Creek  
 \*Fly Flat  
 \*Giant White Pine  
 \*†Laird Park 1  
 \*Laird Park 2  
 \*Little Boulder Creek  
 \*Spruce Tree  
 \*Tin Can Flat  
 \*Turner Flat

*Sawtooth NF*

\*Alturas Lake  
 \*Baumgartner  
 \*Big Bluff  
 \*Birch Glen  
 \*Boundary  
 \*Bounds  
 \*Brackenbury  
 \*Easley  
 \*Harrington Fork  
 \*Lake Cleveland  
 \*North Fork  
 \*Penstemon  
 \*Pettit  
 \*Pioneer  
 \*Porcupine  
 \*Redfish Lake  
 \*Sandy Beach  
 \*Schipper  
 \*Smoky Bear Boat Ramp  
 \*Thompson Flat  
 \*Wood River

*Targhee NF*

\*Big Springs  
 \*Big Elk Creek  
 \*Box Canyon  
 \*Buffalo  
 \*Buttermilk  
 \*Flat Rock  
 \*Grandview  
 \*Island Park Boat Ramp  
 \*McCrea Bridge  
 \*Mike Harris  
 \*Palisades  
 \*Pine Creek  
 \*Riverside  
 \*Table Rock  
 \*Upper Coffee Pot  
 \*†Warm River  
 \*West End

*NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*

\*Craters of the Moon NM

\*Lava Flow Cmpgd.  
 \*Yellowstone NP (also listed under States of Montana and Wyoming)

\*Bridge Bay Cmpgd.  
 \*Canyon Cmpgd.  
 \*Fishing Bridge Cmpgd.  
 \*Grant Village Cmpgd.  
 \*Madison Cmpgd.  
 \*Mammoth Cmpgd.  
 \*Norris Cmpgd.

*BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT*

Boise District

\*Steck

- Salmon District**
- \* Mackay Reservoir
  - ILLINOIS  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Shawnee NF*
    - \*+ Lake Glendale Rec. Area
    - \* Lake of Egypt Rec. Area
    - \* Redbud
    - \* Teal Pond
    - \* Tower Rock

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
*Crab Orchard NWR*

    - \* Boat and Yacht Club
    - \* Cambria Neck
    - \* Carterville Beach
    - \* Crab Orchard Beach
    - \* Dogwood Lane
    - \* Hogens Area
    - \* Little Grassy Swimming Beach
    - \* Lookout Point
    - \* Primitive Area
    - \* Sailboat Basin
    - \* Spillway Area
    - \*+ The Group Picnic Area
    - \* West End Ramp

INDIANA  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Hoosier NF*

    - \*+ German Ridge Rec. Area
    - \* Hardin Ridge Rec. Area
    - \*+ Saddle Lake Rec. Area

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*George Rogers Clark NHP*

IOWA

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
*DeSoto NWR*

KENTUCKY  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Daniel Boone NF*

    - \* Bee Rock
    - \* Koomer Ridge
    - \* Rockcastle
    - \* Rodburn

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*Cumberland Gap NHP* (also listed under States of Tennessee and Virginia)

    - + Wilderness Cmpgd.
    - + Mammoth Cave NP
    - + Cave Trips
    - + Headquarters Cmpgd., New
    - + Headquarters Cmpgd., Old

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Land Between the Lakes (also listed under Tennessee)

    - + Camp Energy Group Cmpgd.
    - + Ft. Henry-Piney Cmpgd.
    - + Hillman Ferry Cmpgd.
    - + Rushing Creek-Jones Creek Cmpgd. and Day Use Area

LOUISIANA  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Kisatchie NF*

    - \* Caney Lakes
    - \* Corney Lake
    - \* Stuart Lake
    - \* Valentine Lake

MAINE  
FOREST SERVICE  
*White Mountain NF*

    - \* Crocker Pond
    - \* Hastings

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*Acadia NP*

    - + Black Woods Cmpgd.
    - + Seawall Cmpgd.

MARYLAND  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*Assateague Island NS*  
(Maryland section)

    - + Cmpgd.

Catoctin Mountain Park

    - + Green Top Camp
    - + Misty Mount Camp
    - + Owens Creek Cmpgd.

Fort McHenry NM and HS

    - \* Inner Fort
    - Greenbelt Park
    - + Cmpgd.

MASSACHUSETTS

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
*Parker River NWR*

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

    - \* Adams NHS
    - Cape Cod NS

Entrance to parking areas:

    - \* Coast Guard Beach
    - \* Head of the Meadow Beach
    - \* Herring Cove Beach
    - \* Marconi Beach
    - \* Nauset Light Beach
    - \* Race Point Beach

Bathhouse locker or basket:

    - + Herring Cove Beach

Salem Maritime NHS

    - \* Derby House

MICHIGAN  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Hiawatha NF*

    - \* Au Train Lake
    - \* Bay Furnace
    - + Bayview
    - + Brevoort Lake
    - + Camp 7 Lake
    - \* Carp River
    - + Colwell Lake
    - \* Corner Lake
    - \* Foley Creek
    - \* Indian River
    - \* Island Lake
    - \* Lake Michigan
    - \* Little Bass Lake
    - + Monocle Lake
    - + Petes Lake
    - + Soldier Lake
    - \* Three Lakes
    - \* Widewaters

Huron NF

    - \* Horseshoe Lake
    - + Island Lake
    - + Jewell Lake
    - \* Loon Lake
    - \* Monument
    - \* Pine River
    - \* Railways
    - + Round Lake
    - + Wagner Lake

Manistee NF

    - \* Bear Track
    - \* Driftwood Valley
    - \* Hemlock
    - \* Highbanks Lake
    - + Lake Michigan Rec. Area
    - + Nichols Lake
    - \* Old Grade
    - \* Peterson Bridge
    - + Pine Lake
    - + Pines Point
    - + Sand Lake
    - \* Seaton Creek
    - + Udell Railways

Ottawa NF

    - \* Bob Lake
    - \* Bobcat Lake
    - \* Courtney Lake
    - \* Golden Lake
    - \* Henry Lake
    - \* Imp Lake
    - \* Lake Ottawa
    - \* Lake Ste. Kathryn
    - \* Langford Lake
    - + Marion Lake
    - \* Moosehead Lake
    - \* Norway Lake
    - \* Perch Lake—West
    - \* Pomery Lake
    - \* Sylvania Rec. Area
    - \* Taylor Lake
    - \* Teepee Lake

BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
*Shiawassee NWR*

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*Isle Royale NP*

    - + Beaver Island Cmpgd.
    - + Belle Isle Cmpgd.
    - + Birch Island Cmpgd.
    - + Caribou Island Cmpgd.
    - + Chippewa Harbor Cmpgd.
    - + Daisy Farm Cmpgd.
    - + Duncan Bay Cmpgd.
    - + Duncan Narrows Cmpgd.
    - + Grace Island Cmpgd.
    - + McGargo Cove Cmpgd.
    - + Malone Bay Cmpgd.
    - + Merritt Lane Cmpgd.
    - + Moskey Basin Cmpgd.
    - + Rock Harbor 3-Mile Cmpgd.
    - + Siskiwit Bay Cmpgd.
    - + Tobin-Rock Harbor Cmpgd.
    - \* Todd Harbor Cmpgd.
    - \* Tookers Island Cmpgd.
    - \* Washington Creek Cmpgd.

MINNESOTA  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Chippewa NF*

    - \* Clubhouse Lake
    - \* Deer Lake
    - \* East Seelye Bay
    - \* Knutson Dam
    - \* Mosomo Point
    - + North Star
    - + Norway Beach
    - + Ojibway
    - \* Plug Hat Point
    - + South Pike Bay
    - + Stony Point
    - \* Tamarack Point
    - \* West Seelye Bay
    - \* Williams Narrows

Superior NF

    - + Birch Lake
    - \* East Bearskin Lake
    - \* Echo Lake
    - + Fall Lake
    - \* Fenske Lake
    - \* Flour Lake
    - \* Isabella River
    - \* Kimball Lake
    - \* Lake Jennette
    - \* McDougal Lake
    - \* Nine Mile Lake
    - \* Pfleiffer Lake
    - \* Sawbill Lake
    - \* South Kawishiwi River
    - + South Kawishiwi River Community Hall
    - \* Temperance River
    - \* Trails End
    - \* Two Island Lake
    - \* Whiteface Reservoir

MISSISSIPPI  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Bienville NF*

    - \* Marathon
    - \* Shongelo

DeSoto NF

    - \* Big Biloxi

Holly Springs NF

    - \* Chewalla

Homochitto NF

    - \* Clear Springs

Tombigbee NF

    - \* Choctaw Lake
    - \* Davis Lake

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE  
*Vicksburg NMP*

    - \* Museum

MISSOURI  
FOREST SERVICE  
*Clark NF*

    - \* Davisville
    - \* Loggers Lake
    - \* Marble Creek
    - \* Markham Springs
    - \* Silver Mines
    - \* Suttons Bluff

*Mark Twain NF*

- \*Big Bay
- \*Current River float camp
- \*Noblett Lake Beach
- \*Watercress Spring

*MONTANA  
FOREST SERVICE**Beaverhead NE*

- \*Cliff Point
- \*Dinner Station
- †Grasshopper
- \*Hilltop
- \*Madison River
- \*May Creek
- \*Mill Creek
- †Potosi
- \*Wade Lake
- \*West Fork

*Bitterroot NF*

- \*Alta
- \*†Black Bear
- \*Charles Waters Mem.
- \*Crazy Creek
- †Fales Flat group camp
- \*Indian Trees
- †Lake Como
- †Larry Creek group camp
- †Rombo
- \*Slate Creek
- †Spring Gulch
- \*†Warm Springs

*Coeur d'Alene NF*

- \*Cabin City
- \*Denna Mora
- \*Sloway

*Custer NF*

- \*Basin
- \*Cascade
- \*Emerald Lake
- \*Greenough Lake
- \*Limber Pine
- \*Parkside
- \*Pine Grove
- \*Ratine
- \*Red Shale
- \*Sheridan
- \*Woodbine

*Deerlodge NF*

- †Basin Canyon
- †Bison Creek
- †Cable Mountain
- †Delmoe Lake
- \*Lodgepole
- †Lowland
- †Mormon
- \*Phillipsburg Bay
- \*Piney
- †Shamrock
- \*Southside
- †Spring Hill 1
- †Spring Hill 2
- \*Warm Springs 1
- †Warm Springs 2

*Flathead NF*

- \*Big Creek
- \*Devil Creek
- \*Devil Corkscrew
- \*Doris Point
- \*Emery Bay
- \*Graves Creek
- \*Handkerchief Lake
- \*Holland Lake
- \*Hungry Horse
- \*Lakeview
- \*Lost Johnny
- \*Lost Johnny Point
- \*Murray Creek
- \*North Lion Lake
- \*Peters Creek
- \*South Lion Lake
- \*Spotted Bear
- \*Swan Lake
- \*Tally Lake

*Gallatin NF*

- \*Aspen Grove
- \*Bakers Hole
- \*†Battle Ridge

*Beaver Creek*

- \*Chief Joseph
- \*Colter
- \*Falls Creek
- \*Greek Creek
- \*Hicks Park
- \*†Hood Creek
- \*Langhor
- \*Moose Creek Flat
- \*Pine Creek
- \*Red Cliff
- \*Snow Bank
- \*Soda Butte
- \*South Fork
- \*Spire Rock
- \*Swan Creek

*Helena NF*

- \*Aspen Grove
- \*Blackfoot
- \*Cooper Creek
- \*†Cromwell-Dixon
- †Crystal Creek
- †Kading
- \*McDonald Pass
- \*Skidway
- †Ten Mile

*Kaniksu NF*

- \*Bull River
- Kootenai NF*
- \*North Dickey Lake
- \*Paul Bunyon
- \*Pleasant Valley
- \*Yaak

*Lewis and Clark NF*

- \*Aspen
- \*Benchmark
- \*Cave Mountain
- \*Crystal Lake
- \*Dry Wolf
- \*Grandview
- \*Grasshopper
- \*Jumping Creek
- \*†Kings Hill
- \*Many Pines
- \*Mortimer
- \*South Fork
- \*Straight Creek
- \*Summit Cmpgd.
- \*Wood Lake

*Lolo NF*

- \*Big Larch
- \*Lee Creek
- \*Lewis and Clark
- †Pattee Canyon
- \*Quartz Flat
- \*River Point
- \*Seeley Lake

*BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE**National Bison Range**Tours**NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*

\**Bighorn Canyon NRA* (also listed under Wyoming)

- †Barry's Landing Boat Ramp
- †Horseshoe Bend Cmpgd.
- †Horseshoe Bend Boat Ramp
- †Kane Bridge Boat Ramp

*\*Glacier NP*

- \*Apgar Cmpgd.
- †Avalanche Cmpgd.
- †Bowman Lake Cmpgd.
- †Fish Lake Cmpgd.
- †Many Glacier Cmpgd.
- †Rising Sun Cmpgd.
- †Sprague Creek Cmpgd.
- †St. Mary Lake Cmpgd.
- †Two Medicine Cmpgd.

*\*Yellowstone NP*

(Also listed under Idaho and Wyoming)

- †Bridge Bay Cmpgd.
- †Canyon Cmpgd.
- †Fishing Bridge Cmpgd.
- †Grant Village Cmpgd.
- †Madison Cmpgd.
- †Mammoth Cmpgd.
- †Norris Cmpgd.

*NEBRASKA**FOREST SERVICE**Nebraska NF*

- \*Bessey
- \*Cedars
- \*Claypit

*NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**\*Scotts Bluff NM**NEVADA**FOREST SERVICE**Humboldt NF*

- \*†Angel Creek
- \*Angel Lake
- \*Baker Creek
- \*Big Bend
- \*†Bird Creek
- \*†East Creek
- \*Gold Creek
- \*Jack Creek
- \*Jarbridge
- \*†Lehman Creek
- \*Lehman Creek Trailer
- \*Lower Lamoille
- \*North Fork
- \*Pine Creek
- \*Thomas Canyon
- \*†Timber Creek
- \*†Ward Mountain
- \*Ward Mountain Trailer
- \*Wheeler Peak
- \*Wildhorse

*Toiyabe NF*

- \*Bob Scott Summitt
- \*Big Creek
- \*Cathedral Rock
- \*Clear Creek
- \*Deer Creek
- \*Fletcher View
- \*Hilltop
- \*Kingston
- \*Kyle Canyon
- \*†Mahogany Grove
- \*Mary Jane Falls
- \*McWilliams
- \*Mr. Rose
- \*†Nevada Beach
- \*†Peavine Creek
- \*Pine Creek

*NATIONAL PARK SERVICE**Death Valley NM*

(Also listed under California)

†Mesquite Springs Cmpgd.

*Lake Mead NRA*

(Also listed under Arizona)

- †Boulder Beach Cmpgd.
- †Cottonwood Cove cmpgd.
- †Echo Bay Cmpgd.
- †Hemenway Cmpgd.
- †Katherine Cmpgd.
- †Las Vegas Bay Cmpgd.
- †Temple Bar Cmpgd.
- †Willow Beach Cmpgd.

*\*Lehman Caves NM**BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**Las Vegas District*

\*Willow Springs

*NEW HAMPSHIRE**FOREST SERVICE**White Mountain NF*

- †Barnes Field Group Area
- \*Big Rock
- \*Blackberry Crossing
- \*†Campton
- †Campton Group Area
- \*Cold River
- \*Covered Bridge
- \*†Dolly Copp
- \*Dugway
- \*†Jigger-Johnson
- \*Passaconaway
- \*Russel Pond
- \*South Pond
- \*Sugarloaf

- \*Waterville
- \*White Ledge
- \*Wild River
- \*Wildwood
- \*Zealand
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - \*Saint-Gaudens NHS
- NEW JERSEY
- BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
  - \*Brigantine NWR
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - Edison NRS
- \*Home of Thomas Alva Edison, Glenmont
- \*Laboratory of Thomas Alva Edison
- Morristown NHP
- \*Ford Museum and Mansion
- NEW MEXICO
  - FOREST SERVICE
    - Carson NF
- \*Agua Piedra
- \*Amizette
- \*Angostura
- \*Cabresto Lake
- \*Capulin
- \*Columbine
- \*Comales
- \*Duran Canyon
- \*Eagle Rock
- \*Echo Amphitheater
- \*Elephant Rock
- \*El Nogal
- \*El Rito
- \*Fawn Lakes
- \*Goat Hill
- \*Hodges
- \*Hopewell Lake
- \*Italianos
- \*Junebug
- \*Laguna Larga
- \*Lagunitas
- \*La Junta Canyon
- \*La Sombra
- \*Las Petacas
- \*La Vinateria
- \*Lerous
- \*Lower Canjilon Lakes
- \*Lower Hondo
- \*Mallette
- \*Manzanita
- \*Middle Canjilon Lakes
- \*Santa Barbara
- \*Trampas Canyon
- \*Twining
- \*Upper Canjilon Lakes
- \*Upper Cuchilla
- \*Upper Italianos
- \*Upper La Junta
- Cibola NF
  - \*Balsam Glade
  - \*Canyon Lobo
  - \*Capillo Peak
  - \*Capulin Springs
  - \*Cedro Peak
  - \*Cienega Canyon
  - \*Coal Mine
  - \*Cole Spring
  - \*Dead Man Flat
  - \*Doc Long
  - \*Day Camp
  - \*Fourth of July
  - \*John F. Kennedy
  - \*Juan Tabo
  - \*La Cueva
  - \*Las Huertas
  - \*McGaffey
  - \*New Canyon
  - \*Oak Flat
  - \*Ojo Redondo
  - \*Pine Flat
  - \*Quaking Aspen
  - \*Red Canyon
  - \*Springtime
  - \*Sulphur Canyon
  - \*Tajique
  - \*Water Canyon
- Gila NF
  - \*Ben Lily
  - \*Gillita
- \*Iron Creek
- \*Lake Roberts
- \*Little Walnut
- \*Mesa
- \*Scorpion Corral
- \*Whitewater
- \*Willow Creek
- \*Upper End
- Lincoln NF
  - \*Apache
  - \*Cedar Creek 1
  - \*Cedar Creek 2
  - \*Deerhead
  - \*Fir
  - \*Nogal Lake
  - \*Oak Grove
  - \*Pines
  - \*Saddle
  - \*Silver
  - \*Sitting Bulls Falls
  - \*Skyline
  - \*Sleep Grass
  - \*South Fork
- Santa Fe NF
  - \*Battleship Rock
  - \*Big Tesuque
  - \*Black Canyon
  - \*Borrego Mesa
  - \*Cowles
  - \*Dalton
  - \*El Porvenir
  - \*Ev Long
  - \*Field Tract
  - \*Glorieta
  - \*Holy Ghost
  - \*Las Conchas
  - \*Little Tesuque
  - \*Paliza
  - \*Paliza Group
  - \*Panchuela
  - \*Redondo
  - \*San Antonio
  - \*Santa Fe Basin
  - \*Windsor Creek
- BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
  - \*Bitter Lake NWR
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - \*Aztec Ruins NM
  - \*Bandelier NM
  - \*Frijoles Mesa Cmpgd.
- CAPULIN MOUNTAIN NM
  - \*Capulin Mountain Cmpgd.
  - \*Carlsbad Caverns NP
  - Chaco Canyon NM
  - \*Galo Wash Cmpgd.
  - \*El Morro NM
  - \*Fort Union NM
  - \*White Sands NM
- BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
  - Albuquerque District
    - \*Santa Cruz Lake
- NEW YORK
  - BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
    - \*Montezuma NWR
  - NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
    - Fire Island NS
      - \*Sailors Haven Marina
      - \*Watch Hill Marina
      - \*Home of Franklin D. Roosevelt NHS
      - \*Sagamore Hills NHS
      - \*Statue of Liberty NM
      - \*Theodore Roosevelt Birthplace
      - \*Vanderbilt Mansion NHS
- NORTH CAROLINA
  - FOREST SERVICE
    - Croatan NF
      - \*Neuse River
- Nantahala NF
  - \*Appletree
  - \*Cable Cove
  - \*Cheoah Point
  - \*Cliffs Lake
  - \*Hiwassee Lake
  - \*Horse Cove
  - \*Jackrabbit Mountain
- \*Standing Indian
- \*Tsali
- \*Van Hook Glade
- Pisgah NF
  - \*Black Mountain
  - \*Carolina Hemlock
  - \*Coon Tree Creek
  - \*Davidson River
  - \*Lake Powhatan
  - \*North Mills River
  - \*White Pines
- Blue Ridge Parkway (also listed under Virginia)
  - \*Crabtree Meadows Cmpgd.
  - \*Daughton Park Cmpgd.
  - \*Linville Falls Cmpgd.
  - \*Otter Creek Cmpgd.
  - \*Peaks of Otter Cmpgd.
  - \*Pisgah Cmpgd.
  - \*Price Park Cmpgd.
  - \*Roanoke Mountain Cmpgd
  - \*Rocky Knob Cmpgd.
- Cape Hatteras NS
  - \*Cape Point Cmpgd.
  - \*Frisco Cmpgd.
  - \*Oregon Inlet Cmpgd.
  - \*Salvo Cmpgd.
  - \*Fort Raleigh NHS
- Great Smoky Mountains NP (also listed under Tennessee)
  - \*Balsam Mtn. Cmpgd.
  - \*Cades Cove Cmpgd.
  - \*Cosby Cmpgd.
  - \*Deep Creek Cmpgd.
  - \*Elkmont Cmpgd.
  - \*Look Rock Cmpgd.
  - \*Smokemont Cmpgd.
  - \*Theodore Roosevelt NMemP
  - \*Cottonwood Cmpgd.
  - \*Squaw Creek Cmpgd.
- OHIO
  - FOREST SERVICE
    - Wayne NF
      - \*Burr Oak—Cove
      - \*Lake Vesuvius Rec. Area
      - \*Vesuvius Furnace
  - Group Picnic
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - \*Perry's Victory and International Peace Memorial NM
- OKLAHOMA
  - FOREST SERVICE
    - Ouachita NF
      - \*Cedar Lake
- Panhandle NG
  - \*Dead Indian
  - \*Skipout
  - \*Spring Creek
- BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
  - \*Wichita Mountains NWR
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - Arbuckle Rec. Area
    - \*Buckhorn Cmpgd.
    - \*The Point Cmpgd.
- Platt NP
  - \*Central Cmpgd.
  - \*Cold Springs Cmpgd.
  - \*Rock Creek Cmpgd.
- OREGON
  - FOREST SERVICE
    - Deschutes NF
      - \*Allen Springs
      - \*Ailingham
      - \*Beach
      - \*Blue Bay
      - \*Camp Sherman
      - \*Cinder Hill
      - \*Crescent Lake
      - \*East Lake
      - \*Elk Lake
      - \*Gorge
      - \*Hot Springs
      - \*Indian Ford

- \*Lava Lake
- \*Link Creek
- \*Little Crater
- \*Lower Bridge
- \*North Wickiup
- \*Odell Creek
- \*Paulina Lake
- \*Perry South
- \*Pine Rest
- \*Pioneer Ford
- \*Point
- \*Princess Creek
- \*Scout Lake
- \*Smiling River
- \*South Shore
- \*Spring
- \*West Davis Lake
- \*West Indian Ford
  
- Fremont NF*
- \*Sprague River
- \*Thompson Reservoir
  
- Malheur NF*
- \*Dixie
- \*Idlewild
- \*Joaquin Miller
- \*Magone Lake
  
- Mt. Hood NF*
- \*Armstrong
- \*Bear Springs
- \*Camp Creek
- \*Carter Bridge
- \*Clackamas Lake
- \*Clear Lake
- \*Fish Creek
- \*Frog Lake
- \*Green Canyon
- \*Kingfisher
- \*Lazy Bend
- \*Lost Lake
- \*McNeil
- \*Oak Fork
- \*Peninsula
- \*Rainbow
- \*Ripplebrook
- \*Riverside
- \*Roaring River
- \*Rock Creek Reservoir
- \*Still Creek
- \*Sunstrip
- \*Toll Gate
- \*Trillium Lake
  
- Ochoco NF*
- \*Haystack Lake
- \*Ochoco Divide
- \*Walton Lake
  
- Rogue River NF*
- \*Abbott Creek
- \*Farewell Bend
- \*Hamaker
- \*Muir
- \*Union Creek
  
- Siskiyou NF*
- \*Boundary
- \*Cave Creek
- \*Daphne Grove
- \*Myrtle Grove
- \*Grayback
- \*Illahue
  
- Sierras NF*
- \*Archie Knowles
- \*Carter Lake East
- \*Carter Lake West
- \*Eel Creek
- \*Rock Creek
- \*Siltcoos
- \*South Eel Creek
- \*Sutton Creek
- \*Sutton Lake Cmpgd.
- \*Sutton Lake Picnic Ground
- \*Tahkenitch Lake
- \*Tillicum Beach
- \*Tyee
  
- Umatilla NF*
- \*Bear Wallow Creek
- \*Bull Prairie
- \*Frazier
- \*Lane Creek
- \*Target Meadows
  
- \*Umatilla Forks
- \*Woodward
  
- UMPQUA NF*
- \*Bogus Creek Cmpgd.
- \*Broken Arrow
- \*Diamond Lake
- \*Eagle Rock
- \*Horseshoe Bend
- \*Poole Creek
- \*Wolf Creek Cmpgd.
  
- Wallowa-Whitman NF*
- \*Anthony Lake
- \*Arrow
- \*Blackhorse
- \*Coverdale
- \*Eagle Creek
- \*Evergreen
- \*Falls Creek
- \*Fish Lake
- \*French
- \*Grande Ronde Lake
- \*Hidden
- \*Indian Crossing
- \*Kettle Creek
- \*King
- \*Lake Fork
- \*Lake Creek
- \*Lillyville
- \*Mud Lake
- \*Oregon
- \*Shady
- \*Tamarack
- \*Turkey Flat
- \*Two Color
- \*Two Pan
- \*Union Creek
- \*Walla Walla
- \*Wetmore
- \*Williamson
- \*Yellow Pine
  
- Willamette NF*
- \*Big Lake
- \*Black Canyon
- \*Blue Pool
- \*Breitenbush
- \*Clark Creek
- \*Clear Lake
- \*Delta
- \*Fernview
- \*French Pete
- \*Gold Lake
- \*Hoover
- \*House Rock
- \*Humbug
- \*Ice Cap Creek
- \*Islet
- \*Longbow
- \*Marion Forks
- \*McKenzie Bridge
- \*Olallie
- \*Packard Creek
- \*Paradise
- \*Riverside
- \*Sand Prairie
- \*Shady Dell
- \*Southshore
- \*Trail Bridge
- \*Trout Creek
- \*Whispering Falls
  
- Winema NF*
- \*Aspen Point
- \*Rainbow Bay
- \*Spring Creek
- \*Williamson
  
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
- \*Crater Lake NP*
  
- BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
- Burns District*
- \*Fish Lake
  
- Coos Bay District*
- \*Loon Lake
  
- Eugene District*
- \*Clay Creek
- \*Whitaker Creek
  
- Lakeview District*
- \*Gerber Reservoir
  
- Medford District*
- \*Hyatt Lake
  
- Prineville District*
- \*Beavertail
- \*Macks Canyon
  
- Roseburg District*
- \*Mill Pond
- \*Rock Creek
  
- Salem District*
- \*Elkhorn Valley
- \*†Fisherman's Bend
  
- PENNSYLVANIA*
- Designated Area*
  
- FOREST SERVICE*
- Allegheny NF*
- \*†Buckaloons
- \*†Dewdrop
- \*†Klasutha
- \*Kinzuia
- \*†Loleta
- \*†Twin Lakes
- \*†Willow Bay
  
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*
- Gettysburg NMP*
- \*Cyclorama
- \*†Independence NHP
  
- PUERTO RICO*
  
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE*
- San Juan NHS*
- \*El Morro
- \*San Cristobal
  
- SOUTH CAROLINA*
- FOREST SERVICE*
- Sumter NF*
- \*Burrell's Ford
- \*Cherry Hill
- \*Lick Fork Lake
- \*Parsons Mountain Lake
- \*Woods Ferry
  
- BUREAU OF SPORTS FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE*
- Cape Romain NWR*
- \*Bulls Island Camping Area
- Carolina Sandhills NWR*
- \*Lake Bee
  
- SOUTH DAKOTA*
- FOREST SERVICE*
- Black Hills NF*
- \*Bear Gulch
- \*Bismarck Lake
- \*Boardinghouse Gulch
- \*Boxelder Forks
- \*Calumet
- \*Calumet Boat Launch
- \*Entrance Admission
- \*Comanche Park
- \*Custer Gulch
- \*Custer Trail 1
- \*Custer Trail 2
- \*Dalton
- \*Deer Creek
- \*Deerfield Cove
- \*Ditch Creek
- \*Dutchman
- \*Grizzly Bear
- \*Hanna
- \*Horsethief Lake
- \*Jenny Gulch
- \*Lakeshore
- \*Major Lake
- \*Mount Perrin
- \*Mountain City
- \*Newton Lake
- \*North Beach
- \*North Cove Group Area
- \*North Landing 1
- \*Northside
- \*Northside Boat Launch
- \*Oreville
- \*Pactola
- \*Pactola Boat Launch
- \*Pactola Point
- \*Preacher Smith

\*Rifle Pit  
\*Rimrock  
\*Rod and Gun  
\*Roubaix Lake 1  
\*Roubaix Lake 2  
\*South Beach  
\*Southside  
\*Spring Creek  
\*Steamboat Rock  
\*Strawberry Hill  
\*Timon  
\*Whitetail

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

†Gavins Point NFH

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Badlands NM

†Cedar Pass Cmpgd.  
†Jewel Cave NM

Wind Cave NP

†Cave  
†Elk Mountain Cmpgd.

## TENNESSEE

## FOREST SERVICE

Cherokee NF

\*Big Oak Cove  
\*Chilhowee  
\*Davis Branch  
\*Gardens Bluff  
\*Hiwassee River  
\*Horse Creek  
\*Indian Boundary  
\*Jacobs Creek  
\*North River  
\*Paint Creek  
\*Parksville Lake  
\*Quinn Springs  
\*Rock Creek  
\*Shook Branch  
\*Spivey Cove  
\*State Line  
\*Watauga Lake

## BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE

†Tennessee NWR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Andrew Johnson NHS

\*Andrew Johnson Home

\*Visitor Center and Tailor Shop

Chicamauga and Chattanooga NMP

\*Point Park

Cumberland Gap NHP

(Also listed under Virginia and Kentucky)

†Wilderness Cmpgd.

Great Smoky Mountains NP

(Also listed under North Carolina)

†Balsam Mtn. Cmpgd.

†Cades Cove Cmpgd.

†Cosby Cmpgd.

†Deep Creek Cmpgd.

†Elkmont Cmpgd.

†Look Rock Cmpgd.

†Smokemount Cmpgd.

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY

Land Between the Lakes

(Also listed under Kentucky)

†Camp Energy Group Cmpgd.

†Ft. Henry-Piney Cmpgd.

†Hillman Ferry Cmpgd.

†Rushing Creek-Jones Creek Cmpgd. and

Day Use Area

## TEXAS

## FOREST SERVICE

Panhandle NG

\*Black Creek

Angelina NF

\*†Boykin Spring

\*†Caney Creek

\*†Harvey Creek

\*†Letney

\*†Sandy Creek

\*†Townsend

Davy Crockett NF

\*†Ratcliff Lake

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

## September 24, 1969

Sabine NF  
\*†Red Hills Lake  
\*†Willow Oak  
Sam Houston NF  
\*†Double Lake  
\*†Stubblefield Lake  
BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE  
\*Aransas NWR  
\*Buffalo NWR  
\*Laguna Antacosta NWR  
\*Santa Ana NWR

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Big Bend NP

†Chisos Basin Cmpgd.

†Rio Grande Village Cmpgd.

\*Fort Davis NHS  
Padre Island NS

†North Headquarters Cmpgd.

## UTAH

## Designated Area

## FOREST SERVICE

Ashley NF

\*Antelope Flat  
\*Aspen Grove  
\*Bootleg  
\*Bridge  
\*Browne Lake  
\*Buckboard Crossing  
\*Canyon Rim  
\*Castle Cliff  
†Cedar Springs  
\*Deep Creek  
\*Deer Run  
\*Dripping Springs  
†Dutch John Boat Ramp  
\*Greendale  
\*Greens Lakes  
\*Hades  
\*Iron Mine  
\*Little Hole  
\*Lodgepole  
\*Lucerne Valley  
\*Moon Lake  
\*Mustang Ridge  
\*Oaks Park  
\*Pole Creek Lake  
\*Red Springs  
\*Reservoir  
\*River View  
†Sheep Creek Boat Ramp  
\*Skull Creek  
\*Swift Creek  
\*Uinta Canyon  
†Uinta River  
\*Wandin  
\*White Rocks  
\*Yellowstone

## Cache NF

\*Anderson Cove  
\*Beirdneau  
\*Bluffs  
\*Botts  
\*†Box Elder  
\*Brider  
\*Brown's Roll-Off  
\*Card  
\*China Row  
\*Chokecherry  
\*Dewitt  
\*Friendship  
\*†Guinavah  
\*Hawthorne  
\*High Creek  
\*Hobble  
\*Jefferson Hunt  
\*Lewis M. Turner  
\*Lodge  
\*Magpie  
\*†Malibu  
\*Maples  
\*Meadows  
\*†Monte Cristo  
\*Nook  
\*North Arm  
\*Old Juniper  
\*Pioneer  
†Port Boat Ramp  
\*Preston Valley

\*Red Banks  
\*Shenoa  
\*Smithfield Canyon  
\*South Arm  
\*South Fork Forest Camp  
\*Spring  
\*†Spring Hollow Rec. Area  
\*Sunrise  
\*Tony Grove Lake  
\*Twin Bridges  
\*Wild Cat  
\*Willows  
\*Woodcamp  
\*Zoo

## Dixie NF

\*†Duck Creek  
\*†Navajo Lake Area  
\*Kings Creek  
\*Panguitch Lake  
\*†Pine Valley Area  
\*Red Canyon  
†Vermillion Castle  
\*White Bridge

## Fishlake NF

\*†Adelaide Park  
\*Anderson Meadow  
\*†Bowery 1  
\*†Bowery 2  
\*Buckskin Charlie  
\*City Creek  
\*Copley's Cove  
\*Elkhorn  
\*†Frying Pan  
†Johnson Reservoir Boat Ramp  
\*†Kent's Lake  
\*†Little Cottonwood  
\*†Little Reservoir  
\*†Mackinaw  
\*Mahogany Cove  
\*†Maple Grove  
\*†Monrovia  
\*†Oak Creek  
\*†Pistol Rock  
\*†Ponderosa  
\*Shingle Mill  
\*Sun Glow  
\*†Twin Creeks

## Manti-la Sal NF

\*†Dalton Springs  
\*†Devils Canyon  
\*†Ferron Canyon  
\*Ferron Reservoir Cmpgd.  
\*†Flat Canyon  
\*†Forks of Huntington Canyon  
\*†Gooseberry  
\*†Indian Creek  
\*Joe's Valley  
\*Joe's Valley Boat Ramp  
\*Lake Hill  
\*Lake Oowah  
\*Manti Community  
\*†Old Folks Flat  
\*Pinchot  
\*Twelve Mile Flat  
\*†Warner

## Uinta NF

\*Altamont  
\*Aspen Grove  
\*Balsam  
†Bear Canyon  
\*Birch  
\*†Cherry  
\*†Diamond-Palmyra  
\*Dry Creek  
\*Echo  
\*†Granite Flat  
\*Graycliff  
\*Hanging Rock  
\*Hawthorne  
\*Hope  
\*Houserock  
\*†Kolob  
\*†Little Mill  
\*†Lodgepole  
\*Lone Fir  
\*Maple Bench  
\*Martin  
\*Mile Rock  
\*Mill Hollow  
\*Mt. Timpanogos  
\*North Mill

- \*<sup>†</sup>Payson
- \*Payson Lakes
- \*Ponderosa
- \*<sup>†</sup>Riverside
- \*Roadhouse
- \*Sulphur
- \*<sup>†</sup>Timpooeke
- \*Three Forks
- \*Warrick
- \*<sup>†</sup>Whiting
- \*<sup>†</sup>Wolf Creek
- Wasatch NF*
- \*Albion Basin
- \*Bear River
- \*Beaver Creek
- \*Beaver View
- \*Birches
- \*<sup>†</sup>Bountiful Peak
- \*<sup>†</sup>Boxelder
- \*<sup>†</sup>Boy Scout
- \*Bridge Lake
- \*Brighton
- \*Butterfly
- \*China Meadows
- \*Christmas Meadows
- \*Church Fork
- \*Cobble Rest
- \*<sup>†</sup>Cottonwood
- \*Dogwood
- \*East Fork of Bear River
- \*Hayden's Fork
- \*Hoop Lake
- \*Intake
- \*<sup>†</sup>Jordan Pines
- \*<sup>†</sup>Ledgefork
- \*Ledgemere
- \*Lily Lake
- \*Little Lyman Lake
- \*Loop
- \*Lost Creek
- \*Lower Narrows
- \*Lower Provo
- \*Lower Smith Morehouse
- \*Maple Grove
- \*Marsh Lake
- \*Mirror Lake
- \*Moosehorn
- \*Moss Ledge
- \*<sup>†</sup>Mueller Park
- \*Oak Ridge
- \*Pine Valley
- \*Redman
- \*Shady Dell
- \*Shingle Creek
- \*<sup>†</sup>Soapstone
- \*<sup>†</sup>Stillwater
- \*<sup>†</sup>Storm Mountain
- \*<sup>†</sup>Sulphur
- \*Tanners Flat
- \*Terrace
- \*Trial Lake
- \*<sup>†</sup>Upper Narrows
- \*Yellow Pine
- BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
  - Bear River NWR*
  - \*Public Use Area
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - \**Arches NM*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Devils Garden Cmpgd.
  - \**Bryce Canyon NP*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>North Cmpgd.
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Sunset Cmpgd.
  - Capitol Reef NM*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Capitol Reef Cmpgd.
  - Cedar Breaks NM*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Point Supreme Cmpgd.
  - Dinosaur NM (also listed under Colorado)*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Green River Cmpgd.
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Split Mountain Cmpgd.
  - Glen Canyon NRA (also listed under Arizona)*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Bullfrog Cmpgd.
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Lees Ferry Cmpgd.
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Wahweap Cmpgd.
  - Hovenweep NM (also listed under Colorado)*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Square Tower House Cmpgd.
- Timpanogos Cave NM*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Cave
- \*<sup>†</sup>Timpanogos Cave Cmpgd.
- \*<sup>†</sup>South Cmpgd.
- \*<sup>†</sup>Watchman Cmpgd.
- BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
- Cedar City District*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Red Cliffs Cmpgd.
- Kanab District*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Calf Creek Cmpgd.
- Monticello District (Canyon Rims Recreation Lands)*
- \*Anticline Overlook
- \*Hatch Point Cmpgd.
- \*Needles Overlook
- \*Windwhistle Cmpgd.
- Price District*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Price Canyon
- Richfield District*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Star Springs
- VERMONT
- FOREST SERVICE
  - Green Mountain NF*
  - \*Chittenden Brook
  - \*Greendale
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Hapgood Pond
  - \*Moosalamo
- VIRGINIA
- FOREST SERVICE
  - George Washington NF*
  - \*Bealers Ferry
  - \*Blowing Springs
  - \*Camp Roosevelt
  - \*Elizabeth Furnace
  - \*Hone Quarry
  - \*Little Fort
  - \*Longdale
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Sherando Lake
  - \*Todd Lake
  - \*Entrance and Admission Fees/<sup>†</sup>User or Service Fees.
- Jefferson NF*
- \*Cave Mountain Lake
- \*High Knob
- \*Hurricane
- \*Raccoon Branch
- \*Scott Wise Lake
- \*White Rocks
- BUREAU OF SPORT FISHERIES AND WILDLIFE
  - \**Chincoteague NWR (Joint fee with Assateague Is. NS)*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Presquile NWR
- NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
  - \**Appomattox NHP Assateague Island NS (Joint fee with Chincoteague NWR)*
  - \*<sup>†</sup>Assateague Is. Cmpgd.
- Blue Ridge Parkway (Also listed under North Carolina)*
- \*Crabtree Meadows Cmpgd.
- \*Doughton Park Cmpgd.
- \*Linville Falls Cmpgd.
- \*Otter Creek Cmpgd.
- \*Peaks of Otter Cmpgd.
- \*Pisgah Cmpgd.
- \*Price Park Cmpgd.
- \*Roanoke Mountain Cmpgd.
- \*Rocky Knob Cmpgd.
- Colonial NHP*
- \*Jamestown Island (Joint fee with the Assoc. for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities)
- \*Moore House
- Cumberland Gap NHP (Also listed under Kentucky and Tennessee)*
- \*Wilderness Cmpgd.
- \*Custis Lee Mansion N Mem
- Fredericksburg and Spotsylvania NMP*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Fredericksburg and Chancellorsville Visitor Centers
- \*George Washington Birth Place NM
- Manassas NBP
- \*Museum
- Prince William Forest Park*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Group Cabin Camps
- \*<sup>†</sup>Oak Ridge Cmpgd.
- \*<sup>†</sup>Turkey Run Ridge Cmpgd.
- Shenandoah NP*
- \*Big Meadows Cmpgd.
- \*Lewis Mountain Cmpgd.
- \*Loft Mountain Cmpgd.
- \*Matthews Arm Cmpgd.
- WASHINGTON FOREST SERVICE
- Colville NF*
- \*<sup>†</sup>Lake Gillette
- \*Lake Leo
- \*Lake Thomas
- \*Long Lake
- \*Noisy Creek
- \*<sup>†</sup>Pierre Lake
- \*<sup>†</sup>Sullivan Lake
- \*<sup>†</sup>Swan Lake
- \*Ten Mile
- Gifford Pinchot NF*
- \*Adams Fork
- \*Beaver
- \*Bench Lake
- \*Bird Creek Meadows
- \*Bird Lake
- \*Blue Lake Creek
- \*Clearwater
- \*Cultus Creek
- \*Council Lake
- \*Goose Lake
- \*Government Mineral Springs
- \*Iron Creek
- \*Ice Caves
- \*La Wis Wis
- \*Maple Leaf
- \*Mirror Lake
- \*Moss Creek
- \*North Fork
- \*Paradise Creek
- \*Peterson Prairie
- \*Spirit Lake
- \*Takhlahk
- \*Tillicum
- \*Tower Rock
- \*Walupt Lake
- Mt. Baker NF*
- \*Baker Lake
- \*Boulder Creek
- \*Douglas Fir
- \*Gold Basin
- \*Hemple Creek
- \*Horseshoe Cove
- \*Nooksack
- \*Park Creek
- \*Silver Fir
- \*Turlo
- \*Verlot
- Okanogan NF*
- \*Bonaparte Lake
- \*Lost Lake Cmpgd.
- Olympic NF*
- \*Falls Creek
- \*Falls View
- \*Hamma Hamma
- \*Klahowya
- \*Olallie
- \*Seal Rock
- \*Willaby
- Snoqualmie NF*
- \*Big Creek
- \*Cedar Springs
- \*Cottonwood
- \*Cougar Flat
- \*Denny Creek
- \*House Creek
- \*Heils Crossing
- \*Indian Creek
- \*Kaner Flats
- \*Lodgepole
- \*Money Creek
- \*River Bend
- \*Sawmill Flat

*Silver Springs	NICOLET	*Narrows
*The Dalles		*†New Fork Group
*Wild Rose		*New Fork Lake
*Willows		*Sacajawea
*Windy Point		*Sandy Beach Picnic
	<i>Umatilla NF</i>	*Swift Creek
*Tuncannon		*Trails End
	<i>Wenatchee NF</i>	*Upper Half Moon
*Cottonwood		*Whiskey Grove
*Crystal Springs		
*Glacier View		<i>Medicine bow nf</i>
*Kachess		*Blair
*Mineral Springs		*Brooklyn Lake
*Nason Creek		*Evans Creek
*Salmon La Sac		*Hidden Valley
*Silver Falls		*Lake Marie
*Swauk		*Lake Owen
*Taneum		*Lewis Lake 1
*Tronson		*Lewis Lake 2
*Tumwater		*Libby Creek
		*Lincoln Park
		*Miller Lake
		*Mirror Lake
		*Nash Fork 1
		*Pickaroon
		*Pike Pole
		*Pole Creek
		*Rob Roy
		*Silver Lake
		*South Brush Creek
		*Tie City
		*Vedauwoo 1
		*Vedauwoo 2
		*Wallis
		*Yellow Pine
		<i>Shoshone nf</i>
		*Beartooth Lake
		*Big Game
		*Brooks Lake
		*Bruce
		*†Clearwater
		*Crazy Creek
		*Dead Indian
		*Double Cabin
		*Dickenson Creek
		*Eagle Creek
		*Elk Fork
		*Falls
		*Fiddlers Lake
		*Fox Creek
		*Hanging Rock
		*Horse Creek 1
		*Horse Creek 2
		*Hunter Peak
		*Island Lake
		*Lake Creek
		*Louis Lake
		*Newton Creek
		*Pahaska
		*Popo Agie
		*Reef Creek
		*Rex Hole
		*Sinks Canyon
		*Sleeping Giant
		*Sunlight Creek
		*Three Mile
		*Wapiti
		<i>Targhee NF</i>
		*Alpine
		*Cabin Creek
		*Cave Falls
		*East Table Creek
		*Elbow
		*Little Cottonwood
		*Station Creek
		*Teton Canyon
		*Trail Creek
		*Wolf Creek
		<i>Teton NF</i>
		*Atherton Creek
		*Crystal Creek
		*Curtis Canyon
		*Four Mile Meadow
		*Granite Creek
		*Hatchet
		*Hoback
		*Kozy
		*Lava Creek
		*Red Hills
		*Snake River

## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

*Lander District*

\*Cottonwood Campground

*Worland District*

\*Five Springs Falls Campground

## NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

\*Bighorn Canyon NRA (also listed under Montana)

†Barry's Landing Boat Ramp

†Horseshoe Bend Campground

†Horseshoe Bend Boat Ramp

†Kane Bridge Boat Ramp

\*Devils Tower NM

†Belle Fourche River Campground

## Grand Teton NP

†Colter Bay Campground

†Gros Ventre Campground

†Jenny Lake Campground

†Lizark Point Campground

†Signal Mountain Campground

\*Yellowstone NP (Also listed under Idaho and Montana)

†Bridge Bay Campground

†Canyon Campground

†Fishing Bridge Campground

†Grant Village Campground

†Madison Campground

†Mammoth Campground

†Norris Campground

## DO YOU NEED MORE INFORMATION?

You may obtain information on the location, recreation opportunities available, types of facilities, or other matters by writing to the agency administering the area in which you are interested. Regional, State, or area offices of administering agencies are listed. You may write to the office closest to the area in which you are interested or to the office closest to your home. Your letter will be answered directly or referred to the office best able to supply the information you request. For general information about the Federal recreation fee program, you may write to: Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Operation Golden Eagle, Box 7763, Washington, D.C. 20044.

## FEE AREA DESIGNATION CRITERIA

Areas are designated for outdoor recreation fee collection in accordance with Section 3 of Executive Order 11200. Basically these criteria are:

1. An area must be administered by one of eight agencies listed in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act.

2. An area must be administered primarily for recreation or one of several specified related purposes.

3. An area must have recreation facilities or services provided at Federal expense.

4. Fee collection at an area must be administratively and economically practical.

Authority for designation is granted to the President by the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. This authority is delegated to the Secretaries of the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, and Interior and to the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority by Section 1 of Executive Order 11200. This authority has in turn been delegated to agency heads through a series of Secretarial delegations of authority. Actual interpretation of the designation criteria and designation of areas, therefore, is the responsibility of the chief administrative officer of the various agencies collecting fees.

Specific criteria supplementing the general criteria in the Executive Order have been developed only for the Corps of Engineers. These criteria were developed because there was much contention over any designation of Corps areas and some agreement had to be reached before any fees could be collected at Corps' areas. These criteria are well known as the "White House Agreement."

Agency heads of all other agencies have

examined all areas under their administration and have designated those believed to be "administratively and economically practical." Considerable variation in the number of areas designated has prevailed from one year to the next. Each year of experience in working with the fee program has demonstrated the practicability or impracticability of designating a specific group of areas.

Attempts have been made to develop specific criteria which could be used as an aid to securing greater uniformity in the fee program. For each criterion proposed, one or more agencies has been able to advance examples of existing areas where the proposal would prove to be impractical. One must realize that the Federal Government is providing a wide variety of recreation services through several agencies. Each agency has differing management objective, experience, development standards, clientele groups, resource potentials and so on for a host of other differences. However, greater uniformity is possible and should be sought if a coordinated fee program is continued through some extension of authorities similar to those contained in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. For the present, the ability of the agencies to achieve steady increases in fee revenue within reasonable administrative cost limits and with dramatic decreases in the number of letters of complaint received should be accepted as evidence that the selection of designated areas is a selection based upon experience, observation and professional judgment.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent also to have printed in the Record at this point a statement entitled "Background Statement Concerning the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Discontinuance of the Golden Eagle Passport," which has been prepared by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation.

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

## BACKGROUND STATEMENT CONCERNING THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AND DISCONTINUANCE OF THE GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT

The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of September 3, 1964, Public Law 88-578, established the Land and Water Conservation Fund as of January 1, 1965, to help provide expanded local, State, and Federal outdoor recreation opportunities.

The Act authorized as revenue for the Fund: (1) Proceeds from the sale of Federal surplus real property, (2) Federal motorboat fuels tax, and (3) Entrance, admission, and user fees at Federal recreation areas.

Money appropriated by Congress from the Fund is used by the National Park Service, Forest Service, and Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to acquire authorized national outdoor recreation lands and waters; and as matching grants to the States and their political subdivisions for planning, acquiring, and developing outdoor recreation areas and facilities. During the first five fiscal years of the Fund, receipts have averaged around \$100 million annually.

In 1968, Congress amended the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide that the original sources of revenue to the Fund could be augmented to provide a Fund of \$200 million annually, 1969 through 1973.

The additional income to the Fund will come from General Fund receipts or Outer Continental Shelf mineral leasing receipts.

By the same Act, Congress repealed authority for the annual Federal recreation area permit, known as the Golden Eagle Passport, and for other recreation entrance and user fees collected under the Golden Eagle program. The Federal agencies still

have authority to collect recreation fees at their areas, but after March 31, 1970, there will be no annual permit which may be used at all Federal recreation fee areas.

The termination action was based, in large part, upon complaints from citizens regarding fees at Corps of Engineers' reservoirs where fees had not been previously collected, and on a lack of revenue from recreation entrance and user fees.

Under fee collection authorities which have not been repealed individual Federal agencies managing outdoor recreation areas may establish fee schedules for their areas following termination of the Passport. Revenue from fees collected after March 31, 1970, will be available for appropriation to the collecting agency for support of its authorized outdoor recreation functions. Federal recreation fees are expected to continue to be reasonable, but more specific information is not available at this time.

Continuation of the nationwide Passport or some similar permit beyond March 31, 1970 would require Congressional authorization. The legislative history of Public Law 90-401 indicates that a major consideration in extending the life of the Golden Eagle Passport until March 31, 1970, was to provide Congress with additional time to consider the advantages, disadvantages, and public attitudes regarding the existing Federal outdoor recreation fee collection system.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I have listened to the discussion of the effect of repealing section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968, as proposed in S. 2315, which is being reconsidered by the Senate today because of concern expressed by the senior Senator from Oklahoma and others that doing so could authorize the collection of entrance fees on lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers, which have traditionally been open for public use and which, in a large section of the country offer great opportunities for recreation.

I would like to comment briefly for, as the ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Public Works, I was a conferee on the Flood Control Act of 1968, and recall the purpose of section 210 which, while it was not included in the bill as passed by the Senate, was adopted by the conference. That section prohibits the collection of entrance or admission fees at public recreation areas located at lakes and reservoirs under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. It provides that user fees may be collected only from users of highly developed facilities, and not for access to or use of water areas, or undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical equipment is provided. It seems to me a proper provision, because recreation facilities at these projects are not only developed with public funds, but under the Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965 States and local governments are required to reimburse half the cost of the recreational development.

I believe the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Idaho resolves this question, and that it does so in a way that preserves the intent and effect of section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968. The amendment would include in section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 the requirement that user fees at recreation areas administered by the United States at Federal

September 24, 1969

lakes and reservoirs may be collected only from users of highly developed facilities, and may not be collected for entrance or access to or use of water areas, or undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical equipment is provided. So it seems to me that the amendment maintains the effect of section 210 and, in fact, applies that policy to all recreation areas at Federal reservoirs, not only those under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

Placing the language in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act and applying it to all Federal reservoirs should make possible uniform administration of this policy and of the golden eagle passport program. I am glad to support the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Idaho.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, before we proceed to final passage of the bill as amended, I wish to say that the use of the golden eagle passport to enter national parks and other Federal outdoor recreation areas has established itself as a public service. I have received hundreds of letters urging its continuance, and many writers have volunteered that they would be happy to pay more for the passport—often citing \$10 as a suggested fee. An increase from \$7 to \$10 is provided by this bill.

I have been particularly impressed with the enthusiastic use of the permit by our senior citizens. Many of these people, on restricted incomes, would not otherwise be enabled to visit and camp in the national parks and other Government recreation areas. In letter after letter, they express their pleasure in this activity, and their approval of the program.

Receipts from the sale of the golden eagle passport have greatly increased, proving the growing popularity and use of the permit, and that it adds considerably to the money needed in the land and water conservation fund.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe this is a bill of much merit. It has the general approval of the people who have benefited from the passports in the past. It makes a significant contribution to the land and water conservation fund, which has become very important to the States and local governments, since it provides for Federal matching money to assist those governments in land acquisition and the development of outdoor recreation facilities. This is a good bill, Mr. President, and I urge that it be passed.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, before the Senator moves the passage of the bill, will he yield to me?

Mr. CHURCH. I am happy to yield to my colleague from my neighboring State of Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. I wholeheartedly concur in what the Senator from Idaho has said so very well. I think this is excellent legislation. I think it is an act with wide support; I am sure that the Senator's mail reflects the same amount of approval and the same general type of sup-

port as does my own, particularly from the elderly and retired people of our country who use these park and recreation areas.

I hope that the House of Representatives will have hearings, if they have not already done so. I am not advised as to that. Perhaps the Senator can tell me; has the House of Representatives had hearings on this matter?

Mr. CHURCH. No hearings have as yet been held.

Mr. BIBLE. We are running against a deadline, or an expiration date, on this bill. I hope that the distinguished chairman of the House Interior Committee will schedule early hearings. The people are left in a state of uncertainty as to whether or not this program will be continued. Many doubts have been raised in their minds; unquestionably some of the earlier news releases have led to such doubts; and then, of course, the action of the House Public Works Committee in the resolution which prevented the enforcement of the bill which was passed last year insofar as the Army Engineers are concerned led to further doubts.

Has that problem been completely resolved as between those who had varying viewpoints, the Army Engineer problem?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the Senator that, in light of the action the Senate has just taken, and with the cooperation that has been given by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), I think that this problem has now been satisfactorily solved.

Mr. BIBLE. I have not followed this particular agreement that has been entered into between the chairman of our committee and the Senator from Oklahoma. Probably the Senator from Idaho has already developed it, but I would appreciate it if the Senator from Idaho would tell me exactly what the amendment provides insofar as users of the areas under the control and jurisdiction of the Army Engineers are concerned. Exactly how does that work?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say to the Senator that, under the bill as amended, the user fees would apply to recreational areas, reservoirs, and like facilities, administered by all Federal agencies. It would apply specifically to multiple-purpose reservoirs, whether they are under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, or other Federal agency.

Mr. BIBLE. Do they have to have highly developed recreation facilities? Would there have to be an overnight use? This is where the original problem arose, and I am trying to clarify the matter.

Mr. CHURCH. If I may read the Senator the language of the amendment, I think it will constitute a full reply to his inquiry.

Mr. BIBLE. I wish the Senator would.

Mr. CHURCH. The pertinent part of the amendment reads:

User fees at recreation areas administered by the United States at Federal lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees only from users of highly developed facilities constructed for reasons of public health, safety, and convenience, and which require a schedule of regular maintenance and supervision. Fees shall not be

collected for entrance or access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided.

Mr. BIBLE. I appreciate the Senator's reading that into the RECORD. In reexamining that language—and I now have it before me—I wish the Senator would point out how that differs from the language that was in the Flood Control Act, which caused the adverse resolution which came from the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives. How does that differ?

Mr. CHURCH. I would say it is very similar to the language that appeared in the Flood Control Act.

But in the Flood Control Act the language had reference only to Corps of Engineers reservoirs. Under the pending bill, as now amended, the formula would be applicable to all outdoor recreational facilities, regardless of the Federal agency concerned. Thus we will achieve the uniformity we have been seeking.

Mr. BIBLE. I understand that, but the real problem arose in areas under control of the Army Corps of Engineers. That is where the basic problem arose. I just wonder whether this would solve the problem. I do not know how it would, since it is put in almost the same language.

Mr. CHURCH. The language of the Flood Control Act was intended to resolve the problem for the Corps of Engineers.

Mr. BIBLE. But it did not. Is that not true?

Mr. CHURCH. We believe, with the legislative history that is being made today, and with the insertion of this amendment in the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, where it belongs, that the intention of Congress is being made sufficiently clear, so that the confusion will be cleared up, as to those facilities operated by the Corps of Engineers and those operated by the Bureau of Reclamation and other Federal agencies.

Mr. BIBLE. I hope that is true. My concern has been the lack of uniformity in the interpretation and enforcement of the golden eagle provisions in the Land and Water Conservation Act. This was a very helpful instrument, as I see it, in encouraging the elderly people to make better use of the facilities of the National Park Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Corps of Engineers, and other governmental agencies.

I would hope this would solve the problem. One problem that developed during the hearings was the difficulty in determining the difference between a highly developed facility and a lightly developed facility.

Does the Senator have any information on that? It seems to me that is where the differences of opinion arise.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this is one of the problems with which we attempt to deal in the language of the substitute amendment.

I think that his language spells out, as precisely as we can, the intended differentiation between highly developed facilities and lightly developed facilities

which consist, as an example, only of picnic grounds or simple boat launching aprons—facilities, that is, that do not require the degree of maintenance or supervision for which fees would be charged.

I think that the language of the amendment, together with this very helpful colloquy with the Senator from Nevada, along with the other contributions to the debate, should establish a legislative record to clarify the law.

Mr. BIBLE. Do overnight facilities have anything to do with distinguishing between highly developed and lightly developed facilities? Is that a distinguishing point? If I were to stay overnight in a facility under the operation of the Federal Government, then I assume I would be subject to the golden eagle provision. Is that correct?

Mr. CHURCH. If the Senator were to stay overnight at a campground of the kind that provides electricity, waste disposal, and other facilities that require close supervision, then the answer would be yes. He would be charged for that kind of service. It is clear that in developed campgrounds of this character services are rendered for which fees should be collected.

Mr. BIBLE. I agree with that. I think it should be charged in those areas.

All I am trying to do is to narrow down the difference of opinion that has come about since the first enactment of the golden eagle program, particularly with the Army Corps of Engineers.

I would hope that by legislative history, colloquy, and discussion on the matter, we could clarify it so that in the future there would be no further problems. I know that is what the Senator from Idaho is trying to do.

Certainly it is a worthwhile program. I hope that the House of Representatives would agree to the amendment.

I commend the Senator. I think he has made a fine presentation. I hope that we have made some contribution toward clarifying the misunderstanding, if there is a misunderstanding, as to the areas in which the golden eagle pass is required and in which it is not.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I appreciate very much the contribution of the Senator from Nevada. He has helped to establish a very valuable legislative history, one that will assist the administrative agencies in interpreting the intent of Congress in approving the amendment.

I think the questions raised involve a reasonable man test, if I might put it that way. The Senator from Nevada, for example, is aware of the kind of boat launching aprons to be found at many Corps of Engineer reservoirs. All that is necessary to use them is to back the boat into the water. It is not intended, under the language of the pending bill, that such a facility should be charged for. However, if the boat ramp is of a different character, and entails the use of hydraulic equipment that must be carefully maintained, which might require the presence of an operator, a Federal employee, then that would be a developed facility of the kind for which a fee should be charged within the intent of this provision.

I again thank the Senator from Nevada for his interest.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, it is most important that we take favorable action on the golden eagle passport bill before us—S. 2315—and that we pass the bill as reported by the committee, without amendments which dilute its effectiveness.

I sincerely wish it were not necessary to charge admission fees to any of our Federal recreation areas or campgrounds. But we all know we cannot afford to do this. We appropriate substantial sums of money each year to maintain and improve our parks and recreation areas, and to acquire new ones, but we never have enough money to do all of the things we want to do, and must do, if we are to keep the high standards we have set for ourselves in our present recreation areas, and if we are to continue to acquire additional ones to satisfy the needs of our burgeoning population. We must have the extra revenue that entrance and users fees bring us.

The golden eagle passport has been devised as a fair way to allow those people who use our parks and recreation areas most often and most widely to continue to support them, and still get a very good bargain for themselves.

By the simple purchase of one \$10 gold eagle passport each year, they can enter as many of our Federal recreation areas and campgrounds as they wish, and as often as they wish. They can take in a whole car full of people on a single passport. They can come in and out and back and forth—without question.

If that is not a good buy, and a considerable convenience—I do not know what would be.

I remember at the time the golden eagle passport was first recommended, there was a wide outcry against it. Nobody wanted it. Now that the golden eagle faces extinction if this legislation extending its life is not passed, everybody is writing to plead for it. This is because the passport has more than proved itself.

There are, however, some people who are protesting the increase in its annual cost, from \$7 to \$10. These people are unaware, I am sure, that the reason the passport was slated for extinction is that it was not bringing in enough revenue to justify its continuation. An increase to \$10 would mean an additional \$2,076,000 for the land and water conservation fund.

The alternative to the increase from \$7 to \$10 is a return to the system of making everyone pay entrance fees everywhere, and users fees to concession operators.

I am confident all the people will all accept the \$10 increase, once they understand its purpose. I am confident they want the golden eagle extended. It will honor those who already know about it to visit our recreation areas as often as they wish, and will encourage their use by others who have not already been aware of its broad benefits, to begin using our recreation areas more often.

I do feel, however, that this should be a one-for-all, and an all-for-one pass. The policy should be uniform. There

should be no exceptions among our recreation areas where it can or cannot be used. Nor should there be some recreation areas where entrance is free and some where there must be an entrance payment.

A national golden eagle passport is effective if it is national in every sense.

Mr. President, I ask that S. 2315 be passed without further amendment and delay.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2315) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 2315

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the first section of the Act entitled "An Act to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, and for other purposes", approved July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is hereby repealed.*

(b) Subsection (c) of section 2 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (16 U.S.C. 4601-5), as added by section 2 of the Act of July 15, 1968 (82 Stat. 354; Public Law 90-401), is redesignated as subsection (d).

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) The first sentence of section 8 of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, as amended, is further amended to read as follows:

"Not to exceed \$30,000,000 of the money authorized to be appropriated from the fund by section 3 of this Act may be obligated by contract during each fiscal year for the acquisition of lands, waters, or interest therein within areas specified in section 6(a)(1) of this Act."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 2(a)(1) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), is amended by deleting "\$7" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$10".

(b) Section 7 of such Act (78 Stat. 903), is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except to the extent that the Secretary of the Interior determines necessary in order to advertise and promote any entrance or user fee program established pursuant to section 2(a) of this Act".

Sec. 3. Section 210 of the Flood Control Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 746) is repealed.

Sec. 4. Section 2(a) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897) is amended by inserting, immediately after the words "for use of any waters," in the second paragraph of such section 2(a) the following: "User fees at recreation areas administered by the United States at Federal lakes and reservoirs shall be collected by officers and employees only from users of highly developed facilities constructed for reasons of public health, safety, and convenience, and which require a schedule of regular maintenance and supervision. Fees shall not be collected for entrance or access to or use of water areas, undeveloped or lightly developed shoreland, picnic grounds, overlook sites, scenic drives, or boat launching ramps where no mechanical or hydraulic equipment is provided."

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE  
MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will proceed to the transaction of routine morning business and the statements will be limited to 3 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## RESIGNATION OF SENATOR METCALF AS A MEMBER OF THE MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION COMMISSION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter from the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF):

MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION  
COMMISSION.

Washington, D.C., September 24, 1969.

HON. SPIRO T. AGNEW,  
Vice President of the United States, Senate  
Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I hereby resign as a member of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Very truly yours,

LEE METCALF.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,  
ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letter, which was referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO AMEND TITLE 49,  
UNITED STATES CODE, "TRANSPORTATION"

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation, to codify subtitles I, II, IV, and V of title 49 "Transportation" of the United States Code (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment:

S. 2210. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 so as to permit donations of surplus property to public museums (Rept. No. 91-423).

By Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 406. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit the rotation of certain property whenever its remaining storage or shelf life is too short to justify its retention, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-424);

S. 1366. A bill to release the conditions in a deed with respect to a certain portion of the land heretofore conveyed by the United States to the Salt Lake City Corp. (Rept. No. 91-425); and

S. 1718. A bill to provide the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city (Rept. No. 91-426).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Government Operations, with amendments:

S. 1707. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement (Rept. No. 91-427).

By Mr. LONG, from the Committee on Finance, with amendments:

H.R. 12829. A bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-428).

By Mr. EAGLETON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

H.R. 12982. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-429).

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 117. A joint resolution to authorize appropriations for expenses of the Office of Intergovernmental Relations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-430).

## ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-431)

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I am happy to report, without amendment, S. 2701, which would create a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future has been unanimously recommended by the Government Operations Committee for passage in the Senate and I submit a report thereon. This is a particularly happy occasion for me for I introduced this bill on behalf of the Nixon administration after a recognition that there is a national urgency to study population trends, movements, and demographic characteristics which have a direct bearing on the economic and social progress of our Nation.

Those of you familiar with S. 2701 will recognize its relationship and similarity to Senate Joint Resolution 60 which would establish a National Commission on Balanced Economic Development. This legislation has, as you know, been passed by the Senate on two occasions and now is awaiting action by the House of Representatives, and I am happy to call your attention to the fact that the proposed Commission on Population Growth and the American Future will incorporate many of the basic principles and objectives as the Balanced Economic Development Commission.

In presenting S. 2701 to the Senate for consideration I can think of no stronger argument for its passage than to quote from testimony prepared by Senator HOWARD BAKER, JR., of Tennessee when he spoke in behalf of the Balanced Economic Development Commission concept during the Government Operations Committee's hearings in 1967. Senator BAKER said in part:

Our concern here is a dramatically important part of the larger challenge that confronts our Nation in this age of revolutionary technological advancement: whether the new technology will overwhelm us in a way that minimizes our freedoms and our individuality, or whether by bold and anticipatory thinking we can harness technology in a way that will maximize our freedom, our opportunities, our comfort, and our productivity.

*A sensible and imaginative national policy toward the proper distribution of population and industry across our Nation could dra-*

*matically increase the opportunities of each American to choose where he prefers to work and live.*

The heart of our concern is that during this 20th century more than 63 percent of the American people have concentrated in one percent of the land area. More than 40 percent of the population resides in the 38 largest areas of the country. And, as Senator Mundt has pointed out, population increased in metropolitan areas between 1960 and 1965 at a rate twice that outside the metropolitan areas.

There has been, and there will continue to be, speculation about why such a disproportionately large segment of the people tends to concentrate so heavily. . . . Nevertheless, one could at least say that beyond question our national government—by means of its variety of programs which influence the nation's social, economic, and political development—plays an increasingly important role in the location of industry and population. One would think, then, that the national government would have developed an understanding of this phenomenon and have formulated a policy, or at least an attitude or approach toward it.

*Senator Mundt believes that we have no such policy, and that we have hardly begun to inquire about what our approach should be toward encouraging a more desirable balance in industry and population distribution. I must admit that neither have I been able to discern an identifiable policy, nor much concern about developing a policy.*

This, then, is my reason for support of the Mundt proposal which would: first, inquire how the national government and other forces affect social, political and economic factors which influence the location of population and industry; second, decide whether there can be national, or regional, agreement upon what kind of balance there should be in the nation between distribution of population and industry; and, third, perhaps suggest an approach or policy that will guide our national government in activities which influence such a distribution.

This is an exciting area of concern. It is an integral part of the continuing dialogue about what New Direction our Nation shall take in the technological age.

Mr. President, on July 18 of this year, President Nixon recognized the very problems that the balanced economic development bill would tackle and I had urged previous administrations to endorse so that we might very well look toward that "new direction" that Senator BAKER spoke about 2 years ago. On this day, President Nixon proposed the establishment of a National Commission on Population Growth whose duties would be to study demographic, social and mobility characteristics of our population in order to systematically and effectively plan for proper economic and social developments within our Nation, and to share the information and technology developed to study these factors with all the nations of the world who are or will soon be facing the problems of overpopulation. Reading his statement of July 18 brought to mind a statement I made concerning the Balanced Economic Development Commission.

I believe it is extremely pertinent today as I recommend to you S. 2701. In May 1967, I said:

Two major national problems, which are directly related, are the objective of the proposed study (to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development). One is the tremendous decline in population occurring in rural areas of America; the other is the overcrowding of already heavily-pop-

ulated urban centers. There are those who believe such a study is unnecessary, because it is "not the business of Government" to concern itself with population growth and movement or that the answer is already known, "a simple economic fact of life—people go where the jobs are!"

The "simple economic fact of life," however, is that many people go where they think the jobs are—and end up on welfare rolls. As to the Government's role, population shifts of the past decade have already moved the Federal Government actively into an effort to solve problems created by such movements. But too often we are finding the solutions which are recommended either inadequate or off the target. For example, mass transportation programs are recommended to alleviate traffic problems. But for every freeway built, we have displaced hundreds of people from their homes, frequently many who are poor and must be provided public housing elsewhere. And with construction of new public housing, we have found ourselves confronted with additional problems, a need for law enforcement in one area, more classrooms for another, stepped-up health facilities elsewhere. It is a seemingly never-ending cycle of problems begetting new problems and always involving the Federal Government to a greater degree.

A reverse of this condition exists in rural America. People leave one area because they believe economic opportunity is better elsewhere. The depletion of families for one reason results in economic decline for those remaining. Thus, an entire community, a region or a state becomes a depressed area.

Is it wise for the Federal Government to move now in a direction which proposes to look at population movements in their totality? My conviction is that if we delay until the situation becomes so severe in a decade or two, a massive outlay of billions of Federal funds will be considered the only answer! Even then, if past history is any judge, this will not accomplish what can be achieved now with considerable less expenditure and also avoiding the feared Federal encroachment which would be a certainty at a later date in any massive "crash" program.

The goal sought through my resolution is the compilation and subsequent analysis of geographic trends in American economic development, the causative factors influencing such trends, the implications in terms of distribution of population, the effect of governmental actions in shaping such trends, and the factors both public and private, which influence the geographic location of industry and commerce.

One phase of the study, for example, would evaluate economic, social and political factors effecting geographic location of industry. Another would concern factors necessary for industries to operate efficiently both within and outside large urban areas. Evaluation would be given the impact Federal programs and expenditures have on economic development in the Nation. The role which state and local governments have or should have in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a state or region would be studied.

The objective of this Commission study is not to place the Federal Government in the role of determining where you or your neighbors are to live, nor to dictate where industry may or may not locate. What is sought is information from which a partnership concept can be developed in which the various levels of government and the private sector can work together to achieve a national growth of benefit to all areas of the nation and particularly those which are hard-pressed through either a heavy decline or a massive influx of population.

More recently, I spoke in behalf of the Commission on Population Growth and

the American Future while the Government Operations Committee was considering the bill. I cannot give a more impassioned plea for the passage of S. 2710 than the following excerpt from my testimony on September 15:

I would hope that when the National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future becomes an active investigatory body it will give its attention in a meaningful way the eight objectives that were basic duties of the Balanced Economic Development Commission which I have proposed. In listing them here I trust that we will all see the interrelatedness of these eight objectives with a study of the nation's population. Indeed, without such prior population studies and gathering of statistics the Balanced Economic Development Commission could not achieve its intended goals. And likewise, I see in this legislation we are considering here today that its goals will not adequately be met unless the Commission addresses itself to the entire array of economic, social, and political factors that interact to affect both our system of government and the living of our lives as freeholding citizens. It is suggested that the National Commission on Population Growth, embody the following objectives into their report to the President and the Congress:

(1) An analysis and evaluation of the economic, social, and political factors which affect the geographic location of industry;

(2) An analysis and evaluation of the economic, social, and political factors which are necessary in order for industries to operate efficiently outside the large urban centers or to operate and expand within the large urban centers without the creation of new economic and social problems;

(3) A consideration of the ways and means whereby the Federal Government might effectively encourage a more balanced industrial and economic growth throughout the Nation;

(4) An analysis and evaluation of the limits imposed upon population density in order for municipalities, or other political subdivisions, to provide necessary public services in the most efficient and effective manner;

(5) An analysis and evaluation of the effect on governmental efficiency generally of differing patterns and intensities of population concentration;

(6) An analysis and evaluation of the extent to which a better geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation serves the public interest;

(7) An analysis and evaluation of the role which State and local governments can and should play in promoting geographic balance in the economic development of a State or region; and

(8) An analysis and evaluation of practicable ways in which Federal expenditures can and should be managed so as to encourage a greater geographic balance in the economic development of the Nation.

The hearings pointed out that there is a dire need for us to authorize the President to establish a National Commission on Population Growth and I therefore urge this body to join me in passing this needed legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and the report will be printed.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session, the following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations:

Robert F. Keller, of Maryland, to be Assistant Comptroller General of the United States.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2952. A bill to amend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to extend its coverage to an additional county; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 2953. A bill for the relief of Khaled Barhamda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 2954. A bill for the relief of Angela Ching-Yee Chan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2955. A bill to amend section 1902(d) of the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia:

S. 2956. A bill to provide private relief for Lt. Comdr. LeRoy E. Coon, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy (retired) continued on active duty in a retired status after June 30, 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2957. A bill for the relief of Edith Jeanne Hendrickse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 2958. A bill to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase conventional mortgages, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. GRAVEL (for himself and Mr. FONG):

S.J. Res. 155. A joint resolution to provide for a study and evaluation of international and other foreign policy aspects of underground weapons testing; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

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

#### S. 2955—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 1902(d) OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1902(d) of the Social Security Act. The amendment is simply a technical amendment and does not change the substance of section 1902(d).

Relief can be granted to States that are having difficulty maintaining their level of payments and services to patients under Medicaid by complying with the conditions set forth in section 1902(d). One step in the compliance procedure is certification by the Governor that the State qualifies for the relief. Due to the fact that in some States directors or boards are responsible for the welfare program, it has been suggested that the certification called for under section 1902

(d) should more properly be accomplished by the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State program. The amendment I offer would accomplish this purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2955), to amend section 1902(d) of the Social Security Act, introduced by MR. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

**S. 2958—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AUTHORIZE THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION TO PURCHASE CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES**

MR. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for reference to the Banking and Currency Committee, together with an explanation of the bill and a statement showing how the present law would be changed.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill, the explanation of the bill, and the statement showing the change to be made in present law may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the explanation, statement, and the text of the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2958), to authorize the Federal National Mortgage Association to purchase conventional mortgages, and for other purposes, introduced by MR. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2958

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 302(b) of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act is amended—*

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately following "(b)";

(2) by striking out "each of the bodies corporate named in subsection (a)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Association";

(3) by striking out "; and the corporation is authorized to lend on the security of any such mortgages and to purchase, sell, or otherwise deal in any securities guaranteed by the Association under section 306(g); and

(4) by adding thereto the following new paragraph:

"(2) For the purposes set forth in section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the corporation is authorized, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal in mortgages and in securities guaranteed by the Association under section 306(g). The corporation shall not in the regular course of its business purchase or lend on the security of any mortgage which is not insured or guaranteed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or some other officer or agency of the Federal Government, unless the outstanding principal balance thereof at the time of purchase does not exceed 80 per centum of the amount determined by the corporation to be the value of the mortgaged property, or unless that portion of the unpaid principal balance which is in excess of such 80 per centum

is guaranteed or insured by an institution, and under a contract, determined by the corporation to be generally acceptable to other institutional mortgage investors."

(b) Section 305(h) of such Act is amended by striking out "clause (2) of section 302(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "clause (2) of the proviso to the first sentence of section 302(b)(1)".

The material presented by MR. SPARKMAN follows:

**EXPLANATION OF BILL AUTHORIZING FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION—TO DEAL IN CONVENTIONAL MORTGAGES**

The bill would authorize FNMA to purchase, service, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal in conventional mortgages. This is the same range of authority FNMA now has with respect to mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration, or insured or guaranteed by the Veteran's Administration or the Farmers Home Administration.

With respect to these conventional mortgages, however, FNMA would not be allowed to purchase or lend on the security of any such mortgage unless its outstanding principal balance did not exceed 80% of the value of the mortgaged property, or unless that portion of the unpaid principal balance in excess of 80% was guaranteed or insured by an institution, and under a contract, determined by FNMA to be generally acceptable to other institutional mortgage investors.

By supplying a secondary market for Government assisted mortgages, FNMA has played an essential role in maintaining stability in the prices of these mortgages. This has never been more vividly demonstrated than in the last year since FNMA became a private, Government sponsored corporation.

At the present time, FNMA is making commitments to purchase Government backed mortgages at an annual rate of nearly \$8 billion, compared to its highest previous activity of \$2.4 billion in one year. Without this assistance and the willingness and ability to FNMA to purchase these FHA and VA mortgages, the mortgage funds available to this important segment of the residential mortgage market would have been considerably lower and probably at significantly higher discounts.

It is now proposed to permit FNMA to expand this important secondary market activity to the conventional mortgage market. This market has been suffering in recent months because of the severe tightness of mortgage money and the lack of any real, national secondary market. Since it represents the great bulk of residential mortgages issued in the country—approximately 75% to 80%—the establishment of a sound secondary market will serve to provide a much needed stability in times of tight credit such as in 1966 and the present.

The ability of FNMA to deal in conventional mortgages has never been seriously questioned. In the past, however, because of its dual private-Government ownership, the general opinion was that its activities ought to be limited to Government backed mortgages. This inhibition no longer exists because of the split up of the functions of FNMA authorized in the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 which placed in a new, privately owned FNMA the responsibility of handling the non-subsidized activities of the old FNMA.

Since the creation of the privately owned FNMA on September 1, 1968, the new FNMA has demonstrated its unquestioned ability to function without Government support. Its activity during this past year has been at a rate higher than any year in its previous history. FNMA has also demonstrated that the funds it needs to carry on its activities are readily obtainable in the private market without reliance on the Federal Government as was often necessary in the past.

It is recognized that there will be technical problems and difficulties involved in implementing a secondary market for conventional mortgages. However, these are not believed to be insurmountable, and the most important problem to be overcome, the establishment of a uniform mortgage instrument, can only really be worked out when there is a firm basis for taking such a step. The availability of a secondary market for conventional mortgages will serve to spur the development of such an instrument.

In support of this step, MR. Raymond H. Lapin, President and Chairman of the Board of FNMA, in recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, stated that he would recommend that a proper role for FNMA may be to aid the conventional mortgage market. He also stated that FNMA has been conducting in-depth studies related to the technical problems associated with such a move. Mr. Lapin's statements are consistent with those of MR. Stanley Baughman, his immediate predecessor, and of others knowledgeable in this field.

**SECTIONS 302(b) AND 305(h) OF THE FEDERAL NATIONAL MORTGAGE ASSOCIATION CHARTER ACT AS THEY WOULD BE AMENDED BY CONVENTIONAL LOAN PROPOSAL**

SEC. 303. \* \* \*

(b) (1) For the purposes set forth in section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, [each of the bodies corporate named in subsection (a)(2)] the Association is authorized, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, or otherwise deal in any mortgages which are insured under the National Housing Act or title V of the Housing Act of 1949, or which are insured or guaranteed under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code [I: and the corporation is authorized to lend on the security of any such mortgages and to purchase, sell, or otherwise deal in any securities guaranteed by the Association under section 306(g)] *Provided*, That (1) the Association may not purchase any mortgage at a price exceeding 100 per centum of the unpaid principal amount thereof at the time of purchase, with adjustments for interest and any comparable items; (2) the Association may not purchase any mortgage, except a mortgage insured under title V of the Housing Act of 1949, if it is offered by, or covers property held by, a State, territorial, or municipal instrumentality; and (3) the Association may not purchase any mortgage under section 305, except a mortgage insured under section 220 or title VIII, or under title X with respect to a new community approved under section 1004 thereof, or insured under section 213 and covering property located in an urban renewal area, or a mortgage covering property located in Alaska, Guam, or Hawaii, if the original principal obligation thereof exceeds or exceeded \$17,500 for each family residence or dwelling unit covered by the mortgage (plus an additional \$2,500 for each such family residence or dwelling unit which has four or more bedrooms). Notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3) in the preceding sentence, the Association may purchase a mortgage under section 305 with an original principal obligation that exceeds \$17,500 per dwelling unit if the mortgage (1) is a below-market interest rate mortgage insured under section 221(d)(3), and (2) covers property which has the benefit of local tax abatement in an amount determined by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to be sufficient to make possible rentals not in excess of those that would be approved by the Secretary if the mortgage amount did not exceed \$17,500 per dwelling unit and if local tax abatement were not provided. For the purposes of this title, the terms

"mortgages" and "home mortgages" shall be inclusive of any mortgages or other loans insured under any of the provisions of the National Housing Act or title V of the Housing Act of 1949.

(2) For the purposes set forth in section 301 and subject to the limitations and restrictions of this title, the corporation is authorized, pursuant to commitments or otherwise, to purchase, service, sell, lend on the security of, or otherwise deal in mortgages and in securities guaranteed by the Association under section 306(g). The corporation shall not in the regular course of its business purchase or lend on the security of any mortgage which is not insured or guaranteed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, or some other officer or agency of the Federal Government unless the outstanding principal balance thereof at the time of purchase does not exceed 80 per centum of the amount determined by the corporation to be the value of the mortgaged property, or unless that portion of the unpaid principal balance which is in excess of such 80 per centum is guaranteed or insured by an institution, and under a contract, determined by the corporation to be generally acceptable to other institutional mortgage investors.

\* \* \*

SEC. 305. \* \* \*

(h) Notwithstanding clause (2) of the proviso to the first sentence of section [§] 302(b) [§] 302(b)(1) and any provision of this Act which is inconsistent with this subsection, the Association is authorized (subject to Presidential action as provided in subsection (a), as limited by subsection (c)) to purchase pursuant to commitments or otherwise, and to service, sell, or otherwise deal in, mortgages insured under the provisions of sections 221(d)(3) and 221(h) of this Act.

---

**SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 155—  
INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RES-  
OLUTION TO PROVIDE FOR A  
STUDY AND EVALUATION OF IN-  
TERNATIONAL AND OTHER FOR-  
EIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF UNDER-  
GROUND WEAPONS TESTING**

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), I introduce today, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to establish a commission that would review the international and foreign policy implications of the United States underground testing.

In recent days, two nations, Japan and Canada, have expressed their concern formally over the planned underground tests at Amchitka, Alaska. Both nations objected to the tests, raising the question of safety, the question of damage, and the question of liability.

The full text of those objections has not yet been released by the State Department, but the content in part is known.

There is considerable concern throughout the Pacific region regarding the forthcoming tests. In Alaska, the public has been alarmed. Though Atomic Energy Commission officials have been attempting to reduce that alarm it continues to exist. In Hawaii, as my distinguished colleagues Mr. FONG and Mr. INOUYE can confirm, concern is equally high. There is enough scientific information on the seismic punch of underground tests to suggest the possibility of a man-made earthquake, and an equal possibility of a resultant tsunami wave.

Each nation on the rim at one time or another in this century has suffered damage by such natural occurrences. The fear is now expressed, by two of our closest national allies, that the next occurrence may be man made. The foreign policy implications of such an event need to be fully recognized by the United States before we proceed.

Second, both Japan and Canada—close powers to the United States economically and strategically—share in the Pacific fish and wildlife abundance. We in the large sense live on that abundance. Native peoples in all three places take their subsistence from it. International business concerns add to the gross fiscal product of the world through the marketing of the Pacific fishery products. At least 10 other Pacific rim nations are affected by that fishery, and its health. Again, the question of submarine venting, the concentration of radioactivity in fish, and the increased radioactivity among those who consume those fish, has also been raised. We know that because of 1962 tests, atmospheric tests, in the Pacific, the salmon running up the Kotzebue, Kuskokwim and Yukon Rivers delivered the highest radioactivity counts ever measured on earth to the Eskimos of my State. What foreign policy considerations are brought into view by the possibility of internationalizing the radioactivity? This is another question my joint resolution seeks to have answered.

In view of the impending tests at Amchitka, Mr. President, I have prepared this joint resolution with particular emphasis on foreign policy considerations. If the United States is to be fully liable for the immediate effects of a possible tsunami, or the possible destruction of a fishery, or the increase of radioactivity generally among people of the Pacific rim, I believe we should know the implications and extensions of that liability. I would hope that the Foreign Relations Committee, in recognition of this fact, would schedule early hearings on the measure, and I trust that will be the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 155), to provide for a study and evaluation of international and other foreign policy aspects of underground weapons testing, introduced by Mr. GRAVEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

---

**ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS**

S. 2718

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be added as cosponsors of S. 2718, a bill to modify ammunition recordkeeping requirements.

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

S. 2887

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2887, a bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, to authorize a study of essential railroad passenger service by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes.

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

S. 2890

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished colleague from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), be added as cosponsors of S. 2890, a bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit certain active duty for training to be counted on active duty for purposes of entitlement to educational benefits under chapter 34 of such title.

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

---

**SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION  
38—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION  
SUBMITTED RELATING TO HI-  
JACKING OF AIRCRAFT**

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38) concerning the hijacking of commercial aircraft.

In almost all of the past hijacking flight crew skills, air carrier policies, and fortunate circumstances have permitted hijacked flights to be completed; however, we have been lucky and there is general fear it is only a matter of time before a hijacking incident results in a catastrophic aircraft accident. As each hijacking increases the probability of such a disaster, there is also concern that such a disaster would generate a wave of public feeling making deliberate and careful consideration of the hijacking problem difficult.

An aircraft hijacking involves immediate physical danger to all of the occupants of the aircraft. The hijacker, who is usually a fugitive from justice, a malcontent, or a "nut" armed with anything from a sawed-off shotgun to a dynamite bomb, may panic at any time and destroy the aircraft directly or indirectly by physically incapacitating the pilots. Also, passengers may panic or react in an imprudent manner to endanger the aircraft. There are also additional hazards presented by landing an aircraft at an unfamiliar airport, particularly at night without adequate landing aids, lights, and so forth. To reduced the hazards somewhat, arrangements have been made for extra fuel to be placed aboard aircraft in the case of airline flights terminating in the Florida area and for cards to be carried by flight crews on which is printed in both English and Spanish such messages as "not

September 24, 1969

enough fuel to reach Cuba" in case the hijacker does not understand English.

Recently, the Nation's news media has extensively publicized the gravity of the hijacking offense, the many hazards to safety of the aircraft, and that even when successful, hijacking an aircraft does not pay. The public has been informed that the so-called "safe haven" of Cuba may be an illusion and this should discourage would-be hijackers who are often fugitives from justice and persons with personality disorders who are seeking notoriety and excitement. The press has reported that hijackers are given rough treatment and that at least one hijacker was put into solitary confinement for longer than 2 weeks. Another hijacker was reported to have spent the first 6 weeks after his arrival there in a Cuban jail. The news media has also informed the public that two aircraft hijackers, who were returned to the United States by Cuba are serving 20 years' sentence. Unsuccessful hijackings have been widely publicized as well as the policy recently instituted by the Justice Department to indict hijackers who can be identified so that when jurisdiction over the person is obtained, he will immediately be prosecuted.

However, the permanent solution to the aircraft hijacking problem is to secure an agreement based on internationally accepted standards that hijacking is a serious crime endangering many lives and that the hijacker shall be severely punished. Hijacking of a commercial aircraft is an offense that may involve aircraft of any country, operating in any part of the world, and is likely to occur anytime that tensions exist between two or more countries. With respect to the hijacker who requests political asylum, the dangers of hijacking a commercial aircraft are clearly so great that nations acting responsibly should agree to return the hijacker provided, however, that he will be tried and punished only for the hijacking offense.

The concurrent resolution would make it the sense of Congress that this should be done.

I submit the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 38), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 38

Whereas the hijacking of the Trans World Airlines Boeing 707 to Syria by Arab guerrillas on August 26, 1969 astonished responsible governments that any government would condone and associate itself with the hijacking of a commercial airplane; and

Whereas the hijacking of any commercial airplane greatly endangers the lives of the passengers and crew of the airplane, and results in delays and inconvenience to both passengers and the airlines; and

Whereas in the past flight crew skills, airline policies, and favorable circumstances have fortunately prevented a hijacking incident from becoming a catastrophic airplane accident; and

Whereas the hijacking of commercial airplanes will cease only when an international agreement is reached that recognizes hijacking as a vicious international crime

and provides that the hijacker shall be punished; and

Whereas the Tokyo Convention on hijacking and certain other offenses committed aboard aircraft, establishes sound international law to promote safety of civil aviation, but does not provide that the hijacker shall be punished: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the Senate of the United States (The House of Representatives concurring).* That it is the sense of the Congress that the Administration should act immediately to enter into bilateral agreements with all nations to provide for the mandatory extradition of a hijacker, including a hijacker who requests political asylum to the flag country of the hijacked aircraft; and be it further

*Resolved,* That the bilateral agreements shall provide that the hijacker who is extradited will be tried and punished only for the hijacking offense.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF  
RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 243

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), be added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 243, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate concerning action by the United Nations for the purpose of obtaining compliance by North Vietnam with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

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

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED—MESSAGE  
FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 1888) to change the composition of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—  
AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 202

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13270) to reform the income tax laws, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF  
1969—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 203

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the administration's foreign aid bill, S. 2347, which would curtail military aid to Greece.

Following the military coup in April 1967, the United States suspended shipment of major arms to Greece and, al-

though there was modification of the policy last fall, the suspension of major items, such as tanks and aircraft, remains in effect. But authorizations and appropriations for military aid to Greece have continued each year in the hope that democratic government would be restored, thus justifying a resumption of arms deliveries. As a consequence, a sizable backlog of weapons has accumulated in the pipeline.

As of June 30, 1968, \$122 million in military aid was available for delivery which, together with the \$37 million approved for fiscal 1969 made a total of \$159 million in arms aid available, twice the highest annual arms aid program provided Greece during the last 5 years. The bulk of this amount remains undelivered, much of it composed of suspended items.

But this is only a part of the picture. In addition to the \$159 million in regular military aid available in fiscal 1969 large quantities of surplus defense equipment, originally costing \$105 million, were programmed for Greece. Although Defense officials explain that this is used equipment and should only be counted at a fraction of original cost, they look through American, not Greek, eyes. To our military men a used tank may be worth only its value as junk. But to a Greek military man a tank is a tank. So the value to the Greeks of the surplus arms set aside would be far higher than the Pentagon cares to admit.

My amendment would not affect military aid previously voted for Greece. It would insure only that no additional aid is programmed until Congress gives its approval. With the large amount already in the pipeline the actual effect on Greece's military posture, should Congress not vote additional aid until next year, would be minimal. There will, of course, be some disruption in the flow of arms, should full shipments be resumed following a change in the character of the Greek Government. But the United States cannot have its cake and eat it too. I believe we should demonstrate in no uncertain terms to the world, and particularly to the Greeks themselves, that the present Greek Government does not enjoy the full support of the United States and that the arms spigot has been turned off until a reasonably democratic government emerges. To glut the pipeline further in view of the current situation in Greece will only add to the pressures to ease up on the suspension policy.

I might point out that if future events warrant a full resumption of military aid a supplemental authorization can always be requested by the administration. And there is also the emergency authority of section 506 of the Foreign Assistance Act which permits the President to provide up to \$300 million in arms to foreign countries from Defense Department stocks if he deems it important to the national security.

There is no cause for optimism over the prospects for a return to truly democratic government for the unfortunate people of Greece. We can hope for a change, but mere hope is not a proper basis for congressional approval of tens of millions of dollars in military aid.

I hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations will adopt my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 203) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### AMENDMENT OF JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 204

Mrs. SMITH of Maine (for herself and Mr. GOLDWATER) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by her, to the bill (H.R. 11249) to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such center, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 205

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to S. 7, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

This amendment is a short one intended simply to augment the very constructive provisions of S. 7, which for the first time would require compliance with water quality standards by all activities and facilities over which the Federal Government has direct control or for which Federal licenses or permits are required.

Section 103 of S. 7 would establish a new section 16 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. Section 16(c) would require that no Federal agency shall issue a license or permit for any activity which may affect water quality until it receives certification from the State in which the discharge would originate that the proposed activity will be designed to insure compliance with applicable water quality standards.

My amendment to section 16(c) would simply specify that, before a State or, where appropriate, interstate agency or the Secretary of the Interior issues such a certification, it shall provide an opportunity for public hearings on the application being considered.

This additional clause would insure that the concerned public would have a role in the new review process, and that public views would be heard by the certifying agency before a decision is reached.

The most obvious type of case to which 16(c) would apply is that of new nuclear powerplants, such as the large facility being constructed by the Baltimore Gas & Electric Co. at Calvert Cliffs on the Chesapeake Bay. This project has aroused great public controversy on a number of points, including the possible extent of thermal pollution of Chesapeake Bay through the discharge of heated waters which could adversely affect the ecology of that part of the bay. The company has exerted strenuous effort to accommodate public opinion and to meet objective criticism, but there has been no regular forum for such purpose.

Thermal pollution is a serious question which should be fully considered before any new powerplant is built anywhere. Unfortunately, as many concerned citizens of Maryland discovered during the early stages of the Calvert Cliffs debate, current Federal law does not provide for any review of this problem before the basic construction license for a nuclear powerplant is issued by the Atomic Energy Commission. The AEC's jurisdiction does not permit thermal effects to be considered as a licensing criterion. The only forums offered to the public may be provided by the Army Corps of Engineers, which must issue permits for pipes or other structures in navigable waters, or under State law. Neither of these alternatives insures the full, timely and direct consideration of the project's water quality impact before construction has actually begun.

Under section 16(c) of S. 7, however, before approving any nuclear powerplant construction or operating license in the future, the Atomic Energy Commission would be required to obtain from the appropriate State certification that the project would comply with applicable water quality standards. The thermal pollution problem would thus be considered directly and at the most appropriate stage.

Section 16(c) of course would apply not just to nuclear powerplants, but to all facilities and activities conducted under licenses and permits issued by any Federal agency. It thus extends to all of the operations in and around navigable waters which require permits from the Army Corps of Engineers, such as dredging, construction and extension of piers, and the laying of pipelines.

Such activities are multiplying in Maryland and other States which depend heavily on their waterways for commerce and recreation. The Baltimore District of the Army Corps of Engineers, for instance, is now receiving 600 to 800 permit applications per year involving Maryland waters alone. Comment from relevant State agencies is now solicited by the corps in every case. Section 16(c) of S. 7 would alter these procedures and require each applicant to obtain from the State a certification that the proposed project or activity would comply with water quality standards.

I believe it is the intent of section 16(c) that a State or other certifying agency, before reaching a decision on any given application, shall make a full review of the situation and avail itself of all expert opinion on the potential effects of the project on water quality, desirable project modifications and appropriate safeguards.

My amendment would make this intent explicit, by requiring that the certifying agency shall provide the public an opportunity to be heard at this point.

I might note that my amendment would not require a full, formal public hearing to be held on every single application. Many projects which require Federal permits, such as the construction or extension of a small pier or pipe, are essentially noncontroversial and would have no impact on water quality. In such cases the certifying agency could invite comment by public notice but

would not actually have to hold a public hearing if no interest in one was expressed. The degree of controversy and extent of public concern would be the factors determining precisely how extensive a hearing should be held in a given case.

The opportunity for public hearings would be particularly constructive in one particular type of case, where the facility or activity involved is going to be constructed, operated or carried on by a State agency. In such instances, under section 16(c) a State would have to certify that its own activities would be in compliance with its own water quality standards. It would essentially be vouching for itself.

Such a situation would develop, for example, if the District of Columbia government applied for a Corps of Engineers permit to enlarge the pipeline which discharges effluent into the Potomac estuary from the Blue Plains sewage treatment plant. Under section 16(c), the District government itself would provide the certification that its own activity would not impair the quality of the estuary. Public hearings could be especially valuable in such a case.

I might note, finally, that section 16(c) has been carefully drafted by the Committee on Public Works to insure that its requirements will apply in the near future to projects now under construction. In the case of the Calvert Cliffs powerplant, for instance, a construction license has already been granted by the Atomic Energy Commission. The water quality impact of the project would still be reviewed, however, and State certification of compliance with water quality standards would be required before a long-term operating license could be granted. Under my amendment, the public would have an opportunity to comment at that point.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment is fully in accord with the purposes and procedures of this important section of S. 7. The bill as a whole, in fact, is a response to growing and justified public concern over the degradation of our waterways by many types of pollution. It is therefore most fitting to insure that the public will participate actively in enforcing water quality standards and implementing this vital legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and will lie on the table.

#### CUTBACKS IN FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID FOR STATE AND LOCAL CONSTRUCTION

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am much disturbed because of imminent prospects of a 75-percent cutback in Federal grants-in-aid for State and local construction. President Nixon issued a statement on September 4, in which he strongly urged State and local governments to cut drastically their construction plans. However, if the State and local response is not sufficient, the President has indicated that he will reduce Federal matching funds for State and local construction to 25 percent. Of course, if Federal funds are restricted,

September 24, 1969

particularly in the highway construction program, the impact will be devastating.

Because of the possible adverse effect of the proposal on the economy of Arkansas, I sent a telegram to President Nixon yesterday, which expressed my deep concern, and urged that a cutback of such magnitude not be imposed. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of that telegram, together with a copy of a telegram to me signed by numerous trade associations and citizens of the State of Arkansas who express their opposition and highlight possible consequences of a major cutback. I would like to insert in the RECORD a copy of a letter from Mr. Ward Goodman, director of the Arkansas State Highway Commission, which details specific highway projects that will be affected.

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

The PRESIDENT,  
The White House,  
Washington, D.C.:

I am much disturbed because of reports that there will be a 75 percent cutback in Federal grants-in-aid for State and local construction. Because of inflationary pressures and a 75 percent reduction of direct Federal construction contracts already in force, the construction industry is moving to a virtual standstill. If Federal grant-in-aid for State and local construction is cut back to 25 percent, the impact could be devastating. I am advised that in Arkansas it would mean a decrease in Federal matching funds for highway construction from \$32 million to approximately \$6.5 million. This would cause a long delay in the construction of many vital public improvements and will ultimately require additional expenditures to overcome disruption, deterioration, and increased costs. Many contractors who have made large investments in anticipation of Government funding could well sustain severe losses, while thousands of workers would lose their jobs and be forced onto the unemployment compensation rolls and welfare grants. Such a drastic reduction will certainly prove to be false economy and will be adverse to and hinder national progress.

I most respectfully urge that it not be imposed.

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
U.S. Senator.

Little Rock, Ark.,  
September 18, 1969.

Senator JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
Washington, D.C.:

At a meeting held at 10 a.m. this date at the Coachmans Inn Little Rock the undersigned representing approximately twenty-five thousand people in construction and allied industries in Arkansas respectfully request that you as a Senator of the State of Arkansas—

Oppose any cut back in the Federal and highway program. If the highway program is reduced there will be several thousand people out of work placing additional burden on the Welfare Department and the Employment Fund. We believe a cut back will be disastrous to our State highway system as well as the construction industry and will not curb inflation. The construction industry was assured by Secretary of Transportation Mr. Volpe that the highway industry would not have a stop and go highway program. Therefore the contractors have committed themselves to long range financial obligations in equipment and plants. The

highway contractors have committed themselves to a training program for the minority groups in Arkansas at no cost to the Federal Government. A cut back would cause serious curtailment to this program. Statistics reflect that construction cost in highway construction have increased at only about one half the rate of increased cost for construction in the building industry. Thereby indicating that highway construction is not a major cause of inflationary conditions in the nation. If drastic measures are needed to control inflation, we suggest wage and price controls. Arkansas is faced with ever increased highway users safety because of neglect of highways in previous years. The highway trust fund provides for orderly and planned programs, a cut back will break faith with the highway users of this Nation.

We respectfully request that you inform the President and the Secretary of Transportation that we oppose any cutback in highway funds.

Arkansas Chapter of the Associated General Contractors, Arkansas Chapter American Road Builders Association, Arkansas Chapter National Asphalt Paving Association, Associated Equipment Distributors of Arkansas, S. M. Dixon, Gordon Wilson.

Little Rock Road and Machinery, Tyndel Dickinson, McGeorge Construction, Elmer Barber, Jr., Barber Bridge Builders, McBride Construction Co., Max Lyons, J. C. Mitchell, J. A. Riggs, D. B. Hill, Freshour Construction Co. McDonald Equipment Co., Ben M. Hogan, Howard Jones, Clark McClinton, Sam Fullerton, Jim Reynolds, Waldron Construction Co., Jack East, Midcoark, Ft. Smith Structural Steel, R. A. Young and Sons, Gordon McNulty.

ARKANSAS STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION,  
Little Rock, Ark., September 17, 1969.

Hon. JOHN L. McCLELLAN,  
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR McCLELLAN: At the recent Governors Conference in Palm Springs, Vice President Agnew leaked the information that a reduction in construction by seventy-five percent was in the making. On September 4, 1969, President Nixon issued a Statement (not an Executive Order) in which he verified that such a move was possible. First, he directed all agencies of the Federal Government to put into effect immediately a seventy-five percent reduction in new contracts for Government construction. This affects the highway program in a minor degree because very little of the monies allocated to us are in this classification.

In the second part of the President's statement he said, "I strongly urge the state and local governments to follow the example of the Federal Government by cutting back temporarily on their construction plans. The degree and promptness with which they respond to this plea for partnership in action will be watched carefully. If the response proves insufficient, I shall need to restrict the commitments for construction that can be financed through Federal grants. Should this step become unavoidable, the states and localities will, of course, be given due notice, so that they can adjust their affairs properly."

From the interpretation of this statement by the Press, it was indicated that this statement would not affect the regular Federal-aid Highway Program at this time. The press also indicated that most of the Governors present gave tacit approval to the statement due to the inflationary tendencies not in effect. I doubt that they had been given all of the facts when they did, if this be true.

I have learned recently that the Federal Highway Administration and others are interpreting this statement to mean that the voluntary part of the statement will not prove effective, that the cutback will apply to the Highway Program and might be put into effect immediately. This must not be allowed.

With a reduced program such as is being discussed, in order to get the best use of our Federal-aid funds the Interstate System will suffer most. During the year we will have some grades prepared which must have pavement placed upon them immediately if we are to protect our investment from erosion and deterioration. These are gaps on the Interstate that need to be filled in Franklin and Hempstead Counties. One project that is sure to suffer, though not on the Interstate, is the new bridge across the Arkansas River at Pine Bluff. We are raising, many times daily, an old and antiquated bridge to serve our new navigation demands. No one knows when it may stick or become jammed and tie up traffic for miles and miles. Piers for the new bridge are in place and under a normal program, funds would be available in October to let a contract for the superstructure. Due to the magnitude of this project, for which we have been saving money for years, our chances for letting a contract in November will be ruined. Work on the desperately needed Interstate West Bypass of Little Rock and any future contracts for the new Memphis Bridge will be stopped.

Highway contractors in Arkansas and the Nation have believed promises made by members of the Administration in the past that there will be no more "off and on" highway programs. They have bought equipment with the full expectation of having the work available to make payments. They have staffed their crews and set up training programs for the minority groups to adequately handle our expected highway program. A major cutback will ruin, financially, many contractors and stop the training programs.

In the beginning of the President's Statement, he says that the reason for the action is because the cost of building a home or apartment has become exorbitant and the rapidly rising costs of housing are a particular cause for national concern when we are striving to bring the forces of inflation under control. We agree wholeheartedly with that part of the Statement but from charts I have seen, although labor costs for roads and bridges have increased, the rate is about one-half that for housing, why should the highway program be stopped in order to help another industry that is contributing to the problem?

We have had no official directive from anyone that such a cutback for roads is to be put into effect. Persons in high positions tell me it will. My purpose in writing this letter is to beg you to do all within your personal power to see that it is not.

On the basis of some figures I have seen, prepared by the Federal Highway Administration, our ration for the remainder of this fiscal year would be \$6.5 Million instead of about \$32 Million to which we are entitled. I would ask you, what happened to the "the states and localities will, of course, be given due notice so that they can adjust their affairs properly?"

You will recall that monies collected for highway construction are put in a trust fund and can be expended for nothing else. They are dedicated and reserved for highway and bridge construction. If a cutback of this magnitude is put into effect, the trust fund will continue to grow and the balance will be looked upon by other agencies as a source of possible revenue. It is of grave concern to us in the highway field that the trust fund be left alone.

If you concur in our thoughts, your help will be sincerely appreciated.

Respectfully,

WARD GOODMAN,  
Director of Highways.

#### MONEY IS NO PANACEA

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, in response to the growing chorus of Americans who feel that money allocated to the space program could be better spent on our Nation's urban and social needs, Mr. Art V. Maxwell, president of the Consulting Engineers Council of the United States, has written an article entitled "Money Is No Panacea." This article appeared in the September issue of Consulting Engineer magazine.

I ask unanimous consent that this be printed in the RECORD. I recommend this reading to all Members of the Senate.

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

#### CEC COMMENTS: MONEY IS NO PANACEA

(By Art V. Maxwell)

Like many Americans, I was awestruck by our nation's magnificently executed moon flight. A feat of this magnitude virtually dwarfs all other scientific and technological phenomena and I am particularly proud of the role played by fellow consultants in designing many of the elements which made this mission possible. (After months of engineers being chastised for design of facilities and products which despoil our land, air, and water, it was personally gratifying to hear our profession acclaimed for its flawless contribution to this historic event.)

Yet, even as this praise was ringing in our ears, many distinguished citizens were raising serious questions as to the importance of our space program when weighed against the enormous problems of war, hunger, disease, crime, and poverty. They insist, "If government, science and industry can put men on the moon, why can't these same bodies provide the U.S. with efficient transportation, adequate housing, a cure for cancer, and peace on earth?" Such statements assume that the \$24 billion spent in conquering the moon could more humanely be directed to the cure of America's complex social ills.

Frankly, I wonder if we, or any nation, can solve all problems simply by expending great sums of money and applying the latest in research and development. Many of the issues confronting us do not involve financial or technological solutions; there are legal, social, political, and bureaucratic factors totally unrelated to dollars.

This point was underscored by New Mexico's Senator Clinton P. Anderson when he reminded his colleagues that there is already \$26.9 billion in the budget for federal aid to this country's 22 million poor. That represents a total of \$6000 per family of five persons who are classified as "poor." Add to this the monies furnished by state and local governments, private charities, and the modest incomes of such families, and we face the enigma of why anyone can be considered "poor."

One answer is the drain on funds resulting from poor administration. Before transferring NASA's funds to economic assistance programs, government officials might profit from a careful reexamination of the Space Administration's success. Though money and ingenuity were essential to Apollo's achievement, a vital ingredient was the orderly direction and recognizable chain-of-command that characterized this effort. More significant, there was a single, definable, agreed-upon objective.

Everyone connected with the manned flight project had his eyes riveted on the

goal of safely putting the U.S. on the moon in this decade. Decisions were rendered on that basis. Congress, while concerned with the cost, seldom second-guessed or overruled the scientists-engineers in charge of the program. New ideas were encouraged and utilized. Fabricators and producers were rewarded for excellent products and performance. Buckpassing was minimized and red-tape was something to be cut through.

Compare that operation with the Office of Economic Opportunity, or any of a dozen other Federal agencies. Regional administrators have minimal authority (even minor decisions are often made in Washington); many administrative appointments are based not on qualifications but on political patronage; self-nominated Congressional experts are not above revising priorities in mid-stream; the glorious promise of new programs oftentimes fades to disappointment as delays occur in implementation and the staffing of needed offices; Congressional funding is often whimsical and belated; and stultified administrators inhibit innovation by insisting that projects go according to outdated standards.

In some agencies, like the Post Office, employee unions appear to wield more control than executive personnel. (Even former Postmaster Generals have publicly conceded that they lacked sufficient authority to make improvements.) Rivalry between (and within) agencies with related responsibilities has bred a competition that often borders on the infantile.

All the money in the U.S. Treasury will not correct these defects.

Congressmen who are swayed by appeals to divert space and other technological investments to the solution of urban and social problems may find they have inadvertently halted our forward progress, and with it, our ranking as a world leader. The fact is no nation has ever solved all of its internal problems. Even the Greeks, at the time they built the Parthenon, had poverty, hunger, disease, and social upheaval; but this beautiful edifice has survived as a tribute to the vision and genius of that great civilization.

#### NEED IMPROVED MANAGEMENT

I would be the first to agree that NASA's \$24 billion could benefit thousands of Americans if it were applied to new airports, sewage treatment, medical research, housing, and other needs. But I would be far more enthusiastic if this transfer of funds were accompanied by improved management of the affected programs. First priority, in my opinion, should be correction of the problem cited by Delaware Congressman William Roth at this year's AIA-CEC Public Affairs Conference: "The Federal bureaucracy is so enmeshed in duplicative redtape that no one, least of all Congress, is fully and completely informed on all of the grant-in-aid programs presently in existence."

Apollo 11 has opened a new frontier; it has rekindled America's dreams and revived our lagging spirits. No one is able at this time to comprehend fully the significance of this achievement. The tangible technical benefits are already accruing from space research faster, and in larger quantities, than even the most optimistic prophets anticipated. Engineers, including consultants, have advanced the boundaries of nearly every technical discipline and have even created new disciplines.

This is the spinoff of a program that demonstrated which can be accomplished by not only money and intellect, but a definite, uncontested objective which is systematically attacked. In doing so, personnel were assigned and exercised specific authority; there was little hesitancy to adopt new methods, new ideas, and new procedures necessary to get the job done.

I am hopeful that this vital lesson is not overlooked by those with administrative authority in Washington.

#### FORMER UNDER SECRETARY OF AIR FORCE SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, without comment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an interview with Hon. Townsend Hoopes, former Under Secretary of the Air Force, published in the Armed Forces Journal of September 20. I am certain that every Member of the Senate will be intensely interested in what Mr. Hoopes has to say.

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

#### FORMER UNDER SECRETARY SPEAKS OUT ON VIETNAM

(By Benjamin F. Schemmer)

Townsend Hoopes, Air Force Under Secretary in the waning days of the Johnson Administration, has labeled former Defense Secretary Robert Strange McNamara an "ambivalent" manager who "finessed serious debate on basic issues," of U.S. intervention in Vietnam. He also calls Walt Rostow, the former President's chief advisor on national security affairs, "a fanatic in sheep's clothing" unwilling to listen to other's ideas.

In a recent telephone interview, Hoopes said that "If he [Johnson] had known it would take 100,000 or 200,000 men in Vietnam, he'd not have gone in." (Hoopes was referring to decisions made in late 1964 and early 1965 to follow up on retaliatory bombing raids over North Vietnam with a major commitment of U.S. combat forces in the South.) "But," Hoopes also told the JOURNAL, Johnson "didn't want to hear" any such pessimistic advice.

Hoopes confirmed that in a major new book on Vietnam—not to be released until late October—he also characterizes:

Dean Rusk as "a major contributor to the national confusion over Vietnam."

LBJ as a "sentimental patriot" who lacked self-confidence in foreign affairs and leaned too heavily on the counsel of poor advisors.

The JCS as having led the former President down "the garden path." (Here, Hoopes quotes a blunt report requested by LBJ from former Secretary of State Dean Acheson.)

#### PLAYING IT BY EAR

"A notable exception" to the poor advice given Johnson on U.S. intervention in Vietnam, Hoopes told the Journal, was that of former Under Secretary of State George Ball, who predicted late in 1964 that "there would be over 300,000 men in Vietnam within about a year." According to Hoopes, McNamara and Johnson "never even had an idea of the troops that would be required." He said they were "playing it by ear, day by day."

Asked if he had consulted with McNamara while writing the new book, Hoopes said that he had invited McNamara "to be drawn into a number of candid discussions" about the war in Vietnam. McNamara declined to comment, however, Hoopes said. He described the former Secretary as a "close personal friend who obviously made some mistakes."

Hoopes said that, while he does not know precisely to what extent McNamara was "in the vanguard" of the 1964-1965 decisions to intervene, there clearly was "no major dissent" between the former Defense Secretary and JCS Chairman General Earle G. Wheeler.

By the summer of 1967, Hoopes told The Journal, McNamara was "aware that the war, as it had developed, had become a great mistake." McNamara's doubts, Hoopes said, first surfaced publicly in the summer of 1967 during hearings before the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, when that panel was probing restrictions imposed by the Pentagon on the U.S. bombing campaign over North Vietnam.

Asked if such publicly-expressed doubts were responsible for McNamara's sudden appointment in November of 1967 to his current post as President of the World Bank, Hoopes said, "McNamara was becoming quite dovish at a time when the President was driving on to clear victory. There was a disparity he [Johnson] didn't want to live with." Hoopes described the President's motives in replacing McNamara as "mixed, some of the highest and friendliest" character. He also labeled Johnson's decision to move McNamara out of the Pentagon "a fateful hinge."

Hoopes' book (*The Limits of Intervention: An Inside Account of How the Johnson Policy of Escalation in Vietnam Was Reversed*) is being published by David McKay (Long Island). It will retail for \$5.95. According to *Publishers' Weekly*, the release date has been set for October 27.

Hoopes told The Journal that he has also written an article, based on the book, for the October issue of *Atlantic*. (The magazine says that the issue will be on the newsstands about 30 September.)

Hoopes' book gives a brief, phase-by-phase account of the Vietnam escalation after the Gulf of Tonkin incident. Most of the narrative, however, concerns the six months of Administration soul-searching that led to former President's Johnson's decision of 31 March 1968 to halt bombing of North Vietnam about the 20th parallel, and not to seek re-election. Throughout the book, Hoopes critically examines advice given to the former President by his principal Southeast Asia advisors.

Hoopes served in key Pentagon post: for over four years. He was sworn in on 2 December 1964 as Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs. Hoopes told the Journal that, notwithstanding his position title, he had little to do with the late 1964-early 1965 decisions which "crystallized the inner group's determination to intervene" in Vietnam. Hoopes said that his ISA duties mainly concerned the Military Assistance Program (MAP) and the Near and Middle East. In October of 1966 Hoopes replaced Norman S. Paul as Air Force Under Secretary, a Presidential appointment.

#### WARNKE, CLIFFORD: DECISIVE INFLUENCES

During The Journal interview Hoopes said that he played a "rather indirect" role in the early 1968 decision to de-escalate. He described himself as "one of four people" who were a "decisive" influence on former Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, who in turn was, Hoopes said, the most persuasive figure convincing President Johnson to reverse his previously hawkish stand on Vietnam. The other three DoD officials who comprised the "decisive influence" quartet, Hoopes said, were:

Paul Warnke (then Assistant Sec Def for International Security Affairs, now a partner in Clifford's Washington, D.C., law firm);

Phil Goulding, then Assistant Sec Def for Public Affairs; and,

Paul Nitze, Clifford's Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Of the four, Hoopes said, "Warnke had more influence on Clifford than any other single person."

#### RECKLESS ESCALATION

Hoopes told The Journal that he felt the decision to intervene in Vietnam was "a deliberate decision," triggered by successive Viet Cong attacks on the airfield at Bien Hoa (two days before the November, 1964 Presidential election), at Pleiku (on 7 February 1965), and—three days later—at Qui Nhon where a barracks was bombed. It was primarily the November 1964 Bien Hoa attack, however that "crystallized the inner group's determination to intervene," Hoopes said.

"Reckless escalation" is the way Hoopes

described to The Journal subsequent increases in U.S. Southeast Asia force levels.

In a note to The Journal mailed last week from Edgartown, Mass., where he was vacationing, Hoopes enclosed extracts from galley proofs of the article he has written for *Atlantic*, by way of further comment on questions he was asked about McNamara's "management" of the Vietnam War.

#### M'NAMARA'S MANAGED DECISIONS

Hoopes spells out the fateful consequences of a trip made to Vietnam in late February 1968 by JCS Chairman Wheeler. McNamara, serving out his final month as Defense Secretary, did not accompany Wheeler. The trip resulted in an "authoritative" and "undiluted" request for 206,000 more troops.

In contrast, Hoopes says, on every previous such trip McNamara flew to Vietnam with the JCS Chairman "to bargain directly with Westmoreland" on the manpower levels and discretionary authority needed to fight the war. "In every instance, he [McNamara] had reached his own conclusions before departing Washington," Hoopes says. McNamara even had "meticulously prepared his position" before departing on such trips, "including a draft of what he would report to the President on his return" (Journal italics).

Thus, McNamara prevailed upon SEA commanders to "scale down" their requests, in return for his public endorsement of new build-up plans.

Hoopes concluded that McNamara—by holding control within very narrow channels, by developing his position on future troop requirements before each trip to the battlefield and by moving fast—"finessed serious debate on basic issues" and thus "saved" President Johnson from having to arbitrate disputes among Administration advisors. Hoopes notes that the result was a twenty-five-fold increase, (21,000 to 510,000) over three years, in U.S. forces sent to Vietnam.

McNamara's typical reaction to military recommendations, according to Hoopes, was to "manage the problem, whittle down the numbers, muffle the differences and thereby avoid a bruising confrontation within the Administration."

In contrast, Hoopes notes, the "undiluted" Westmoreland-Wheeler request of early 1968 touched off an "immediate and dramatic reappraisal of policy." (According to Clifford's own account, published in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs*, he had been directed to determine "how" the new requirement would be met, not to assess the need for it.) But the reappraisal led—31 days after Clifford took office as Secretary of Defense—to Johnson's decision of 31 March 1968 to de-escalate and not to run for re-election.

#### TROOP CUTBACK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I hope the new withdrawal of U.S. troops will spur the South Vietnamese to assume more of the combat burden. We have already spent more than a hundred billion dollars and lost nearly 40,000 men. I have supported every effort to train and equip the South Vietnamese to take over the fighting. But I do not believe they will do so until we compel them to. From the beginning we have fought this war with one hand tied behind our back. We should have hit the enemy with all of our conventional power. We should have destroyed his dikes, closed his ports, and forced him to negotiate in good faith. Our fighting men did not ask to go to Vietnam. If we are not going to do all that we can to protect them and get them back alive, then we ought to continue the gradual withdrawal and get out.

#### CODAF AND UNITED STATES-MEXICO RELATIONS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on September 8, when President Nixon met with Mexican President Diaz Ordaz at the border to dedicate the Amistad Dam, he referred to the "special relationship" which binds the two nations. The official name given that day to the \$78 million joint complex signaled the nature of the ceremonies which brought the two Presidents together. "Amistad" is the Spanish word for "friendship."

The good will and harmony which marked the occasion of the first meeting between Presidents Nixon and Diaz Ordaz is about to be shattered, however, by the impact of a diplomatic slap in the face for which Congress will bear the major blame. This threat to cordial inter-American relations is caused by the failure of Congress to pass legislation to extend the life of the newly created joint United States-Mexican Commission to improve border relations and conditions. The organization possesses a long title, the United States-Mexico Commission for Border Development and Friendship, but it is generally described as "CODAF."

I know that whichever name is used, several Senators still will want to ask themselves: "What is it and what does it do?" And here is where a great deal of the present difficulties may be traced. For no fault of its own, CODAF is up against a recognition gap. Consequently, it will be my purpose today to inform Senators of the outstanding work being done by CODAF and to urge that immediate attention be given to preventing its disappearance.

Mr. President, at this point in my statement, I would like to describe exactly how the Commission is organized and just what its rôle is supposed to be.

CODAF was established at the highest levels of our two governments. Its origin can be traced to a joint statement issued by the Presidents of Mexico and the United States on April 16, 1966. At that time they announced their agreement to create a commission which would find ways in which the two countries, through cooperative action, could "improve the relations between the frontier cities of both countries" and "elevate the life of those who live in the border region." The Presidents expressly noted that the Commission should focus on means "to raise the standard of living of the respective communities from a social and cultural as well as a material point of view."

In accordance with this agreement, two sections were set up by the respective governments and the joint Commission began its formal operations in July of 1967. The U.S. section is composed of the Chairman and 10 Commissioners appointed from Federal departments and agencies whose programs are of concern to the border area. Our Commissioners have been drawn from eight major departments and three executive offices. In turn, the Mexican section consists of Commissioners appointed from nine major departments and three offices.

In addition to the membership of the Commission, there are 14 separate joint working groups which have been established to handle much of the fieldwork

of CODAF. The bulk of the problems that confront CODAF are highly specialized and it is these working groups which provide the Commission with the amount of proficiency needed to carry out its responsibilities. Each of these groups consists of technical experts who explore a number of topics in the areas of their competence and formulate specific recommendations for action to be taken by communities along the border and programs to be sponsored by the full Commission.

Mr. President, I believe this brief historical review amply demonstrates that CODAF has been given a very important role to play on the inter-American stage. First, it is charged with elevating the economic, social, and cultural life of the peoples in the entire border area, a territory that sweeps across 2,000 miles and encompasses 5 million persons. Second, it has been given the mandate to work towards the improvement of relations between border communities and to concern itself with any programs that would stimulate friendship between the two nations.

Speaking as a person who has lived on the border all his life, I would like to vouch for the fact that CODAF has made an excellent start toward both objectives. Although the Commission only began operations 2 years ago, it has promptly achieved a remarkable series of constructive accomplishments. I believe the following summary of 16 major contributions will substantiate my comment.

First. CODAF drafted the first formal agreement ever entered into between Mexico and the United States dealing with cooperative action in case of emergencies and natural disasters in the border area. This agreement was put into effect at the second joint meeting of CODAF. The United States and Canada have had such an agreement for years, but the spirit and mechanism provided by CODAF and its Emergency Planning Working Group were a prerequisite to the establishment of such an agreement with Mexico.

Second. For the first time in history, local, State, and Federal technicians from both sides of the border have been brought together to consider the twin border cities in a "single community" context. The Urban Development Working Group of CODAF has sponsored successful meetings in four of the twin border cities, and five more joint urban development workshops are scheduled.

Third. The U.S. section of CODAF has assisted in the development of a pilot program in which 80 "roundhouses," to sell for a maximum of \$5,000, are being constructed in Del Rio, Tex. The Mexican section has expressed interest in this approach to obtaining low-cost housing in border cities and is considering a similar undertaking on its side of the border.

Fourth. CODAF has stimulated discussions with Mexico which have led to collaboration on the forthcoming American and Mexican 1970 census to guarantee collection of comparable data.

Fifth. The Transportation Working Group has initiated discussions—

For the development of joint transpor-

tation planning in the Brownsville-Matamoros area;

For the location of a new bridge in Laredo;

For the coordination of plans for building highways in the border area; and

For the adoption of a uniform system of traffic signs in the border area.

Sixth. The U.S. section has obtained the publication of a major study relative to the special economic and social characteristics of the border as they relate to industrialization. This report, entitled "Industrial and Employment Potential of the United States-Mexico Border," was published in December 1968. For its part, Mexico has a program for industrialization of the border zone well underway.

Seventh. CODAF is about to achieve a significant breakthrough by arranging the establishment of a joint labor market and skill survey all along the border. As the first step toward this goal, the Manpower and Labor Working Group has initiated a pilot survey that has been conducted on both sides of the border at the El Paso-Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua area.

Eighth. CODAF has proposed an imaginative scheme for the designation of a network of roads and highways along both sides of the border, to be known as the "Border Friendship Route." All four of our border States have approved designation of this route, and the implementation of this concept is now being considered by the tourism working group.

Ninth. The education working group scheduled a joint conference on the accreditation of university level studies which was held at the twin border cities of Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua-El Paso, Tex., in April 1969. Approximately 30 educators from each country, representing universities, college accrediting associations, and the two Governments attended the conference.

Tenth. The education working group is seeking to inaugurate a pilot project for the exchange of high school language teachers between the cities of El Paso and Ciudad Juarez.

Eleventh. A binational sanitary landfill project has been established for Nogales, Arizona-Nogales Sonora. This project originated with the public health working group, was approved by the Mexican authorities, and has been funded by the U.S. Public Health Service.

Twelfth. The cultural activities working group has recommended that CODAF promote conferences, workshops, and competition in the arts in the border area, and that two pilot cultural projects be established in twin border cities. United States and Mexican authorities have already set in motion the initial steps which will lead toward the creation of a national committee in each country, and local coordinating groups in the border communities, to act as mechanisms for carrying out joint cultural programs.

Thirteenth. A CODAF-sponsored pilot project has been established for Laredo, Tex., by which five mobile trailer vans devoted to theatrical productions, recreation, educational and cultural films, history, and health services, will make

scheduled visits to neighborhood centers in and around Laredo, to rural communities in Webb County and Nuevo Laredo, Tamaulipas, across the border.

Fourteenth. A similar CODAF-supported binational project is the Calexico, Calif., community services project. This project includes a multiservice cultural unit, a vocational training electronics unit, and a mobile health services unit. As its contribution to this project, Mexico has purchased \$83,000 worth of industrial equipment for CECATI, a vocational training institute in Mexicali, Baja California, which will be made available to U.S. trainees.

Fifteenth. An adult education demonstration project, with CODAF participation, is in operation in a five-county area of Arizona. This project utilizes radio and a closed circuit mobile television unit to bring practical education courses to people in a widespread rural area.

Sixteenth. CODAF has sponsored two annual "Border Beauty and Friendship Days," which were held on May 18, 1968, and April 19, 1969. The results of these events have been so encouraging that both United States and Mexican officials have concluded that border beautification efforts should be carried out on a continuing basis and that the day shall be established as an annual ceremony.

Mr. President, these successes readily demonstrate why we who live on the border feel that CODAF has more than lived up to the original hopes expressed for it by the Presidents of the two countries. CODAF has chalked up a sizable list of tangible accomplishments that have been set in operation and are not merely plans on the drawing board. And, perhaps the most singular characteristic of the CODAF-sponsored projects is that they are models which have planted the seeds for cooperative action to grow all along the border for years and years into the future.

In view of all this, it is obvious that it would be sheer folly to permit CODAF to disappear. But, this is exactly what will happen unless Congress acts without further delay to approve legislation which authorizes the continued financing of the U.S. section of the Commission.

The difficulty is that, because of a sweeping prohibition passed by Congress just last year, the U.S. section has lost its authority to be appropriated funds. This newly effective restriction is set forth in section 510 of Public Law 90-479, which bars the financing of executive commissions unless they possess some form of authorizing legislation.

Thus, while the U.S. section has been funded in the past by contributions from its member agencies, this manner of financing is now foreclosed. Further, as a result of the broad limitation enacted in the last session, the congressional appropriations committees have been powerless to act on the 1970 funding for CODAF.

Without prompt action by Congress on a bill to provide some form of specific legislative foundation for the U.S. section, it simply will have to fold up. We cannot allow this to happen.

The failure to authorize funds for the

September 24, 1969

continued U.S. participation in CODAF would be to renege on the commitment made to the peoples living on the border, would leave a large number of problems standing unsettled without any joint forum to place them before, and would amount to a serious diplomatic affront with traumatic effects on U.S. efforts to achieve a better understanding and improvement of the cordial relations between the two border nations.

The solution is clear. There is no question that this matter deserves our immediate attention. We must act, and act now, on legislation to keep CODAF alive.

#### JEWISH HIGH HOLY DAYS AND THE SOVIET UNION

**Mr. DODD.** Mr. President, millions of Jewish faith have observed their holy days and New Year, but a significant portion of those people have been forcibly isolated from their co-religionists. I should like to make the following observations on the plight of Jews in the Soviet Union.

An ominous silence from hostile quarters has fallen, like a leaden weight, on the historic Jewish High Holy Days just concluded with the commemoration of Yom Kippur, the Day of Atonement.

It was a day that also reminded Jew and non-Jew alike in this Nation of the mammoth burdens and ignominies heaped on the largest Jewish community outside the United States, that in the Soviet Union.

I was particularly reminded of that plight by a great Hebrew liturgical work sung here in the Capital for the first time. It is called "U-Nessaneh Tokef," composed by Michael Moses Milner.

He was a victim of the Stalin purges. His music was dedicated "to our brethren in Russia."

We know of the wretched conditions of the remnants of once-flourishing Jewish communities in most Arab States. But the Day of Atonement pointed up poignantly the problems besetting Jews in the Soviet Union.

They are the only minority in the U.S.S.R. forced to carry identity cards which bear the word, "Jew," as an identifying mark. It was not very long ago, under another totalitarian regime, that Jews were compelled to so identify themselves.

That was under Hitler and there was a world outcry. But it is a muted protest that appeals to the Soviet sense of humanity to desist from this malevolent practice.

Added to this humiliation is the refusal of the Soviet authorities to permit Jews to emigrate from the U.S.S.R. to Israel. Only a few aged people are allowed to leave to be reunited with families.

But 3 million Jews are compelled to remain in the Soviet Union, forbidden to develop their old culture and not even allowed new prayerbooks.

We all have read the tragedy of Babi Yar, where Jews were slaughtered near Kiev by Nazis and hurled into a mass grave. That monstrous episode in contemporary history also has been distorted by the men who rule Russia.

And Svetlana Alliluyeva, the daughter

of Stalin, told us the other day of her own knowledge about those practitioners of brute and errant power.

It is mournful and macabre, indeed, to reflect on a savage word that has become part of the international lexicography. The word is: "pogrom," manhunt and massacre. It is a Russian word.

Without mass manhunts, a permanent pogrom is in progress in the Soviet Union. Why are voices not raised in persistent demand to let those 3 million go?

Must it only be a liturgy like Milner's heard on the Day of Atonement?

We have a great and long tradition of succoring the oppressed. Let it not be confined in this case to majestic music and clucks of indifferent sympathy.

Rather it should be a strong and vibrant call to the men in the Kremlin: Let those people go.

#### "DO IT YOURSELF" CURE FOR INFLATION

**Mr. DOLE.** Mr. President, it is a basic economic fact of life that excessive spending by the Federal Government is a major contributing factor to the devastating inflationary activity which continues to plague our Nation. It is also basic that the cure resides largely in the hands of all of us if we wish to achieve it, but to do so means denial and self-restraint.

An editorial published in the Atchison, Kans., Globe on September 17, 1969, points up some of the problems our country faces in trying to restore some semblance of financial stability to our economy. If we as a nation choose to ignore these economic facts of life, the future in this regard is not hard to predict. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### DO-IT-YOURSELF ECONOMIC SELF-EDUCATION

It is time to stop, think and act about the great problem no one can solve but ourselves.

For the last 40 years every President of the United States has faced the problem: how to do what is best for the people when the people seemingly do not know what is best for them.

Under universal suffrage good leadership requires intelligent followership which in turn requires informed citizenship.

Where are you going to lead a people who believe that deficit spending reduces the amount they must pay for government?

Where are you going to lead a people who do not know that higher incomes without higher production do nothing but increase living costs?

Where are you going to lead a people who do not know that payroll comes from the customer and that the customer is the worker who gets the payroll?

You are going to lead them into inflation and then take the blame for the high cost of living. You're damned if you do and you're damned if you don't.

Perhaps you remember the high note on which Franklin D. Roosevelt opened his administration. He said: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man who labors because they are a burden on production and can be paid only by production. Our workers may never see a tax bill, but they pay in deductions from wages and in the increased cost of what they buy."

It was the economic ignorance of the peo-

ple that drove Franklin Roosevelt away from sound money. He had to do it to retain his popularity.

Do you remember Dwight Eisenhower's futile fight to protect the purchasing power of the dollar? The people wanted it protected but were unwilling to do what had to be done.

Newly-elected John F. Kennedy appealed to the people: "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country," but most of the people, ignorant of economic consequences, still wanted things done for them.

President Nixon, and all future Presidents, will face the same problem and suffer the same discouragements unless the people understand the fallacies of increasing government spending and taxation.

For your "Do-It-Yourself" economic self-education we reprint the "Ten Pillars of Economic Wisdom" which were prepared by the American Economic Foundation:

Nothing in our material world can come from nowhere or go nowhere, nor can it be free: everything in our economic life has a source, a destination and a cost that must be paid.

Government is never a source of goods. Everything produced is produced by the people, and everything that government gives to the people, it must first take from the people.

The only valuable money that government has to spend is that money taxed or borrowed out of the people's earnings. When government decides to spend more than it has thus received, that extra unearned money is created out of thin air, through the banks, and, when spent, takes on value only by reducing the value of all money, savings and insurance.

In our modern exchange economy, all payroll and employment come from customers, and the only worthwhile job security is customer security; if there are no customers, there can be no payroll and no jobs.

Customer security can be achieved by the worker only when he cooperates with management in doing the things that win and hold customers. Job security, therefore, is a partnership problem that can be solved only in a spirit of understanding and cooperation.

Because wages are the principal cost of everything, widespread wage increases, without corresponding increase in production, simply increase the cost of everybody's living.

The greatest good for the greatest number means, in its material sense, the greatest goods for the greatest number which, in turn, means the greatest productivity per worker.

All productivity is based on three factors: 1) natural resources, whose form, place and condition are changed by the expenditure of 2) human energy (both muscular and mental), with the aid of 3) tools.

Tools are the only one of these three factors that man can increase without limit, and tools come into being in a free society only when there is a reward for the temporary self-denial that people must practice in order to channel part of their earnings away from purchases that produce immediate comfort and pleasure, and into new tools of production. Proper payment for the use of tools is essential to their creation.

The productivity of the tools—that is, the efficiency of the human energy applied in connection with their use—has always been highest in a competitive society in which the economic decisions are made by millions of progress-seeking individuals, rather than a state-planned society in which those decisions are made by a handful of all-powerful people, regardless of how well-meaning, unselfish, sincere and intelligent those people may be.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING FAILURE

**Mr. PERCY.** Mr. President, Chicago has its Robert Taylor public housing

project; St. Louis has its Pruitt-Igoe. The Christian Science Monitor for Tuesday, September 23, 1969, reports the terrifying story of Pruitt-Igoe.

Built just 15 years ago and hailed as a new concept in public housing, a way for working-class people to get better housing, Pruitt-Igoe today has the following attributes:

Eight murders in the last year.

Human excrement and urine in the elevators and stairways.

An 8-foot-high fence surrounding the buildings so that children would not destroy the improvements HUD is trying to make in the buildings.

Elevators that do not work because repairmen do not like to be shot at when they come to repair the elevators.

A woman who has not left her apartment for 3 years because she is afraid.

A mother who fears that her 8-year-old daughter will be raped every time she leaves the apartment.

Stairwells serving as havens for dope addicts and sexual perverts.

Grounds that look like a battlefield, with glass, old tires, and other junk everywhere.

Fifteen years have translated a vision of hope into fear, squalor, hopelessness.

As George Favre, the author of the article points out, "5,000 under-16 kids roam like undisciplined animals across Pruitt-Igoe's barren acres, wasting all their marvelous potential and boundless energies in self-destructive pursuits."

Yesterday the Senate passed a 2-year extension of existing Federal housing programs with some modifications. The next 15 years must record a very different story for the people who move into these dwellings.

As a people, we must alleviate human misery, both physical and emotional. We must not keep cramming people in large impersonal public housing projects to live like animals. We must go in the direction of giving people a stake in their own future, of giving them something to be proud of—to live for. This is what sections 235 and 236 of the Housing Act are designed to do. Section 235 permits lower income families to purchase homes. This is vital. A family that has equity interest in its dwelling is not going to defile it. Section 236 helps subsidize rents to enable people to get out of high rise public housing projects into better houses in other parts of the city.

Another problem in Pruitt-Igoe and other housing projects is that, historically, the Federal contribution to public housing projects has been limited to amounts required to cover debt service on the capital cost of the project, with the local authority covering other project expenses out of annual income. But with public housing projects taking in more and more welfare tenants and costs of operation rising every year, local housing authorities have been driven closer and closer to bankruptcy. There has been no money for modernization and improvement of existing facilities. The Senate recognized this problem yesterday by providing \$20 million for Federal contributions for public housing projects for modernization and rehabilitation of existing older structures. These provisions should help maintain projects in

a sound condition. It is intended that this \$20 million be used solely for modernization and to insure that all public housing projects be improved to at least meet minimum housing codes in each community.

I think the Senate moved in the right direction yesterday. I pray that it did, because if we fail again, there will be more Pruitt-Igoes in the future with their incalculable human suffering.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Story of Housing that Failed," written by George H. Favre, and published in the Christian Science Monitor.

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

#### A STORY OF HOUSING THAT FAILED

(By George H. Favre)

ST. LOUIS.—Pruitt-Igoe is a nasty word on the lips of St. Louisans. Given the address, a taxi driver comments: "You'd better have a shotgun with you." You smile a bit wryly and settle back, undisturbed because you've seen slums before.

But you haven't seen Pruitt-Igoe, a public-housing project.

You haven't seen elderly people locked behind an eight-foot steel-mesh fence to keep children from terrorizing them.

Where ordinary slum children are dispersed throughout many city blocks of dilapidated housing, here in Pruitt-Igoe upward of 5,000 children are crowded onto 57 acres of what is supposed to be renewed urban territory. Lawlessness, disorder, vandalism, sexual aggression, perversion, and criminal activity—running the gamut from rape to murder—are rampant. The situation, against the backdrop of a modern housing development, presents raging irony.

#### STAIRWELL LITTERED

You have walked through filth in ancient, rotting tenements before. But this is your first time to walk up the stairwell of a building just 15 years new, picking your way past garbage, beer cans, and human excrement.

You hear the story of a woman who has refused to leave her apartment for three years because she is terrified of being molested.

You hear how 27 high-rise buildings have been without elevator service for weeks because repairmen refuse to be targets for teenage snipers, firing guns out of upper-story windows.

You hear a young mother tell you of the terror she feels every time her eight-year-old daughter goes out the apartment door, fearing that she may be raped in the stairwell.

You hear a young father tell with despair how he hasn't been able to get a job that earns enough money so he can move himself and his young family out—a man who had moved into Pruitt-Igoe originally to get out of a slum and into "a decent place to live."

Visiting Pruitt-Igoe is an unnerving experience, because Pruitt-Igoe is part of what is supposed to be a national housing program to eliminate the social problems of urban living. Instead, Pruitt-Igoe has become a breeding place for human degradation.

Why did it happen? What went wrong?

When Pruitt-Igoe opened its doors in 1954, it got rave reviews in prestigious architectural magazines and even an award for its economy and design. But public housing 15 years ago was a different world than it is today. Both the name and the rules of the game have changed. Pruitt-Igoe simply could not change with the times.

Pruitt-Igoe was originally designed for working-class people of low income, who wanted to move into good housing and keep

it that way. In its early years, only 10 percent of Pruitt-Igoe's tenants were on welfare. The Housing and Redevelopment Authority could and did screen out its tenants.

Pruitt-Igoe was also originally a segregated project. Igoe was for white tenants. Pruitt was for blacks.

#### INTEGRATION ORDERED

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, however, went to court and got a ruling that the project must be integrated. About the same time, the welfare agencies in St. Louis brought pressure to bear on the Housing and Redevelopment Authority to take in more welfare cases.

The results were not long in coming. White families moved out, poor blacks moved in. Then the better-off black families began to move out after the whites.

Today some two-thirds of Pruitt-Igoe's 11,000 residents are on welfare.

Pruitt-Igoe's award-winning design is a parody, for the project is an architectural failure. Not in terms of appearances, but in terms of design for living. Most of the apartments have one or two bedrooms, but some of its tenant families have 10, 12, 14, or more children.

Elevators, when they run, do not stop at every floor. In what was then hailed as a triumph of economic design, the elevators were made to stop at the first, fourth, seventh, and 11th floors only, opening onto a gallery running the length of the building.

#### STAIRWAYS TO APARTMENTS

This meant that apartments open onto narrow, dark stairwells instead of into hallways.

Children burn, rip, and jam, the elevators at Pruitt-Igoe. Then they shoot at the repairmen. That is why 27 buildings were without elevator service the day this correspondent visited the project.

Even when the elevators work, little children seldom have time when nature calls to make it to an elevator, wait for its arrival, get off at a between-floors galley, and run-do-not-walk to the apartment. Result: Elevators and stairwells serve as toilets.

The galleries themselves have become havens for dope addicts and pushers, alcoholics, sexual perverts, and other social parasites, although they are not necessarily residents. This accounts for the terror that law-abiding residents experience simply in leaving their apartments to get outdoors or to return.

Project manager James Bell refuses to blame outsiders. "Ninety-nine percent of the problems live right here," he says.

#### GUNS FLASH AT DUSK

There are no police or guards at Pruitt-Igoe. Asked why not, Mr. Bell shrugs and says: "You have to come out here sometime at dusk and see the gun flashes—it's like a battlefield. Last Thursday we had a boy killed—that's the eighth fatal shooting in the year I've been here. We have offered the residents guards, but they'll be shot at, too. Cops can't do today what they could do 10 years ago. If they take in a kid for doing something wrong, there's no place to send him—the jails are all full. So they take him around the corner, let him go with a warning, and he comes back a hero to the other kids."

I did not go back to see Pruitt-Igoe at dusk. I had no desire to be a target of one of those gun flashes. But even when the sun shines brightly, Pruitt-Igoe has something of the air of a battlefield. Scraps of paper, millions of glass splinters, old rubber tires, and other junk clutter the paths and the ragged worn grass.

#### BUILDINGS MODERNIZED

The Housing and Redevelopment Authority has not totally given up on Pruitt-Igoe. It currently is engaged in a program of modernizing the buildings. Two or three already

are completed, and seven more are in the process of reconstruction.

During the renovation period, eight-foot steel-mesh fences are erected around the building, to keep children from getting in and undoing what has been done. When the job is complete, the fence is left up, and sturdy locks are put on the gates. The new residents are carefully screened. Families with severe social problems are not brought in. And each tenant is given a key to unlock the gate each time he goes in or out.

I asked Mr. Bell what would happen to the problem families.

Without much conviction, he noted that the project has reactivated its community-services office in an attempt to reach problem families with social workers. Some interested tenants also act as home-service visitors, keeping an ear to the ground to inform management of problems that it otherwise may miss.

#### REEVALUATION URGED

How, Mr. Bell was asked, do you turn a situation like this around and make success out of a failure?

"We have got to reevaluate our priorities," he replied. "We've got to make a national decision if we're actually going to house the poor, minority-group people. And if we are, then we're going to have to realize it will cost money. We can't do it without a massive reorientation program."

Reorientation, to Mr. Bell, means work with the children to keep them constructively occupied and out of mischief. He would like a gym with an organized athletic program, to give the youngsters incentive to compete for excellence. He also wants a program to work with the mothers. "The mothers have to be changed," he says.

Can you change the situation, I asked when you have so many problem families crowded together in one project? Won't you have to disperse them around the city?

"St. Louis is now 14,000 units short," Mr. Bell sighed. "There are no dispersal plans in sight. So we're forced to work with this situation." He is not optimistic. "You're defeated from the start," he admits.

#### MORE THAN MONEY ASKED

So long as so many "problem families" are jammed into a single area, Mr. Bell's defeatism is probably justified. Money alone cannot resolve a situation where antisocial attitudes feed upon themselves and multiply. But even if money were an answer, the present federal public housing formula makes it nearly impossible for a city such as St. Louis to get funds for the type of solutions proposed by Mr. Bell.

The public-housing formula, set by the federal government, ensures the kind of problems Pruitt-Igoe has run into, says Irvin Dagen, executive director of the Land Clearance and Housing Authority in St. Louis. The federal government builds the project and the local housing authority operates it. But the formula says that rents must cover the cost of operation (except in housing for the elderly).

"What is happening," Mr. Dagen says, "is that operating costs are going up, but family incomes stay about the same. And the gap is increasing."

#### FORMULA REVISION PROPOSED

He would revise the formula to have apartment rents pay for total costs of operation, including capital improvements and replacements to keep the property up to standard. This is more expensive to do with poor families; and since their income is fixed, the difference between rents and costs would have to be made up by federal rent supplements to tenants.

But even if this were done, Mr. Dagen does not believe it would resolve Pruitt-Igoe's problems, especially the design problem. "You will still have the high-rise building with its built-in social problems," he says.

The combination of rising operational costs, large numbers of welfare tenants, and the requirement that rental income pay for operating costs has driven the housing authority right up to the line of bankruptcy.

So the problem of public housing in St. Louis comes back always to dollars.

But dollars are only one measure of failure. Far more significant, far more dangerous far more tragic is the human failure—those 5,000 under-16 kids that roam like undisciplined animals across Pruitt-Igoe's barren acres, wasting all their marvelous potential and boundless energies in self-destructive pursuits.

#### TENNESSEE WALKING HORSE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week, I presided over hearings before the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment, on S. 2543, my bill designed to put an end to the cruel and unnecessary practice of "soring" the feet of Tennessee walking horses in order to exaggerate their natural gait.

Through the use of chains and irritating ointments, the pastern area of a horse's foot is deliberately made sore and raw so that when the foot is placed upon the ground, the extreme pain that results causes the horse to bring his leg up and out in the desired gait.

This gait can be achieved through careful training. Soring, however, is a quick and cheap way to obtain it. That soring is a barbaric practice does not seem to bother those who do it.

Recently it has been brought to my attention that efforts will be made to cripple this proposed legislation. Opponents will argue that soring is much less prevalent than before and that the State of Tennessee intends to crack down on the practice.

Unfortunately, this is the same tired argument that we have heard before. Somehow, soring has always been on the decrease, yet it never seems to stop. Testimony before the subcommittee by John Seigenthaler, editor of the Nashville Tennessean, which has just concluded a major series on the Tennessee walking horse industry, revealed that the practice is widespread and as extensive as ever.

That Tennessee intends to put a stop to soring is most commendable. But it is already a misdemeanor under Tennessee law and carries a relatively stiff penalty. State law has simply been unable to stop soring. The record makes this very evident. The practice, moreover, extends far beyond Tennessee lines, so even were Tennessee to put an end to soring, the practice would continue elsewhere. The conclusion is obvious. Only Federal law, such as S. 2543, can effectively stop soring. Talk of any other approach is exactly that—just words. The hearings showed that neither the industry nor the States can terminate the practice. Federal legislation is, therefore, required.

This is recognized by a number of Californians who own and train Tennessee walking horses. I ask unanimous consent that their telegrams in support of S. 2543 be printed in the RECORD. Further, I ask unanimous consent that an Evening Star editorial of September 19, entitled "Training Stable Atrocities," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items

were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS,  
Senate Commerce Commission,  
Washington, D.C.:

There are numerous persons and customers among my acquaintances, who are definitely in favor of Senate Bill S-2543.

My interest is prompted principally because my stable is engaged in training Walking Horses.

I sincerely hope that you will use all your influence toward the passage of this bill.

MERCEDES MURPHY,  
Centaur Stables.

Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS,  
Senate Commerce Commission,  
Washington, D.C.:

As a life long trainer of Walking Horses it is one of my greatest desires to see the passage of Senate Bill S-2543.

For at least twenty years I have seen the soring problem becoming worse, and I hope that the passage of this bill will eliminate it. You have much support in this matter.

OWEN DANIELS.

LOMITA, CALIF.

Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

As owners and exhibitors of Tennessee walking horses, we wish to support S. 2543. We are totally opposed to soring horses.

Mr. & Mrs. FRANK L. TREZISE.

We would like to add our support to your efforts toward passage of Senate bill 2543. As owners of several Tennessee Walking Horses which we like to show, we are appalled at some of the cruelty to horses that we personally have observed. It is our sincere desire to see it stopped, and we appreciate all efforts to that end. Please pass the strongest measures possible.

Drs. C. J. and JOY E. CARTER.

#### TRAINING STABLE ATROCITIES

A Senate Commerce Subcommittee has opened hearings on a bill sponsored by Senator Joseph Tydings, Democrat of Maryland, to halt the practice of maiming Tennessee walking horses to force them to prance with a prize-winning gait.

This odious practice, which apparently has become widespread over the past 20 years despite the condemnation of breeders and exhibitors, involves the "soring" of the horse's front pasterns, the area between hoof and ankle.

This is achieved by methods which would do credit to the most sadistic of Nazi concentration camp commanders: The pasterns are pricked with nails, chafed with chains or blistered with chemicals to the point where it is agony for the horse to put his weight on his front legs.

The "sored" area is covered during exhibitions with a three-inch "boot" which serves the double purpose of concealing the wounds inflicted upon the horse and increasing the animal's agony.

Senator Tydings' bill—Republican Congressman G. William Whitehurst of Virginia has a similar bill in the House—would impose penalties of six months in prison and/or a \$500 fine for shipping such horses across state lines, or for exhibiting them in shows.

In response to a challenge by Senator Tydings to halt the exhibition of horses showing signs of past ill-treatment at the Washington International Horse Show, which opens here October 27, show president Austin Kiplinger has promised his full support.

Man's inhumanity to man is sickening enough. His inhumanity is particularly despicable when dumb animals are victimized for the sake of a blue ribbon.

In our view, owners or trainers guilty of such heinous acts should be barred for life

from working with or owning an animal of any sort.

#### LIBERTY LOBBY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, in my Senate speech supporting the Otepka nomination on June 24, 1969, I made the point that the support for the Otepka nomination did not originate with and was not confined to the John Birch Society and the Liberty Lobby, as Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson had charged in repeated columns. I noted that Otepka had very widespread support from editors and columnists and veterans' organizations and political organizations around the country.

On the basis of information which has come to me from a source which I have in the past always found reliable, I also said that according to my information, the Liberty Lobby had taken the stand that Otepka should hold out for complete reinstatement in his previous position, because they prefer to have him as a martyr to the cause.

I have been informed by spokesmen for Liberty Lobby that this last statement was an inaccurate presentation of their position, and that Liberty Lobby was, in fact, among the many organizations that supported Otepka's nomination to the Subversive Activities Control Board.

While I have many political differences with Liberty Lobby, this in no way affects the overriding requirement for fairness and accuracy in all public statements.

On the basis of Liberty Lobby's assurance that they supported the Otepka appointment to SACB, I wish to correct this one statement which I made about them in my speech of June 24.

#### SENATOR GOODELL

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, last week, several Senators joined to observe the completion of a year's service in the Senate by the junior Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL). Unfortunately, I was unable to join them in observing this anniversary, since at the time I was with the Governor of my State in Springfield for the announcement of the appointment of our new colleague, Senator RALPH SMITH.

Senator GOODELL also came to the Senate through an appointment after compiling a distinguished career as a legislator and as a party leader in the House of Representatives. In his first year in the Senate, Senator GOODELL has continued to compile an excellent legislative record. Along with his senior colleague from New York, Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Senator GOODELL has most ably represented the interests of all the people of New York.

I am particularly pleased to serve with Senator GOODELL on the Committee on Banking and Currency. There, I supported his move to replace the present inflexible cost limits on public housing with more realistic and flexible limits—thus helping to ease the national crisis in public housing construction. Senator GOODELL also successfully urged our committee to remove the unrealistically low limits imposed on the rehabilitation

loan program. Under these limits, tenants were barred from receiving the benefits of rehabilitation because the landlord's income was not low enough to qualify.

In all respects, Senator GOODELL has performed the demanding tasks of a U.S. Senator with the energy and conscience that has earned him the full respect of his colleagues in the Senate.

#### STATUES OF KING KAMEHAMEHA AND FATHER DAMIEN—DEDICATION CEREMONIES IN THE CAPITOL

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the State of Hawaii was proud and happy to present to the people of the United States on April 15 the statues of two of its finest men, King Kamehameha the Great and Father Joseph De Veuster Damien.

The following chronicle of the presentation of the statues to the National Statuary Hall collection bears testimony to the significance of Hawaii's choice of the two men whose images now grace our Capitol.

In a time when our Nation's success is measured by its gross national product and an individual's by his bank account, and in a time when extraordinary efforts are being exerted by mankind to make life easier and more comfortable, the people of Hawaii selected a man who turned his back on comfort and ease and chose instead a life of toil, sacrifice, and dedication—a life which he knew could only end with the contraction of a dreadful disease. He was, perhaps, one of mankind's last saints.

Also, in a time when governments across the world are experiencing the trauma and chaos brought by the conscious effort of some to disrupt and disunify, the State of Hawaii selected a man who will long be remembered for his establishment of law and order based on justice and for the unification of his people. It is noteworthy that in the time of King Kamehameha, unlike today, a person could walk the trails and byways, climb mountain tops, and rest in the valleys safe in the knowledge that he would not be molested or assaulted. Kamehameha is hailed by some for his physical and military prowess, but I believe the people of Hawaii chose to honor him for his leadership in the development of a stable government from which the State of Hawaii did eventually grow.

With their gift, the people of Hawaii set before the eyes of the Nation two men who placed spiritual and moral values before others.

Mr. President, at this time it is my great pleasure and honor to share with my colleagues and the American people the complete proceedings of the State of Hawaii's dedication ceremonies for its statues of King Kamehameha the Great and Father Damien. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the transcript of the ceremony.

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

#### TRANSCRIPT OF DEDICATION CEREMONIES FOR THE STATUES OF FATHER DAMIEN AND KING KAMEHAMEHA I

Senator INOUYE. Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

This is a very special day and a very proud day for the people of Hawaii because on this day we honor two of our greatest men, Father Damien of Molokai and King Kamehameha the Great, our first ruler.

May I now call upon the Armed Services Color Guard and the U.S. Marine Corps Band. Please rise. (The Colors are presented by the Armed Services Color Guard, while the Marine Corps Band plays the National Emblem and the Star Spangled Banner.)

I am pleased to call upon The Very Reverend Henry Systermans, Superior General of the Sacred Hearts Order, to invoke the Divine blessings.

Reverend Systerman: Merciful Father, whose love for men embraces all peoples, especially the most abandoned, you sent your Beloved Son into the world to bring good news to the poor; to proclaim to the captives, release; to give sight to the blind; and to set at liberty the oppressed. Fill our hearts with the same compassionate love that filled the Heart of your Son and the heart of Father Damien, whose memory we honor today. Like him, help us to see Christ in the most miserable of our brothers. Give us some of that generous love which enabled him to sacrifice his own interest for the needs of the lepers of Molokai. May this statue, which so vividly depicts the extent to which his love carried him, be an example to all who will stand before it in years to come. Father grant us this favor, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much. Please be seated. Before proceeding with the program, I would like to introduce to you some of our very special guests. First, the members of the Hawaii Congressional Delegation: the senior Senator from the State of Hawaii, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong and Mrs. Fong, United States Representative Spark Matsunaga and Mrs. Matsunaga, United States Representative Patsy Mink and Mr. Mink. We are also deeply honored to have with us the very distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Honorable John McCormack. And I note the very distinguished Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable Gerald Ford. And we have with us special representatives of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii. May I present to you our Senators from the State of Hawaii: the Honorable John Lanham, the Honorable William Fernandes, the Honorable James Clark, the Honorable John Ushijima, and the Honorable Wadsworth Yee. Representing the Hawaii State House of Representatives we have the Honorable Akoni Pule, the Honorable Pedro de la Cruz, the Honorable Anthony Baptiste, Jr., the Honorable Andrew Poepoe, and the Honorable Bernaldo Bicoy. We are also pleased to have with us Brother Dornbos, who is the principal of Damien High School in Honolulu and representatives of several Hawaiian organizations.

At this time, it is my pleasure to present to you the Chairman of the Statuary Hall Commission of the State of Hawaii, Mr. Louis A. Lopez. Mr. Lopez:

Mr. LOPEZ. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests and Friends of Hawaii:

It is my great privilege to welcome you to these solemn ceremonies. I welcome you on behalf of the members of the Hawaii Statuary Hall Commission and the hundreds of people who have worked so diligently to make this historic occasion a reality. I also welcome you on behalf of the hundreds and thousands of Hawaii citizens who on this day, are mindful of what is occurring here at this hour and who in their hearts wish to give to their Nation a supreme gift. We feel that this gift is more than just two bronze statues. It is a gift of supreme achievement of our Hawaiian culture and society. It is a gift of the memory and inspirational lives of a Polynesian king and a saintly missionary priest. It is their lives of devoted service that we offer as monuments to our Nation. It is the

September 24, 1969

best gift, perhaps, that Hawaii can offer to a Nation that is deserving of the best.

SENATOR INOUE. Thank you very much. And now, I am very pleased to present to you a very special friend, Mrs. Gladys Brandt, who is the Coordinator of Secondary Education and Principal of Kamehameha Schools for Girls. Mrs. Brandt.

Mrs. BRANDT. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

In the century and a half, since the passing of Hawaii's great King Kamehameha I, countless ceremonies have been held to honor and respect him. His name graces schools, highways, avenues and buildings. Each year the entire state observes a holiday on June 11, to celebrate Kamehameha Day.

Today, by placing his statue in the Nation's Capitol, Hawaii in fitting manner declares its admiration and aloha for her illustrious hero King.

To the Hawaiian people, King Kamehameha I is the greatest of all Hawaiians. He was born about 1758 of royal blood, and at a time when the islands were unknown to the outside world. Tutored in the traditions of his people, and trained in the skills of a young warrior, he was eminently prepared to rule. The United States had just emerged as a nation when Kamehameha consolidated the major islands into his kingdom.

There was strength in that great warrior-statesman; strength of body—for he was tall and powerful, active in warfare and skilled in the use of weapons. And with that strength there was a courage of a high order.

But not merely courage distinguished him. He was also pre-eminent for his self-denial and his regard for the welfare of his people which he put before his personal claims. He loved peace more than war and the good of his country more than many victories.

It is said that he was the first Hawaiian to have had an adequate appreciation of the advantages to be gained from friendly relations with foreigners. His was a great era of integration—for crossing racial lines he took into his court men of other cultures and those of wisdom he chose for his cabinet. The sure foundation of his power lay in his self-control and his deference to the opinions of experienced men.

He dignified labor by working side by side with his people. As a conservationist, he placed high priority in protecting and developing his country's human and natural resources.

As a lawgiver, he tempered justice with mercy. Few rulers before the dawn of the 19th century were respectful enough of human rights to proclaim and enforce a decree like Kamehameha's Law of the Splintered Paddle, guaranteeing protection to the weak and the helpless.

In evaluating the reasons for Kamehameha's lasting fame, historians are agreed that his greatness was based upon the simple basic concept of right and wrong. Justice was the premise that pervaded his life and thinking. And as one historian put it, "had he been cast in Europe instead of the remotest islands of the sea—he would have figured as one of the most conspicuous figures in history; no king in history ever knew better how to rule his people." And quoting the eminent 19th century historian, James Jackson Jarves, "In form and stature a herculean savage; in abilities and character, a man that any country might have been proud to acknowledge as her son."—King Kamehameha the Great.

#### PROCESSION

We present now a brief Hawaiian processional ritual—heralding the presence of Hawaiian royalty.

First is heard the sound of the conch shell—known as the *pu-kani* and blown in the days of the kings by young men of noble birth. The vibrant tones of the shell trumpet, that might be heard at a distance of two miles, commanded the respect of all persons along the path of the advancing party.

Then comes the bearer of the tabu stick—called *pu-lo'u-lo'u*. This sacred symbol of respect and of tabu was fashioned from a staff made from the hard wood of the ka-ula tree and topped with a ball of white tapa or bark cloth. In a procession, the *pu-lo'u-lo'u* was carried before the Chief by a young man of the same royal lineage. The tabu symbol was firmly planted upright in front of the Chief's compound to signify that it was royal and sacred ground.

Then come the plumed staffs of state—the *Kahili*—the sacred emblem and embellishment of Hawaiian royalty which accompanied royal personages on all occasions. Towering to some 30 feet in height, the Kahili were usually carried in pairs and held aloft by stalwart chiefs.

In early times the staffs or poles were decorated with ivory, bone and tortoise shell, and the cylinders of feathers of native birds were distinctly patterned to be immediately recognizable, even from afar, as to the rank and family lineage of the approaching chief or chiefess.

And, importantly, within the processional ritual was a *chanter*—for in old Hawaii, as in early Greece and Rome, special events and important personages were the subjects of oratory. This form of expression in Polynesia was the chant—and through it, history and tradition were perpetuated.

Our chanter for this occasion was chosen for his skill in this highly specialized art. Too, his ancestry may be traced back to the family of the king whom we are honoring.

We present Mr. Ka'upena Wong, descendant of Chiefess Ka-ha-'opu-lani, foster-mother of Kamehameha I. Mr. Wong, of Hawaiian, Chinese and Caucasian ancestry, will chant to Kamehameha, extolling the virtues and distinction of the King. (Mr. Wong's chant.)

#### KAMEHAMEHA

O Kamehameha lani kā'e'u ke āno kapu,  
O Ka haku manawa kapu all'i kēnā  
He ali'i no ka mu'o lani kapu o lono,  
None ke kapu, ka wela,  
Ka hāhāna I holo I luna o ka wēkiu  
Lū ka ōla'i, naue ka honua,  
'Oni ke kai, nauēu ka moku,  
'Ike I ka lepa kao a kalani,  
Ha'awi wale mai o kahēkili  
Ua lilo ia kalani nui keku'lāpo-iwa I ke kapu,  
'Anapu wela ma ka honua mea,  
He inoa  
He inoa no kalani Kamehameha kapu all'i  
he inoa  
He inoa no Kamehameha

(English translation of Mr. Wong's chant)

#### KAMEHAMEHA

Kamehameha is chief, for him the profound  
Kapu,  
A lord indeed, a sacred chief is he,  
A chief from the highest and most sacred  
realm of Lono.  
His is the Kapu, the fiery Kapu,  
The burning Kapu that reaches the very  
heavens,  
The earth quakes, it is set a-tremble.  
The sea is disturbed, the land is moved,  
And these are the signs of a mighty warrior.  
A gift was given by the chief, Kahekili  
It was carried away by the high chiefess  
Keku'lāpolwa, the sacred one.  
A flash of hot light over the earth is he.  
We chant his praise.  
We praise the king, Kamehameha, a noble  
chief, we praise him  
We honor the name Kamehameha

Representing the youth of Hawaii, and having the high honor in unveiling the Statue of our King are two students from the Kamehameha Schools in Honolulu. These schools were named for Kamehameha the Great and are supported by the income from the royal lands of this dynasty of rulers.

Miss Catherine Cavaco, senior, is president of the Student Government of the high school division. She is of Hawaiian, Portuguese, English and Scotch ancestry.

Cadet Colonel Daniel Hano, also a senior, is of Hawaiian and English ancestry. He is the Brigade Commander of the Kamehameha School for Boys.

This statue soon to be viewed shows the king dressed in the garments which a Hawaiian ruler wore both for the affairs of state and on the battlefield.

A full-length cloak was made especially for Kamehameha by his subjects who tied some half-million small yellow feathers to a net of fine mesh. For eight generations, according to tradition, the bird-catchers searched the rain-forests for the seventy-thousand mamo birds needed to provide the feathers for his royal robe. After the men plucked a few feathers from each bird they released them that they might be free to grow more.

The helmet, also of rare feathers affixed to a sturdy frame of wickerwork and cordage, was the symbol of a ruler and a protection to his head in the Hawaiian hand-to-hand warfare.

Partly covering his simple loincloth and extending up and over his left shoulder, is a sash-like cordon. This feather-covered symbol of royalty was made for one of Kamehameha's ancestors, King Liloa, who ruled the island of Hawaii, according to oral history, about the years 1455 to 1485.

Sandals, worn in Hawaii only when travelers were on rough terrain, were braided or twisted from tough plant fibers. The sandals portrayed here are not copies from Kahehameha's time but suggest the general type of footwear used by him.

The King carries a hardwood spear as a symbol of his ability to defend himself. In the statue, Kamehameha is holding the spear in his left hand as a reminder that he brought wars to an end. His right hand is extended with palm open in a gesture of friendliness—the Hawaiian spirit of aloha. (The statue of King Kamehameha I is unveiled while the Kamehameha School choir sings "Hole Waimea.")

SENATOR INOUE. Thank you very, very much. Before proceeding, I would like to recognize the presence of the two official representatives of the City and County of Honolulu, Councilman Herman Wedemeyer and Councilman Brian Casey. A few moments ago the very distinguished Minority Leader of the United States Senate had to leave the ceremonies because of pressing business. Mr. Dirksen has sent his greetings to the people of Hawaii. I would like to also present at this time a very distinguished American, the Majority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, the Honorable Carl Albert.

The statue of Kamehameha that we see here in this Rotunda is a duplicate of one of the most photographed objects in the State of Hawaii.

Originally created by the American sculptor Thomas Gould in 1880 the Kamehameha statue was unveiled in 1883 and has remained in view in front of the State Judiciary Building. The duplicate that we have here today was produced by a team of Mr. Clarence P. Curtis and Mr. Ortho Fairbanks of Salt Lake City. Mr. Curtis provided the technical knowledge and supervised the taking of the molds and Mr. Fairbanks coordinated the endeavor with the Commission and supervised the foundry work. I would like to recognize Mr. Curtis and Mr. Fairbanks at this time.

It is now my great honor to present to you, His Excellency, the Bishop of Honolulu, the Most Reverend John J. Scanlan. Bishop Scanlan.

BISHOP SCANLAN. Senator Inouye, Distinguished Guests of Church and State:

It is with mingled feelings of pride and joy, the humility in a sense of unworthiness that we of the 50th State join this distinguished assemblage here today to honor Hawaii and one of its most distinguished adopted sons. It is my particular privilege to represent over 200,000 people of Hawaii who profess the same faith which Father

Damien professed. But, today, we join with all the citizens of the State of every creed and ethnic background and express for them our collective joy and pride that Hawaii Nei has this opportunity to place here in our Nation's Capitol the statue of one who exemplified in such an utterly convincing way the spirit of aloha. Humility takes possession of all of us on this unique occasion, for we know that the motivation which inspired the supreme involvement of Damien in the suffering and despair of Kalawao springs only from a greatness of soul which most of us do not have. We are humble in this proud moment for Hawaii because we have realized that the dedication, the unflagging courage, and unwavering love of God and man which Damien showed are the possession only of a few. His statue will stand here among the statues of the great men who each in his own way contributed to the building of America. This humble but sturdy farmer's son from the plains of Flanders takes his place here because his contribution to Hawaii, to America, and to all mankind was the greatest. They are faith, hope and love, but the greatest of these is love. Many of the great men who are represented here were men of faith and courage, hope and persistence. Damien also was a man of faith and hope, but especially of love. His claim to greatness is not in the wisdom which discovered that ordered administration and proper balance of authority given to us by the founding fathers of our Republic, and neither is it to be found in the daring adventure which opened up new areas in our broad land, nor in the military victories which preserved our union and our liberties. Damien's greatness is in the heroic example of Christian living which he gave to all. Life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness are human rights. For Damien, life meant losing it for the sake of Him who said "he who loses his life for my sake shall find it." Liberty meant shutting himself up in his prison at the foot of the cliffs of Molokai for 16 years that he and his charges might possess the liberty of the sons of God. His pursuit of happiness was paced for eternity for his faith told him the age old experience of mankind—that the human spirit is not satisfied with even the best that this life can offer. Accordingly, he witnessed to his Divine Master in an extraordinary degree.

Where there was suffering, he brought alleviation. Where there was despair, he brought hope. Where there was ugliness and deformity of flesh, he brought beauty of soul. In that place where it was said that there was no law of God or man he showed what could be gained by humble obedience to a Heavenly Father. Where the living death of leprosy made life meaningless and without purpose, he showed man the vision of life eternal and the privileged way of the suffering pilgrim.

It was written of him by one who did not share his faith but who saw and admired his greatness of soul that he stepped into battle under the eyes of God to succor the afflicted and console the dying. He himself was afflicted in his turn and died upon the field of honor. Greater love than this no one has.

Our country today is blessed beyond measure with the material things made possible by the intelligence, energy and industry of our people, but we need greater values for the human spirit. We need the understanding of and the dedication to the values to which the life of Damien gives witness. We need the recognition of the value of human life itself from its very beginnings. We need the recognition of the dignity of the human person, even the poorest and most wretched. We need a humanity possessed of a pity which is not condescending and of a humility which thinks of duties before rights. We need that attitude of mind which leads to a faithful personal adherence to the blue-

print for living given to us in The Ten Commandments and in the Sermon on the Mount. It includes a sense of justice. It means an intelligent patriotism. It contains the simple virtues indicated by home and altar which make for true greatness. These values are not merely ideals to be admired. It is not true that they are beyond the reach of men. They must be reached and put into practice if the civilization which was built on them is to be saved. Damien, human in his short temper and impatience, human in his stubbornness, but with the mark of divinity in his loving concern for the most wretched of men and women, speaks now from this seat of civil government of the Nation and the word he utters is the Hawaiian word which expresses what is noblest and greatest in us all—it is Aloha.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much Bishop Scanlan.

In a selection process involving sixty-six leading sculptors of this world, the Statuary Hall Commission in the State of Hawaii selected a most distinguished modernist of international renown. It is now my pleasure to present to you, the artist, Miss Marisol Escobar. Miss Escobar.

Marisol ESCOBAR. I am very grateful that I was asked to do the sculpture of Father Damien because I am very touched by his story. From all the photographs they sent me from Hawaii, I chose very naturally the most interesting one to me, which was the one taken when he was older. He had more character when he had fulfilled himself.

I did the sculpture exactly the same size in wood because I always work in wood and it was the way in which Father Damien liked to work also. The final work was cast in bronze in Italy. I did the sculpture simply, directly, and sturdily because I thought these must be the qualities that Father Damien had in order to devote himself so completely to the lepers. I hope that the people of Hawaii will come to find it a fitting tribute to this Holy Man.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much Miss Escobar.

To unveil the statue of Father Damien of Molokai is the Reverend Father Ernest Claes of the Sacred Hearts Order. Father Claes is related to Father Damien. He was baptized with the name of Damien. And Father Claes joined the same congregation and followed his illustrious relative in serving the people of Hawaii spiritually. He has been a priest in Hawaii for the past 39 years, and is deeply respected and loved by all of us in Hawaii. May I now call upon Father Claes to unveil the statue of his relative, Father Damien.

(The statue of Father Joseph Damien De Veuster is unveiled while the Kamehameha School Choir sings)

Senator INOUYE. May I draw your attention to the pedestal of the statue of Father Damien. You will note that emblazoned is the jeweled insignia of the Order of the Knight Commander of the Royal Order of King Kalakaua. This medal was bestowed on Father Damien by Her Royal Highness, the Princess Regent Liliuokalani. The word *keola* means "the salvation", "the life", or "the health." We believe this is most fitting considering the service provided by Father Damien to the people of Hawaii.

And now representing His Majesty King Baudouin of Belgium is His Excellency Baron Louis Scheyven, the Ambassador of Belgium. It is my pleasure and my great honor to present to you, His Excellency Baron Scheyven.

Ambassador SCHEYVEN. Mr. Speaker, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

Here is a message I received from His Majesty The King of the Belgians.

"In this shrine of the American Nations, where each State of the Union has the privilege to be represented by the effigy of two of its most eminent sons, the State of Hawaii has chosen, in association with the memory of one of its Kings, my countryman Joseph

De Veuster, Father Damien, known to the entire world for his exemplary life and death at Molokai.

This moving tribute deeply touches Belgium. In the name of my country, I wish to express gratitude to our American friends and especially to the people of Hawaii, who, more than thirty years ago—in 1935—agreed that Father Damien's remains leave the isles where he devoted so many years of his life and come to rest forever in his native land.

Today, by paying exceptional homage and acknowledging as one of their own the man who, some time ago, gave them his life, the Hawaiian people remind us that fraternity and love among mankind know no boundary.

With this noble idea, we associate ourselves with all our heart."

BAUDOUIN,  
*King of the Belgians.*

And now, Ladies and Gentlemen, I wish to tell you a very moving story about Damien's boyhood. When he was a schoolboy, every night before he would fall asleep, his dear mother would read to him a chapter from a large book she would lay across her knees. The title of that book was the Lives of the Holy Martyrs and Hermits. And so, one day, the young Damien, when he was on his way home from school, decided to turn his companions and himself into hermits. They stopped in the woods to practice silence, recollection and prayer until nightfall. He was only 8 years old at the time. Now, later on, when Damien made up his mind to embrace the religious life, (he was then 18 years old), he sent a letter to his parents which has been kept: "If God calls me, I must obey. In refusing to answer the Divine call I should be exposing myself to eternal ruin. As for you, the good God could punish you severely for your opposition to me following His will."

And I want to remind some of you and to tell all of you that when it was possible, in 1936, for the body of Father Damien to come back by boat to Belgium, the King and the Cardinal, as well as the American Ambassador and all authorities were present in Antwerp and joined in the people in greeting Father Damien's body as it touched Belgian soil there. According to reports and articles I read upon their publication the day after the ceremonies, the estimates were that more than one million Belgians had made the effort to follow the long cortege from Antwerp to Tremeloo where Damien's body was put to rest. And so he came home a hero.

Ladies and Gentlemen, we have here two heroes who were sent to this shrine by that wonderful State of Hawaii. One is a King and one is a leper. And as a Belgian hero enters the Capitol this evening, I want to thank the authorities concerned for having made that entry of a countryman of mine possible. If ever any of you would be tired as I am, sometimes, of our own smallness, I strongly believe that we could and should find inspiration in the example given to the world by Father Damien—his devotion, his offering his life, a lesson which should benefit all of us. Ladies and Gentlemen, let us through his example, have enough strength, vigor and enthusiasm. Let us aim for higher things!

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much Mr. Ambassador.

The Very Reverend Henry Systermans, the Superior General of the Sacred Hearts Order, has traveled from Rome to be at these ceremonies honoring one of the most celebrated members of his congregation. I wish to now call upon Father Systermans for his response.

Father SYSTERMANS. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Ladies and Gentlemen:

On behalf of the missionary family to which Father Damien belonged, I wish to thank the State of Hawaii for inviting me here today. This is indeed a great day for the people of Hawaii and for all men of good will all over the world who recognize the value of personal dedication and heroism.

Father Damien De Veuster followed faithfully in the footsteps of his Master—the blind saw, the lame walked, lepers were cleansed, the good news was proclaimed. Most faithfully he realized the word and the example of his Master. "This is the greatest love a man can show," said Christ, "that he should lay down his life for his friends."

When Father Damien arrived at the settlement of Molokai in 1873, he was confronted with the state of affairs which would have terrified the bravest of men. Nearly 800 lepers were there huddled together in poverty and dirt, old and young, those who had pain and those who were heartily attacked by the disease, in horrifying promiscuity. A living graveyard indeed. He set to work at once, knowing quite well what was before him. Everything was to be done and he did everything. He took care of bodies and souls, for both needed his help. He provided food, clothing, medicine, water supplies and clean cottages for his unfortunate flock. When they died he often carried out their bodies in his hands or made their crude caskets with his own hands. He encouraged the stronger to do some gardening so that flowers might embellish the settlement. He organized processions and festivals with a band and songs just to help his lepers turn their thoughts from misery. Gradually, a new spirit came to life in the settlement. These most rejected of outcasts found hope and confidence again because they came to know that there was a man among them who cared. A man who loved them, a man of great heart, a man who had given up everything to go and live with them and to die as one of them. Since he had a strong faith in God, who is all love, he was moved by a simple and great passion—love for God and love for his fellow men. His love expressed itself not merely in empty wishes and thin words, but in deeds. He did not content himself with the assertion that his God was a God of love. He shouted it by his actions. He was a simple man. He speaks to us. We all can love our fellow men with simple and practical deeds. If I might borrow words from the Inaugural Address of President Nixon: "We need the energies of our people enlisted not only in grand enterprises but more importantly in those small, splendid efforts. With these we today can build a great cathedral of the spirit. Each of us raising it one stone at a time as he reaches out to his neighbor, helping, daring, doing." Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much, Father Systermans.

His Holiness Pope Paul VI is represented this afternoon by the Apostolic Delegate to the United States, His Excellency the Apostolic Delegate and Archbishop of Tarsus, Luigi Raimondi. May I present to you His Excellency.

LUIGI RAIMONDI. Mr. Senator, Mr. Speaker of the House, Bishop Scanlan, Distinguished Guests and Ladies and Gentlemen:

All through history, geniuses, prophets and saints have been held in high honor as the guiding lights of humanity. By their life and work, they became standard-bearers in the march of humanity. As a poet said: "God has stamped in them a greater mark of Himself."

Saints, in particular, are the embodiment of the highest moral ideals of perfection and spiritual nobility. By their selflessness and luminous example, they have been a constant inspiration and encouragement. In a true sense, they have helped to maintain faith in the basic goodness and worth of human existence.

In the endless variety of their manifestations, those who emerged as saintly figures have one characteristic in common: love in its purest essence. Love expresses itself in giving. Saints have not only given of themselves, but have given themselves in the service of God and their brethren.

Father Damien is certainly in that cate-

gory of extraordinary men. He lived his life of love and dedication in a most heroic yet unassuming and self-effacing way. He lived for others: those whose needs were greatest. He brought to the lepers of Molokai the riches of his spirit, the warmth of Christian charity. He radiated light and hope where there were suffering, darkness, and despair. His life has been an epopea of love. His work reveals the greatness of his soul. His example will shine forever.

We who have gathered in this august place, the center and heart of the Nation which honors his memory, as well as that of another outstanding figure in Hawaiian history, are conscious of the greatness of this humble missionary from Belgium and of the debt of gratitude that we owe him.

We congratulate the officials of the State of Hawaii for entrusting the memory of these two distinctive figures to the admiration and gratitude of the American people. Enshrined, so to speak, in the Nation's Capitol, they will be revered along with many others who have contributed to the greatness of the country and who will continue to inspire new generations.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much Your Excellency.

Because of a problem of great gravity and urgency the Governor of the State of Hawaii has found it impossible to be here with us this afternoon to personally present to the people of the United States these two statues. Representing the Governor of the State of Hawaii, the Honorable John A. Burns, I am pleased to present to you, Mr. Myron Thompson, his Administrative Director. Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your Excellencies, Distinguished Guests, Sons and Daughters and Friends of Hawaii Nei. Aloha e na hoaloha, na makamaka, a me na o iwi o Hawaii, aloha ka kou.

(Greetings to acquaintances and friends with whom I break bread with and native Hawaiians—aloha to all of us.)

It is with profound pride and great joy that I present to our Nation today, a gift from the people of the sovereign State of Hawaii, in the form of bronze statues of the two most distinguished citizens in the history of our Islands. King Kamehameha the Great and Father Damien have been judged eminently worthy of a place of honor among the greatest heroes of the United States. They will henceforth be enshrined with George Washington, Ethan Allen, Henry Clay, Andrew Jackson, Robert E. Lee, Pere Marquette, Sequoia, Father Serra, Daniel Webster, Brigham Young and scores of other great men and women whose lives formed the foundation stones of America.

Two aspects of our gift giving are especially to be noted on this historic occasion. First, these statues represent the will and free choice of all the people of Hawaii, expressed through the democratic process which has distinguished our great Nation from those in which the power structure is controlled neither by the people nor for the people. By a non-violent petition, by public dialogue, by extensive legislative debate and by the full, free, and fair votes of the people's elected representatives, the citizens of Hawaii chose their two greatest heroes from a long list of illustrious candidates, and they selected in the same open manner the artist and craftsmen who were to prepare the statues that you see here.

The second aspect of our gift giving is found in the two remarkable men selected as the noblest in the unique history of our Pacific Island State. We have chosen a Polynesian High Chief. We now rightly call him King because of his extraordinary achievement in uniting for the first time communities of all the Hawaiian Islands under his supreme dominion. He was a king by reason of his birth among the "Ali'i" or ruling chiefs of his home island. He was king by right of con-

test and conquest. He was king by reason of his natural courage, his ability to govern well, and his exceptional native wisdom. This wisdom was tested to the utmost when profound changes shook the native Hawaiian social structure after the unprecedented arrival of the strange white men from unknown lands in the ships of Captain James Cook. It was shortly after Cook's arrival that Kamehameha met another naval explorer, the Russian Von Kotzebue. He was so deeply impressed by Kamehameha that he wrote later and I quote: "He (Kamehameha) deserves to have a monument erected to him." This prophetic suggestion has been fulfilled. Kamehameha should not be caricatured by those who have not studied their history well. He was a king, and kingly, and is most worthy of national esteem. Hawaii has also chosen a European missionary for the honors of national Statuary Hall. Father Damien was a deeply humble, worker-priest of outstanding virtue. He freely chose as his way of life, for 16 years, the role of servant to the most neglected of the Hawaiian people—the suffering victims of leprosy on the Island of Molokai. He was a revolutionary who upset the comfortable lives of many in his time by his total and unwavering commitment to suffering humanity. His compassionate courage is legendary.

His name is revered around the globe. His greatness is in his simplicity and his spirit of poverty. This simplicity is aptly summed up in these few words from one of his letters to the Board of Health of the Kingdom of Hawaii, and I quote: "Kindness to all, charity to the needy, a sympathizing hand to the suffering and the dying." The millions who will visit these statues this year and in the future will see in the Marisol statue of Father Damien the face of a leper and the face of a saint. It was Robert Louis Stevenson who prophesized that 100 years after Damien's death the process of his canonization would be under way. Today, on this memorable occasion of the 80th Anniversary of Damien's death, that prophecy has been fulfilled. Not only is Damien revered by his own Church, but his memory is made even more glorious by the tribute which the State pays to him for his humanitarianism. In this we see the ideal relationship of Church and State, neither union nor separation, but cooperation and mutual respect.

In King Kamehameha and Father Damien of Hawaii, heroes representative of the cultures of both the Atlantic and Pacific hemispheres, we have symbols of the basic unity and oneness of a human family. Our State of Hawaii, observing this year the 10th anniversary of statehood, recognizes that it is blessed among the communities of the globe in the harmony which characterizes our society and its resultant broader vision of that world. In the legacies left to us by such heroes as Kamehameha and Damien, we find the inspiration to believe that harmony among all races of mankind is God's clear mandate to all of us. In their lives we have found the examples of wisdom, of courage, respect and service to our fellow men which transcend all narrow boundaries of national origin, creed and color of skin.

Today, we give to the United States and to the world, in these statues, in the lives of Kamehameha and Damien, evidence of the truth of our Hawaii State Motto—Ua-mau-ke-ea-o-ka-aina-i-ka-pono. The life of the land is perpetuated by righteousness. Aloha pumehana kakou—May love abide with us all. Thank you.

Senator INOUYE. Thank you very much.

The statues of Father Damien of Molokai and Kamehameha the Great will be accepted in behalf of the people of the United States of America by a great American, the Majority Leader of the United States Senate and the senior Senator of the State of Montana, the Honorable Mike Mansfield. Senator Mansfield.

**Senator MANSFIELD.** Mr. Ambassador, Mr. Speaker, Your Excellencies, Very Reverend, Reverend Fathers, Beloved Sisters, Members of the Clergy, Our Fellow Citizens, My Fellow Americans:

The men and women portrayed in stone in the Capitol are an inspiration to the countless Americans from all parts of our Nation who visit this building and this hall each year. In this honored group, we now add the sculptured figures of the two remarkable men who have been chosen for inclusion by the people of Hawaii what it is today—a great contributor to the strength and progress of the Union. It is fitting that the men who are honored today were a European and an indigenous Hawaiian. In their different national and racial origins, they mirror the melting pot as it has existed so uniquely in the 50th State. In Hawaii, races not only lived in harmony with races but more and more and in a higher sense they lived without race. The man responsible for the political integration of the Hawaiian Islands, King Kamehameha, and the man who exemplified the humanitarian spirit that characterizes Hawaii, the Belgian Father Damien, richly deserve the honor we pay them on this occasion.

Kamehameha the Great was determined in war and just in peace. He brought the warring islands for the first time under one roof. He reigned with wisdom, understanding well the needs and aspirations of his peoples. He led them to higher levels of economic well being and political stability by encouraging agriculture, industry, and efficient administration, and by the act of seeking a friendship with foreigners to whom he extended Hawaii's traditional aloha, a heartfelt warmth of welcome to the stranger. For his acts of enlightened leadership, Kamehameha the First is remembered with respect and admiration throughout the State. And Kamehameha is the first monarch to be honored in these hallowed halls of democracy. The supreme Christian charity of Father Damien will remain a profound inspiration to Hawaiians, all Americans, and to all mankind.

Dedicated to the service of God and to all of God's children, Father Damien devoted his life to the victims of leprosy on the Island of Molokai. There compassion and tireless self sacrifice brought physical comfort and spiritual hope to the afflicted and dying. For his reward, he accepted with religious ecstasy his own death as a leper.

These were great men of a great State. I am honored to accept on behalf of the Capitol, therefore, the sculptured likeness of King Kamehameha the Great and Father Damien, who will henceforth represent the State of Hawaii in Statuary Hall.

**Senator INOUYE.** Thank you very much, Senator Mansfield.

And as we close this happy ceremony, I wish to recognize the young ladies and gentlemen who participated in these ceremonies. All of these young girls and boys are students of a school named after the Great Kamehameha. Opened in 1887, in fulfillment of a will of Princess Bernice Pauahi Bishop, the great granddaughter of the King, Kamehameha School presently has an enrollment of over 3,000 students.

May we give a special applause for our young friends here.

And now may I call upon the Apostolic Delegate to the United States for the benediction. Will you all rise?

**Luigi RAIMONDI.** Merciful and eternal God, we are grateful for all the great things we have been witnessing today in commemorating the memory of great men who have aided their country and given a great example to follow to each one of us, gathered here from many countries, many races. We recognize your paternity. We recognize that we are your children. And we strive to see in each here one of our neighbors the reflection of your protections, particularly your

love. We ask you to help us to live in paternal harmony, understanding and love. AMEN.

**Senator INOUYE.** The anthem of the State of Hawaii, Hawaii Ponoi, was the anthem of the Kingdom of Hawaii, the Republic of Hawaii, the Territory of Hawaii, and now the State of Hawaii. May I call upon the United States Marine Band for Hawaii Ponoi.

To close this ceremony, the people of Hawaii would wish to present to you our most sacred word. A word that means hello and goodbye, but most importantly it means I love you. To all of you—Aloha. (The United States Marine Corps Band plays Hawaii Ponoi)

#### THE PHILADELPHIA PLAN

**Mr. BROOKE,** Mr. President, a most significant decision was taken yesterday by the Nixon administration—one which deserves our recognition and support.

For many weeks a controversy has swirled about the so-called Philadelphia plan, an equal opportunity compliance program first put into effect in the Philadelphia area in July of this year. Under this program, designed to implement a 1965 Executive order requiring equal employment opportunity in Federal contracts and federally assisted construction work, six construction trades were required to set specific goals for the utilization of minority employees, and to make every good faith effort to reach those goals.

Yesterday, in a joint press conference, the Secretary of Labor and the Attorney General disposed, once and for all, of the specious argument that the plan was illegal because it violated a provision of the Civil Rights Act declaring that race and national origin could not be used as a factor in employment. According to the Attorney General:

There is no inherent inconsistency between a requirement that each qualified employee and applicant be individually treated without regard to race, and a requirement that an employer make every good faith effort to achieve a certain range of minority employment.

In his statement, the Attorney General recognized the fact that the construction unions are often in a position not only of discriminating against minority workers, but of dominating the hiring system as well. Such practices make it nearly impossible for qualified blacks to obtain jobs on federally financed construction projects. An attempt to overcome such practices could never be "discriminatory."

Secretary Shultz has fought long and hard for equal opportunity in the construction trades. Yesterday's joint announcement represents a major victory. It is a victory for the minority workers, who will now find their employment opportunities expanded as the Philadelphia plan, or modifications thereof, take root in other cities. It is a victory for the Department of Labor, and for the administration, which has recognized the roots of discontent among America's poor and its minorities and has taken steps to answer this discontent. But most of all, it represents a victory for America itself, for it is the beginning of a clear commitment to equal employment opportunity, and with employment can come the essentials of a better life for all Americans.

CUTBACKS IN HEALTH RESEARCH FORCES WRECKING THE MORALE OF HEALTH SCIENTISTS WORKING FOR GOVERNMENT

**Mr. YARBOROUGH.** Mr. President, we in the Senate have an obligation to the people of this country to protest vigorously the callous cutbacks the administration is making in the Nation's health programs.

The announcement that there will be a cutback this year in research in many chronic diseases and a termination of much of this research next year is one of the most heartless pronouncements the administration could make.

This administration is saying that to save a few dollars it is willing to put an end to research which might find a prevention or a cure to many of the killing and disabling diseases. A cutback in research in heart disease and cancer means countless more Americans are being condemned to suffer from these chronic, killing diseases.

**Dr. R. Lee Clark,** medical director of the University of Texas M. D. Anderson Hospital in Houston, has stated publicly that most major forms of cancer could be conquered by the year 1976 if we would but make it a national goal. But the announced cutbacks in research indicate this administration has given the lives of those now suffering from cancer and the future victims of cancer a low priority in its evaluation of what is and what is not important.

Instead of having a cure for cancer by 1976, the 200th birthday of our Nation, this administration appears to be on a course of dragging out a war in Southeast Asia until 1976.

While the American people are undoubtedly perplexed by this administration's decision to say, virtually, it is giving up on trying to solve the great health needs of America, the professionals in the health field are dismayed and disheartened.

Mike Causey, writing in the Washington Post Wednesday, September 24, 1969, reports of the breakdown of morale among the scientists in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as cutbacks are ordered in research programs. Many of these talented people, Mr. Causey says, have decided to leave the Government because of the cutbacks. It will take years to reassemble these research teams once they have been broken up.

It is imperative that this Nation examine its priorities, find where its emphasis is, decide if it is going to forsake the health and welfare of the people and downgrade the quality of life in these United States and do all of this to provide the billions of dollars spent on a war in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Causey be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HEW CUTS HIT MORALE OF ITS SCIENTISTS (By Mike Causey)

Program cuts—real and rumored—have hurt employee morale at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The result is that many young scientists in the agency

are looking for other jobs, and long-time program managers have been advised to find some place (other than where they are) they might be useful.

The National Institutes of Health has been told to make a 5 per cent cut in continuation grants—on-going research programs, and a 10 per cent reduction in new grants. This will mean cutbacks in research in such chronic disease programs as heart, cancer, diabetes, and other major medical programs. Officials say the cutbacks won't affect research in nutrition, smoking and health and kidney disease.

But some of the best talent, young and old, at NIH are involved in the heart and cancer programs. Many of the young scientists—doing their military hitch with the Public Health Service—have already decided to leave the government because of the program cutbacks.

Administrative workers are also worried about the phasedown of many programs in which they've spent entire careers. Rumor has it that their budgets will be cut up to 20 per cent, and officials can't promise them that entire programs won't be shut down.

HEW itself is in a bind because Congress still hasn't approved its budget. It is operating at last year's financial level, unsure what Congress will finally vote it and what further cuts the Administration will make because of increased Medicare and Medicaid costs.

Officials who would like to head off mass resignations (that is failure to re-enlist) within the Public Health Service can't promise the young doctors and other scientists that programs they've been working on will be continued. Many of them have decided to go with universities—which will operate off federal grants—or to go into private practice where the money, if not their hearts, is to be found.

Another result of the cuts is that scientific and professional people—at PHS and the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Services—have been shunted to administrative and clerical duties.

#### THE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATION BILL

**MR. GOLDWATER.** Mr. President, during the recent debate on the military authorization bill, I commented several times that the debate was more than due and that it could result in good for the country. Now that it is over, I have some doubts about my observations, for in reviewing the RECORD I find practically nothing mentioned by those opposed to the committee bill as to the threat involved. Nor did I hear or read anything about the defense of our people, our country, our freedom.

The current issue of Air Force Space Digest contains an editorial, written by John Loosbrock, which gets pretty close to the feelings I have on reviewing those eight long weeks. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE NEW POLITICIANS AND THE DEFENSE BUDGET

(By John F. Loosbrock)

In a remarkably illuminating analysis, beginning on page 46 of this issue, Senior Editor Claude Witze points out that the military budget debate has been turned into a symbolic exercise by those who would like to slash military expenditures drastically. The announced aim is to reduce tensions between the US and USSR on the one hand and, on the other hand, to spend more public money on the economic and social problems that

plague the nation. For lack of a better term, we will borrow, and abbreviate, Herman Kahn's term for this group. Kahn calls them, collectively, the New Political Milieu. We will refer to them as the New Politicians, since the old words, liberal and conservative, simply do not apply in this context.

What has happened, in our judgment, is that the New Politicians have been so blinded by their own oratorical smokepots that they overlook several important considerations that are pertinent to their own arguments and desires.

Central to any discussion of national security policy must be a threat. No one wants a military establishment for its own sake, least of all those who serve in it, whether willingly or unwillingly. There is no nobility in make-work or featherbedding. The New Politicians either ignore the threat or downgrade it. There is room for argument here, of course, but the solid evidence of any mellowing of Communist aggressive aims is hard to find. We do not find it in Vietnam, nor at the Paris peace table, nor in Czechoslovakia.

The New Politicians say the national security budget is swollen. It is big, for a fact. No one calls \$80 billion a piddling sum. But the New Politicians like to ignore what has made it so big. Certainly it is not the advanced, high technology, strategic systems such as ABM, or AMSA, or improved missiles. We are spending less, relatively and absolutely, on strategic systems now than we were back in 1959.

No, it is Vietnam that has swollen the military budget. And how did this come about? Vietnam is a direct outgrowth of theories of limited war gleefully seized on by the New Politicians of 1961 as an alternative to John Foster Dulles' "massive retaliation." The new strategy became coupled with the self-proclaimed ability of former Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, a New Politician in his own right, to manage the war without straining either the pocketbooks or the patience of the American people. It was this combination that inflated the defense budget to its present size.

The New Politicians say that the money can be better spent in solving such problems as poverty, housing, education, and transportation. This view, however desirable, is fallacious on several counts. As Ernest W. Lefever, a serious advocate of arms control, disarmament, and peace, has indicated, such savings are more likely to go into tax reductions than into domestic welfare programs. Indeed, Lefever points out the high inconsistency of the New Politicians when they ignore the historical truth that social programs have fared much better in times of large military budgets than in times of reduced defense spending.

In their criticisms of cost overruns and other examples of so-called military inefficiency, the New Politicians imply that there is little waste, inefficiency, or corruption in nonmilitary government spending. But there has been no Billie Sol Estes in the defense business since World War II. And what about the welfare check scandals in New York when the money wound up in Swiss bank accounts instead of in the pockets of the poor? Or a recent case in Washington where both the government and the Ford Foundation were swindled out of hundreds of thousands of dollars that were supposed to be used to make artisans out of welfare recipients? Simply because the defense budget is so big, the military has evolved a procurement expertise unmatched elsewhere in the government. In truth, the socially oriented agencies would not know how to spend \$40 billion wisely if they got it tomorrow. They probably would have to turn to the professional military managers, just as NASA did with Apollo.

Most important of all, and a point completely ignored by the New Politicians, is the beneficial impact of high technological risk programs on the economy that must feed,

clothe, house, and educate our people. Advanced technology projects demand machinery that will run hotter, use fuel more efficiently, weigh less, perform more functions with greater precision, last longer, and be more reliable.

All this is what generates new ideas, new concepts, new products, and more jobs. Drying up the well of technological demand is self-defeating, as the New Politicians will discover if they have their way. Direct expenditures for welfare are necessary, but they are a quick fix that does not solve the basic problem. If technology does not move ahead simultaneously, the quick fix becomes a permanent panacea, and eventually there is no money to finance it.

Ask the British.

#### BRITON WARNS OF RUSSIA'S BROTHERLY GUISE

**MR. DODD.** Mr. President, recently the Washington Post published an article by Hugh Seton-Watson, one of the top British authorities on Soviet affairs, which I found remarkable for its bluntness and for its commonsense quality. It was all the more remarkable because we live in an era when blinkered thinking has become fashionable and hard truths about the Soviet Union are frowned upon as unfashionable.

Professor Seton-Watson took particular issue with those Western "pseudo-liberals," as he calls them, who believe that the United States and the Soviet Union "are converging," or are growing more and more alike, and who, accordingly, believe that the world will be a more attractive place if we accept its division into two vast spheres of influence, one Soviet, the other American.

Says Professor Seton-Watson:

Enthusiasts for this noble vision will hardly be deterred by mere evidence. Soviet spokesmen addressing their own public invariably repudiate spheres-of-influence and convergence theories and insist on the complete impossibility of "ideological coexistence" between the "bourgeois" and "socialist" worlds. The essence of the sin of the Czech and Slovak Communists, from which they had to be saved by the invasion of half a million troops, was that they believed in ideological coexistence.

Professor Seton-Watson points out that the general tone of the Soviet press in recent months suggests that the bigots and fundamentalists have gained control, and that this is not likely to make for more peaceful policies. He raises the possibility of a Soviet invasion of Rumania, pointing out that the consequences of such an invasion would be unpredictable. He said:

Particularly serious would be the danger of fighting spilling over into Yugoslavia. If Russian armies entered Slovenia, with both Austria and Italy in immediate danger, absolutely nothing can be predicted. The willingness of the NATO powers to put up with almost any degree of provocation is not in doubt. Unfortunately, such willingness is no guarantee against disaster.

I invite attention, in particular to the following paragraphs which I have excerpted from Professor Seton-Watson's article:

Today, everyone in Central Europe sees that the fundamental fact is Russian exploitation, and that this exploitation is utterly odious, a force not of progress but of impoverishment and oppression.

Central Europe is explosive today because

it is oppressed. This oppression is not an "internal matter" to which the Western powers can be indifferent. On the contrary, it is the decisive factor for or against long-term peace in Europe, for or against the long-term survival of the Western European nations. As long as this oppression lasts, there cannot be a peaceful coexistence of American and Soviet spheres in Europe. If United States foreign policy does not recognize this, it will fail, and its failure will involve our common ruin.

The United States will not be able to achieve a durable relationship with the Soviet Union in the world as a whole until it can convince the Soviet leaders that oppression of the people of Central Europe and threats to the people of the Balkans are fraught with mortal danger, no less to themselves than to their victims. It may take a long time to convince them of this, but that does not remove the duty to persevere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of Professor Seton-Watson's article, entitled "Briton Warns of Russia's Brotherly Guise," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### BRITON WARNS OF RUSSIA'S BROTHERLY GUISE

(By Hugh Seton-Watson<sup>1</sup>)

Recent events in Czechoslovakia inevitably recall those of 30 years ago. From a new Munich in August, 1968, we have moved on to a new Protectorate in August, 1969. Or perhaps a better parallel is with Vichy.

The men who now rule in Prague are mostly good Czechs or Slovaks trying to save their country, as the men who ruled in Vichy in 1940 were good Frenchmen trying to save France. Four years later power had passed to French traitors and torturers in the service of the occupying power. Whether this will happen in Czechoslovakia, no one can tell.

Their past record shows Svoboda and Husak to be morally stronger men than Petain and Laval. France's conquerors from 1940 to 1944 were fighting a world war, whereas the Soviet Union in 1969 is at peace.

Whether the Russians whom Brezhnev appoints as his gauleiters will be more humane than Heydrich remains to be seen. The last months have seen a depressing increase of the pressure on Husak to repudiate his people, and already some of the traitors and torturers of the 1950s are offering themselves for new service.

#### BENEVOLENT LOOK-ALIKES

Meanwhile, to a certain type of Western pseudoliberal, pseudo-scientific mind, the division of the world into two vast spheres of influence remains attractive. Western Europe, Latin America and Japan would fall into the American sphere, Eastern Europe into the Soviet. Hard bargaining would decide the lines of demarcation in the Middle East and Southern Asia, and with mutual goodwill, there could even be agreement about such awkward enclaves as Berlin and Cuba.

As this type of mind sees the world, the United States and the Soviet Union are two potentially benevolent giants whose social, cultural and even political systems are growing more and more alike. Their modern-minded statesmen can offer the world peace and material progress as the leaders of nation states, whether old or new, cannot.

If they stand together, they can keep the lesser breeds—conceited French, effete British, restive Czechs, barbarous Chinese and

the like—in their place. Under their protective shield, big business and big Communist bureaucracy can march forward together to a scientific paradise of computers and gobledygook.

Enthusiasts for this noble vision will hardly be deterred by mere evidence. Soviet spokesmen addressing their own public invariably repudiate spheres-of-influence and convergence theories and insist on the complete impossibility of "ideological coexistence" between the "bourgeois" and "socialist" worlds. The essence of the sin of the Czech and Slovak Communists, from which they had to be saved by the invasion of half a million troops, was that they believed in ideological coexistence.

Certainly the Soviet leaders insist on retaining their empire in Eastern Europe (which, of course, is not an empire, or a sphere of influence, but a socialist community of fraternal nations), but there is no question of their recognizing an American empire anywhere else. Our enthusiasts remain unconvinced.

What 200,000 Communist Party officials, from Brezhnev down to the secretaries of party branches in factories or collective farms, tell their subjects is all camouflage. The real views of the Soviet leaders are what some nice guy from the Soviet delegation at the U.N. said over a quiet drink or what an itinerant Midwestern scientist heard from some friendly academician in Novosibirsk.

#### WHEN SPHERES CRUMBLE

There is another type of evidence for which our enthusiasts have even greater contempt—the evidence of history. This shows that spheres of influence can work when the peoples allocated to a protecting power either genuinely accept its protection or are terrorized into submission, but that they break down when neither of these conditions applies.

For example, in 1878, the wisdom of Bismarck, the greatest statesman of the world of that time, allocated Serbia to the Austrian sphere and Bulgaria to the Russian. Neither nation was terrorized, but neither was content. Within a few years, each looked to the protector of its neighbor—the Serbs to Russia and the Bulgarians to Austria.

Far from consolidating Austro-Russian cooperation, the division of the Balkans into spheres of influence inflamed Austro-Russian hostility. The failure to consider the feelings of the peoples themselves in 1878 was a major cause of the world war which began in 1914.

Today, the Russians are hated in every country of Eastern Europe except possibly Bulgaria, but at the same time the people, especially the young, are not frightened as they were in Stalin's time. On the other hand, the Americans are hated in Latin America and increasingly resented in Western Europe, and certainly in neither region do they inspire much fear. The truth is that neither of the protecting powers is willingly accepted, and neither is the object of an effectively paralyzing fear.

Today, Europe is one of the most explosive parts of the world. This is especially true of Central Europe. The abject regime of Gomulka, subservient not only to Russia but to the Red Prussia of Ulbricht, enjoys widespread contempt. It is true that, since the student demonstrations of March, 1968, the Poles have been quiet. It would be unwise to take this at its face value.

The tragic history of Poland since the 18th century partitions has a strangely cyclical character. Patriotic insurrection is crushed, heroics are discredited and a period of "realistic" cooperation with the conquerors follows. But this too fails as the conqueror proves incapable of generosity, and cooperation in its turn is discredited, a new generation grows up which did not experience the last tragedy and a new insurrection occurs.

History never repeats itself in detail, whether as tragedy or as farce, but there

are patterns which tend to recur. Poland in 1969 is a very uncertain and dangerous country.

#### A TRANSFERRED CONTEMPT

In Czechoslovakia, the predominant feeling is hatred and contempt for the Russians, something quite new in the history of the Czech and Slovak peoples. Indeed, their attitude may be roughly compared to their parents' attitude to the Germans in 1939, before the Nazis had begun their rule of terror.

The Czechs and Slovaks are not likely to provoke their occupiers, but it remains to be seen whether provocation will come from the Russian side in the form of mass arrests, deportations, show trials and the like. There is already ominous talk of preparations to victimize those who organized passive resistance in August, 1968. The effect of such action on a new generation which does not remember the humiliations of 1938 and 1948 is unpredictable.

As for the Hungarians, they too remain quiet, and their rulers are without doubt more humane and intelligent than those of their northern neighbors. However, the hatred and contempt of Hungarians, Communist or not, for the Russians lies close beneath the surface of political life. Finally, the potentially explosive character of Eastern Germany is too well known to need elaboration.

In the Balkan states, the internal situation is more stable, and the main danger comes from outside. It is, of course, true that there are social, political and national dissents in both Rumania and Yugoslavia, but it is also true that both governments can count on widespread patriotic support. Bulgaria, the only remaining example of the Slav version of *Niebelungentreue*, appears undisturbed by internal stresses; appearances may or may not be deceptive.

The Rumanian government has hitherto shown a remarkable combination of firmness and prudence. Ceausescu insists on Rumania's sovereignty but avoids provoking the Russians. It does not follow, however, that his statesmanship will save his country.

If Rumania were invaded, and if its army were to resist at least for some days, the consequences are unpredictable. Particularly serious would be the danger of fighting spilling over into Yugoslavia. If Russian armies entered Slovenia, with both Austria and Italy in immediate danger, absolutely nothing can be predicted.

The willingness of the NATO powers to put up with almost any degree of provocation is not in doubt. Unfortunately, such willingness is no guarantee against disaster.

In 1945, Central Europe was crushed and exhausted, but it was also full of utopian longings and hopes. The Russians then behaved brutally, but there were still many Central Europeans who believed that they were liberators, and that Russian misbehavior was a temporary price to be paid for the lasting benefits of socialism.

Today, everyone in Central Europe sees that the fundamental fact is Russian exploitation, and that this exploitation is utterly odious, a force not of progress but of impoverishment and oppression. The Russians do not admit this to themselves.

They know that in 20 years, seven out of the eight states of the region have rebelled against them in one form or another. This hostility cannot be due to any fault of theirs: "as is well known," Soviet policy is based on pure disinterested love of peace, on fraternal love and on unselfish aid to the socialist brothers.

The source of the hostility must be external; it is an infection from the West, especially from West Germany. Western observers are often puzzled by the fact that Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik* aroused more frenzied hostility in Moscow than Adenauer's rigidity.

The explanation is simple. Translated

<sup>1</sup> Professor of Russian history at the School of Slavonic and East European Studies of the University of London, Seton-Watson is the author of many books on Eastern European and international politics. His article is reprinted from Interplay magazine.

from Communist double-talk, the revanchism and aggression of the Bonn government means the potential dissolving effect on Germany's eastern neighbors of friendly relations with a free and prosperous Germany. Western Germany represents to the Soviet leaders today exactly the same kind of threat as free Czechoslovakia represented to Hitler's Third Reich.

#### A RUPTURED WEST

At the same time, this Western Europe which is the source of the infection of liberty is itself internally divided and weak. France nearly collapsed in May, 1968, and de Gaulle's departure leaves the future quite uncertain. In Germany, a weak leadership, subject to alternating bouts of guilt feelings and nationalism, is challenged by the "extraparliamentary opposition" of the so-called left and the noisy antics of the NPD. As for the state of Britain, it defies comment.

The Soviet leaders are themselves weak, ignorant and divided, and the struggle for succession to autocratic power, built into the Soviet political system, presses them to compete with each other in belligerent patriotic postures. The general tone of Soviet public life in recent months suggests that the bigots and the fundamentalists have gained ground in both civil and military affairs. The views of these men on the way to treat Western Europe, which they must regard as both irretrievably hostile and irreversibly decadent, are not likely to make for peaceful politics.

The basic reason why Central Europe is explosive today is that the Soviet leaders refuse to respect its people's national identities and cultural traditions, or to permit its governments to ensure justice and personal liberty to their citizens. The Central European nations are not Russians; they cannot endure the slavery with which all but a small minority of Russians have been content for the last 700 years. The demand for personal and national liberty is endemic and ineradicable.

If it is satisfied, the Central European peoples will be perfectly willing to live at peace with the Russians and to maintain formal alliances with them. The Western European governments are also perfectly willing that these alliances should exist. Russia's general supremacy as a great power in Central Europe is not at issue; what is at issue is the liberty of the Central European peoples.

Central Europe is explosive today because it is oppressed. This oppression is not an "internal matter" to which the Western powers can be indifferent. On the contrary, it is the decisive factor for or against long-term peace in Europe, for or against the long-term survival of the Western European nations. As long as this oppression lasts, there cannot be a peaceful coexistence of American and Soviet spheres in Europe. If United States foreign policy does not recognize this, it will fail, and its failure will involve our common ruin.

#### RUSSIA'S INTEREST

A European observer may perhaps be forgiven if he is skeptical about Soviet benevolence toward the United States or doubtful as to the desirability of securing Soviet diplomatic help in Vietnam at the expense of Europe and China. The American people and the Vietnamese people, North and South, have an interest in peace; the Soviet Union has no such interest. The interest of the Soviet Union is to go on fighting the United States to the last Vietcong soldier. When peace does come in Vietnam, it is as likely to be in spite of the Soviet Union as because of it.

The interest of the United States is to exploit the Chinese threat to Russia. It may be that the Chinese regime is more unpleasant than the Soviet, though this is very difficult to believe; it is certain that it is much less dangerous to the United States. China

has ancient legitimate and deep-seated grounds for resentment against the imperialism of the czars and Bolsheviks.

It may or may not be impossible for the United States to come to terms with China. It is certainly odd that the sporadic U.S.-Chinese negotiations are conducted in the capital of Russia's most abject satellite. But if America cannot at present cooperate with China, that is certainly no reason for helping Russia against China.

Obviously there must be continued contact between Washington and Moscow, and obviously agreements between the two powers are desirable in a whole series of problems and regions. But if these contacts are pursued in the belief that the present leadership of the Soviet Union is in any sense friendly, peaceful or satisfied, they will merely strengthen the bigots and the fundamentalists and harm those Russians, inside or outside the Communist Party, who are struggling for humane policies. They will thereby make the situation of the United States worse, not better; they will further undermine the shaky foundations of world peace, not strengthen them.

The United States will not be able to achieve a durable relationship with the Soviet Union in the world as a whole until it can convince the Soviet leaders that oppression of the people of Central Europe and threats to the people of the Balkans are fraught with mortal danger, no less to themselves than to their victims. It may take a long time to convince them of this, but that does not remove the duty to persevere.

Both the Soviet and American leaders would do well to remember the fate of Nicholas I, Izvolsky, William II and Hitler, and to change course before it is too late.

#### APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDENTIAL TASK FORCE ON INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the White House has now made public the names of 15 distinguished Americans who will comprise the Presidential Task Force on International Development, which has been established under the authority of my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968. This distinguished committee of private citizens, chaired by Rudolph A. Peterson, president and chief executive officer of the Bank of America, will review the aid program of the United States to provide new directions for this program as we enter the critical 1970's—the second development decade.

The naming of this panel comes at a most auspicious time. On a worldwide scale programs of developmental assistance are under review. I refer to the Jackson capacity study going forward under the auspices of the United Nations and the Pearson commission study which has been requested by the World Bank. Central to all these reviews is the fact—and this perhaps may be the key moral problem facing the world in the 1970's—that the gap is growing—the "rich" nations are growing richer while the "poor" nations are growing poorer. Aside from the problem of environmental pollution, there, perhaps, will be no greater problem facing the world in the coming decade.

The naming of the Presidential task force is auspicious for another important reason. Recent polls have clearly revealed not only that the popularity of our foreign aid programs is declining, but also that there is a great misunderstanding

among Americans regarding the scope and size of our aid programs. Few realize that our aid programs have consistently used only less than 1 percent of the goods and services that this economy produces each year—a far smaller percentage than many other industrial nations devote to their aid programs.

I congratulate the distinguished public citizens who have been appointed by the President to develop new directions in our foreign assistance programs consistent with the overall foreign policy of the United States and at the same time to mobilize and inform public opinion about the size and mission of our foreign assistance programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a press release from the White House under today's date.

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

#### WHITE HOUSE ANNOUNCEMENT

The President today announced the full membership of the Presidential Task Force on International Development, which will be chaired by Rudolph A. Peterson, President and Chief Executive Officer of the Bank of America.

When the President announced the appointment of Mr. Peterson on September 2, he directed the Task Force to focus on the underlying rationale of the United States aid effort and its relationship to over-all United States foreign policy. The President has charged the Task Force with developing a new U.S. approach to aid for the 1970's for presentation to him next February. It will hold its first meeting on September 24.

The members of the Task Force are as follows:

Earl L. Butz, Vice President and former Dean of Agriculture, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana

William J. Casey, Partner, Hall, Casey, Dickler, and Howley, Roslyn Harbor, New York

Terence Cardinal Cooke, Archbishop of New York

John E. Countryman, Chairman of the Board, Del Monte Corporation San Francisco, California

Thomas B. Curtis, Vice President and General Counsel, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, Illinois

Ralph Burton Gookin, President and Chief Executive Officer, H. J. Heinz Co., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania

William T. Gossett, Immediate Past President, American Bar Association, Bloomfield Hills, Michigan

Walter A. Haas, Jr., President, Levi Strauss & Co., San Francisco, California

Gottfried Haberler, Professor of International Trade, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

William A. Hewitt, Chairman of Board and Chief Executive Officer, Deere & Co., Moline, Illinois

Samuel P. Huntington, Professor of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Edward Mason, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Rudolph A. Peterson, Chairman, President, Bank of America, Piedmont, California

David Rockefeller, Chairman of Board, The Chase Manhattan Bank, N.A., New York City

Robert Roosa, Partner, Brown Brothers, Harriman, Harrison, New York

General Robert Wood, Retired, Staff Member, Research Analysis Corporation, Stafford, Virginia

**TRIBUTE TO MR. JOHN CROOKER,  
CHAIRMAN OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD**

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, it is not a new nor a startling observation to note the amazing growth of our air transportation industry. We have come to accept air transport superlatives quite casually in any discussion of speed, distance, travel bargains, and aircraft size.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, the agency which regulates, promotes, and encourages the development of that industry, has recently come through a period of activity and accomplishment that can also be described in superlatives.

Mr. John Crooker's resignation from the CAB becomes effective the end of this month. In the 18 months since his appointment by President Johnson, the CAB has either decided, moved near completion, or initiated some of the most significant proceedings in years. They touch on domestic and international route development, development of the regional air transportation industry and development of regulation over the growing third-level air carrier industry, the air taxis and commuter airlines.

Domestically, the Board's route program during fiscal 1969 increased benefits to the public through authorization of first single-plane service, first competitive service and new nonstop service in markets where the growth of traffic warranted it. Local service carrier routes were realigned to permit flexible scheduling and improved operating results. Major route extensions for local service carriers and grants of nonstop authority between pairs of points already served by these regional airlines also achieved effective subsidy reduction. Substitution of air taxi service for service provided by local service carriers and the Alaskan carriers in certain low-density markets was introduced where greater frequency of service would apparently result, and where the community involved supported the change. In turn, this afforded some relief to the regional and the Alaskan carriers in regard to costly equipment purchases.

Major international cases completed by the Civil Aeronautics Board in this period involved better air service to every continent on earth, and there were many large and complex domestic cases also decided.

Nor can we overlook the efforts at relieving congestion at some of the Nation's major air traffic hubs. This problem is not solved but the delays were less in the summer of 1969, contrasted with the summer of 1968.

In a look ahead at the congestion problem, Chairman Crooker spearheaded the recently completed study to identify the airports which will have the most serious congestion problems within the next 6 years.

I have enumerated but a few of the major areas of recent accomplishment by the CAB—accomplishment that has shown the mark of effective leadership by Chairman Crooker. He has done his homework—and has done it well. I want to commend and thank him for his service to our Government at this important

juncture in the development of civil aviation, I know that my colleagues join me in this expression of appreciation.

**THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT**

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, yesterday the President and Secretary of Transportation, John Volpe, gave the go-ahead signal on the supersonic transport. The President stated we would have a prototype in the air by 1972 and commercial operations by 1978. The aircraft will be able to fly at 1,700 to 1,800 miles per hour.

I am glad the President finally decided to go ahead. This gives the United States the chance to maintain its leadership in air transport, a lead we have held for half a century.

I must point out, as I did last April and again in May, that the international SST era began in December 1968 with the first flight of the Russian TU-144. This was followed in March of 1969 by the flight of the French Concorde, and in April by the British version of the Concord. These were first flights.

So, Mr. President, three supersonic transports are already in the air. It has been estimated that revenue passenger miles in the free world will increase at least sixfold between 1969 and 1990. It has been estimated that \$125 billion worth of new commercial aircraft will be required to carry this traffic. Of this expanding traffic the SST market will total about \$25 billion by 1990. It is estimated that the proposed American SST design can obtain at least \$20 billion of this \$25 billion market through the sale of at least 500 SST's, 270 of them to foreign airlines.

It is also estimated that the prospective direct employment for producing 500 SST's will involve approximately 50,000 additional people at peak production. There will be an additional 150,000 in industries connected with the production of the aircraft. The original investment by the Government of \$1.2 billion will be returned by the sale of the 300th aircraft and an additional \$1.2 billion will be paid to the Government by the time we sell the 500th airplane.

The return to our Government will be under contract by means of royalty payments, so it seems this unusual arrangement will give us a dollar profit in addition to more employment which in itself generates tax payments.

I am glad, Mr. President, that after starting, and stopping and stretching out this program, we are underway again.

**GRASSROOTS REACTION TO THE  
NIXON SOCIAL SECURITY PRO-  
POSAL**

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, we in the Congress are now awaiting the full text of President Nixon's message requesting an increase in social security benefits. The only information we now have is that it will be a call for a 10-percent across-the-board increase.

The President's preliminary comments on the proposed increase were made at a White House ceremony for the signing of other legislation, and presumably he

did not have time to provide pertinent details. It is to be hoped, however, that his forthcoming message will deal with fundamental issues related to the economic security of older Americans.

What, for example, are the Presidential intentions about minimum social security benefits? At present, a single individual can receive as little as \$55 a month under social security, or a total annual income of \$660. A 10-percent increase would raise his total income for the month by \$5.50 and for the year by \$66. Not much, and certainly not enough.

And what should be done about such matters as the earnings limitation under social security, the need for more adequate attention to widows, and other basic problems?

The Senate Special Committee on Aging, on which I serve as chairman, is now conducting hearings and studies on "The Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance." From all we have heard thus far, it has become increasingly clear that the economic security of today's elderly—and those in decades to come—is endangered by many problems, not the least of which has been our reluctance to face up to fundamental deficiencies in our social security system.

I intend to have much more to say on this subject after the President's message is sent to us. For the moment, I would like to introduce for the record two examples of grassroots reaction to the early statements made by the President on his intentions.

One is an editorial from the Trenton N.J., Times of September 19. The editorial quotes one of the findings of our committee study—that three out of 10 Americans over 65 live in poverty—and rightly describes that as a shameful record. It also concludes that the "Nixon proposal isn't good enough."

The other item is a perceptive article written by Mr. Robert Ambruster, Consumer Affairs Writer for the Sunday Record Call of Hackensack, N.J., on September 21. Mr. Ambruster shows that the budgetary problems of the elderly are not limited to central urban areas or poverty-stricken rural areas. He describes the very real problems encountered by the elderly in a suburban New Jersey county which is generally considered to be "well-off" and comfortable. But for the older residents of that area, the cost of living is a daily problem which is rapidly worsening.

I ask unanimous consent to have the two items printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Trenton (N.J.) Times, Sept. 19, 1969]

**SOCIAL SECURITY: NOT KEEPING UP**

Back in the summer of 1968, both major political parties pledged themselves to put into the Social Security system a feature which would make pensions for elderly Americans rise automatically with increases in the cost of living.

Nothing is as quickly forgettable as a plank in a party platform. But bipartisan agreement in principle, the rapid rise of living costs under inflationary pressures and the undeniable financial problems of many older Americans make it inexcusable to ignore this sensible proposition.

A U.S. Senate study reported last month that three out of 10 Americans over 65 live in poverty—a shameful record.

The speed with which living costs have been increasing has caused President Nixon to plan a more liberal rise in Social Security benefits—10 percent instead of the 7 percent he proposed earlier. But he would push his proposed effective date from February back to April 1, 1970. The highest rate thus wouldn't cost any more money in fiscal 1970; nor, by the same token, would it put any more money into the pockets of the elderly trying to cope with higher food prices, higher rents, higher taxes, higher medical costs, etc.

The Nixon proposal isn't good enough. The last increase in Social Security benefits came Feb. 1, 1968. What group of government employees or union workers goes more than two years without a raise? Before he left office last January, President Johnson recommended an increase of 13 percent, which would do more to lift pensioners out of poverty.

Politicians from the President down like to be able to approve higher Social Security benefits during an election year. That understandable desire is a formidable obstacle to approving a benefit schedule that would rise automatically with the cost of living. But in fairness to older Americans, who too often become poor after they become old, it ought to be done.

[From the Sunday Record Call, Sept. 21, 1969]

#### SENIORS SHRUG AT "RAISE"

(By Robert Armbruster)

Even with President Nixon's proposed 10 per cent increase in Social Security benefits, retired people will still find it difficult to live in affluent America.

"Ten per cent of \$80!" exclaimed Mrs. Clinton Horni, Bergenfield's welfare director. She says that in her town alone there are 142 persons over 65 with incomes of less than \$1,000.

Nishan Krikorian, president of the Ridgefield Senior Citizens, said:

"It will be very nice to get the 10 percent, but I maintain that it should be a whole lot more. Senior citizens should get at least a 50 per cent increase if we are to live a normal life."

#### NATIONAL INDEX UP

The Consumer Price Index has gone up 27 per cent nationally and 30 per cent in the New York area since January 1959, but the Social Security benefits have gone up only 20 per cent.

President Nixon's proposal if passed by Congress, would go into effect next April, thus bringing the percentage of increases in Social Security benefits in line with the percentage in the cost of living—if there is no great increase in the cost of living between now and next April.

In the years since January 1959—during which Social Security benefits have gone up 20 per cent—gross wages in the private economy have gone up 46 per cent. But, with inflation and higher taxes, even the wage earner is not that much better off than he was 10 years ago.

Bureau of Labor Statistics figures indicate that net spendable earnings after taxes and adjusted to the cost of living for a manufacturing worker with three dependents are about 12 per cent higher than 10 years ago.

#### CLIMBED FASTER

For the senior citizens, rents and property taxes have climbed much faster than have Social Security benefits.

The senior citizen receiving about \$100 a month Social Security in 1959 now receives about \$120.

At present, minimum Social Security payment is \$55 a month and the maximum is \$189.

Louis Miller, manager of the Social Security office in Hackensack, says the average monthly payment in New Jersey is \$98 and the average payment in Bergen County is \$99.

About 94,000 persons in Bergen County receive \$9.3 million in benefits every month, he said.

Edward Carr, legislative representative for the Bergen County Senior Citizens Clubs, says although the maximum is \$189, he rarely has heard of anyone getting more than \$150.

Social Security benefit increases of 6 per cent became effective in January 1959. Since then, there have been two increases—7 per cent in January 1965 and 13 per cent in February 1968—for a total of 20 per cent (in the time the cost of living nationally has gone up 27 per cent).

The amount a senior citizen receives monthly depends upon the amount he paid into Social Security over the years. It also depends upon whether a person waits until 65 to claim the benefits or whether he decides to take them between 62 and 65. The monthly benefit is lower if he chooses to receive benefits before 65.

The Social Security benefits are financed out of a special trust fund supplied by payroll taxes from both employers and employees. Each pays 4.8 per cent on the first \$7,800 of a worker's salary. Under existing legislation, the payroll tax rate will rise to 5.2 per cent Jan. 1, 1971.

**Mr. WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY.** I also ask consent to have reprinted an article which appeared in the August 20 issue of the Newark, N.J., Star-Ledger. This editorial appeared before the President's comments about a 10-percent social security increase, but its major points are highly relevant to that issue. After describing a hearing conducted by the Committee on Aging in Bergen County, the editorial describes the problems faced generally by the elderly; and it concludes with a very timely and significant commentary upon the economic security of today's elderly:

When Congress talks of priorities, as it does too often, it can no longer ignore the growing crisis among the older citizens. Unless there is swift remedial action in expanding benefits in social security, in medicare and providing a better tax break for the aged, the average American will approach old age with abject horror. The monumental problems of the elderly must be viewed by federal legislators with a greater sense of urgency than has been evident to date in Congress.

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

#### PLIGHT OF THE ELDERLY

In case anyone has forgotten (and too many have with a preoccupation and obsessive concern with other frustrating problems facing the nation), the plight of our older citizens has become even more aggravated by the persistent rise in living costs.

There was a poignant reminder in the recent hearing in Bergen County of the special Senate committee on aging, headed by Sen. Harrison A. Williams, New Jersey Democrat.

It has become an old story but a true one: The elderly are caught up in a vicious economic pincer of minimal fixed incomes (in too many cases) and inflated costs. Many have set incomes below the poverty level standards set by the federal government.

The economics of aging in this country is an area that has until recently been only superficially explored. But it is a field that will require extensive research and a radically different legislative approach to alleviate the onerous economic and social burdens of the nation's older citizens.

It is ironic that a modern society that has realized the enormous benefits of medical breakthroughs, which have dramatically prolonged human life, has not made adequate provision for the older citizens in their years

of retirement, when they need it most.

The escalating costs of the staples of human life—food, housing, clothing and medical care—have created a crisis for the elderly. A task force reported last year that more than seven million older people live in poverty or near-poverty, a figure of dismaying proportions.

Until recently, there was a quiet despair among the older citizens. But a sense of urgency, born of desperation, appears to have forged a crucible of determination that becomes increasingly evident at public hearings, such as the one conducted by Senator Williams.

It has been apparent for some time that positive steps must be taken to ease the burden of the elderly being squeezed unconsciously by inadequate income, inflation and the rising cost of medical services. Thirty-five per cent of the 20 million people over 65 live in poverty and 10 per cent more border on poverty.

When Congress talks of priorities, as it does too often, it can no longer ignore the growing crisis among the older citizens. Unless there is swift remedial action in expanding benefits in social security, in medicare and providing a better tax break for the aged, the average American will approach old age with abject horror. The monumental problems of the elderly must be viewed by federal legislators with a greater sense of urgency than has been evident to date in Congress.

#### PUBLIC HEARINGS TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—SUMMARIES OF TESTIMONY

**Mr. LONG.** Mr. President, on Monday, September 22, the Senate Finance Committee received testimony relating to the tax treatment of farm losses and hobby farmers. The committee also heard witnesses address themselves to that portion of the House-passed tax reform bill which concerns taxation of cooperative enterprises and their patrons. Among Monday's witnesses was the Honorable George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, who presented labor's case for tax reform.

So that Senators might follow the progress of these tax reform hearings, I ask unanimous consent that the attached summary of Monday's testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### GENERAL

GEORGE MEANY, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS

#### General

Advocates tax justice; does not believe it was achieved under the House bill. Indicates, also, that the administration's proposals will not bring tax justice.

States that the tax laws discriminate against those whose income comes from the work they do rather than from investments. Points out that a triple standard is applied to income taxed by the Federal Government: (1) income from wages, salaries, and other forms of ordinary income which is taxed in full; (2) income from stocks, real estate, and other so-called capital assets on which only half of such income is taxed; and (3) certain forms of income which is not taxed, such as interest on State and local bonds, nonexistent costs as oil depletion, fast depreciation writeoffs, and bookkeeping farm losses.

Points out that tax justice can only come when the impoverished are removed from the tax rolls, there is meaningful reduction in the relative tax burdens of low- and middle-income families, and the loopholes of special

tax privileges for wealthy families and businesses are eliminated.

#### *Capital gains*

States that the single most costly loophole and the one that is the prime culprit of unfairness is the capital gains loophole. Recommends that this tax concept be eliminated. Recommends also, that the capital gains passed at death be taxed.

Points out that even with the improvements contained in the House bill (the elimination of the 25-percent maximum and extension, the holding period for long-term capital gains to 1 year) unearned income would still be preferably taxed. Points out that the administration has proposed to weaken even these modest tax reforms.

#### *Commends certain provisions in the House bill*

Supports the provisions in the House bill which relieve the working poor from any Federal tax obligations, give relief to the low- and middle-income taxpayers, repeal the 7-percent investment credit to business and trim or eliminate other loopholes and gimmicks.

#### *Recommendations*

Urges the Senate to improve the House bill and proposes the following changes: close the capital gains loophole, ending the major tax preference for unearned income; put an end of the tax abuses of the oil, gas, and other mineral industries; eliminate the maximum tax provision; strengthen the minimum tax provisions of the House bill; and strengthen and improve other measures contained in the House bill, such as the interest on State and local bonds (suggests full taxation and an interest subsidy by the Federal Government), the loss-limit approach contained in S. 500 for the hobby farm loophole; the income-averaging formula should not include capital gains; interest deductions on bonds used to finance corporate mergers and acquisitions should be completely disallowed; and rapid depreciation on real estate should be disallowed except for low- and moderate-income housing.

#### *Tax relief*

Suggests that more substantive relief should be provided to the taxpayers whose incomes are moderate and whose tax burdens are unnecessarily severe.

Supports the provisions in the House bill to increase the low-income allowance to a flat \$1,100 and to increase the standard deduction to 15 percent and \$2,000. Opposes the general rate reductions contained in the House bill. Suggests, instead, a reduction in the tax rates that apply to the first \$8,000 of everyone's taxable income (the first \$4,000 for single persons).

#### *Depletion*

Recommends that the deductions for depletion not be permitted to be taken after the cost of the property has been fully written off.

#### *Interest on State and local bonds*

States that this tax-free interest erodes the equity of the tax laws since it benefits only the wealthy. Recommends that all interest on State and local debt securities be subject to the income tax. Suggests that the Federal Government guarantee the bonds and pay the issuing State or local government one-third of the interest cost on such taxable issues. Opposes any special treatment for industrial development bonds.

#### *Real estate*

Points out that a host of special tax-forgiveness provisions apply to real estate. Recommends that all depreciation in excess of straight line be disallowed on all real estate except low- and moderate-housing real estate.

#### *Farm losses*

Points out that there are special tax accounting privileges for farmers, developed to

ease the bookkeeping chores of ordinary farmers. Indicates that these accounting privileges are being manipulated to provide tax benefits to wealthy individuals and corporations who operate or invest in farms in order to get tax losses (though, not real economic losses). Recommends enactment of the loss-limit approach contained in S. 500.

#### *Tax-exempt foundations*

Points out that the tax-exempt status granted to certain foundations represents one of the most glaring examples of how a well-intended, seemingly desirable, tax privilege can become twisted. Indicates that the Government is relinquishing funds it would otherwise be entitled to, and therefore others must pay a high share of the costs of Government. Notes that family foundations frequently are used as a means whereby the wealthy can avoid income, gift, and inheritance taxes yet maintain control over wealth.

Recommends the following for foundations: that financial transactions between a foundation and its founders, contributors, officers, directors, and trustees be prohibited; that foundations be required to spend their income within 1 year of receipt; that they not be permitted to own 20 percent or more of any business unrelated to their charitable function; that if a donor maintains control of a business or property after it is contributed, no donation deduction from taxes be allowed until the foundation disposes of the property or the donor's control over the property ends; that foundation borrowing to buy investment properties be prohibited; that a limitation (such as 40 years) be placed on the life of foundations; and that Congress studied the problems posed by the operations of foundations and the need for some Federal regulation.

#### *Unlimited charitable contribution deduction*

Indicates that this is a loophole used by the wealthy. Recommends immediate repeal of the unlimited charitable contribution deduction (recognizing that the House bill would phase it out over a 5-year period).

#### *Multiple surtax exemption*

Supports the House bill and the administration in recommending the repeal of the multiple surtax exemptions.

#### *Conglomerates*

Points out that presently there is the greatest wave of corporate mergers in American history. Notes that not only are the "bigs" taking over the "smalls," but minnows are swallowing whales, and the "bigs" are merging with other "bigs."

States that the House bill does not go far enough in meeting this problem. Recommends that the interest deductions be completely disallowed.

HON. LEE METCALF, U.S. SENATOR, STATE OF MONTANA

#### *Farm losses*

States that his bill, S. 500, would eliminate distortions in the farm economy by limiting the amount by which a "farm loss" may offset nonfarm income to \$15,000 or to the amount of "special deductions" (such as taxes, interest, casualty, abandonment, and losses from sale or exchange of farm property). Indicates that the problem in farm losses is that liberal tax accounting rules designed for the benefit of the ordinary farmer are being manipulated by nonfarmers.

Maintains that neither the House bill nor the administration's proposal contains a comparable provision to protect the legitimate farmer and rancher from being penalized for having incurred an economic agricultural loss. Explains that S. 500 protects new farmers as well as others having true losses by providing a 3-year carryback and 5-year carryforward of any disallowed loss.

Argues that the problem with the House bill and the administration proposal is that they allow the "tax-dodge farmer" to defer

any recognized capital gains while at the same time allowing continuation of the full amount of his artificial losses as an offset against nonfarm income each year.

Asserts that the EDA approach will not remove any of the incentive from existing clients of cattle management firms. Notes that S. 500 has received bipartisan support in Congress as well as from numerous farm organizations.

#### *Revenue impact of S. 500*

Indicates that S. 500 would affect an estimated 14,000 individual tax returns (as it is not known how many corporations would be affected), and raise an additional \$205 million a year in revenue. Points out that the House bill provisions would affect only about 3,000 returns and increase tax revenue by about \$25 million a year by 1979. States that the administration proposal would affect 9,300 returns and raise about \$50 million a year.

#### *Affect of S. 500 on farm accounting methods*

Claims that S. 500 would only affect the relatively few tax-dodge farmers who are currently distorting the farm economy. Notes that the "Statistics of Income—1967, Preliminary," reveals that approximately 770,000 individual tax returns reported a net loss from farming, and that S. 500 would affect only about 2 percent of these. Asserts that his bill would not force farmers to use the accrual system of accounting.

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON, PRESIDENT, AMERICAN HORSE COUNCIL, AND HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS, GENERAL COUNSEL

#### *Farm losses and the horse industry*

Opposes sections 211, 212, and 213 of H.R. 13270. Contends that these would constitute a serious threat to the horse industry.

States that the horse breeder is subject to similar risks as other farmers, but does not receive price supports from the Federal Government. Argues that the horse breeder is providing jobs and recreation for thousands of people, and that horseracing has provided millions of dollars to State governments.

#### *Farm incentives*

Points out that Congress has permitted farmers to use the simplified cash accounting method; and in 1962, Congress exempted livestock from the depreciation recapture rule applicable to personal property. Contends that the so-called tax loophole problem of farm losses is insignificant compared to the total tax revenue and other giant loopholes.

Believes that the answer to the few abuses lies not in new legislation but in stronger enforcement of present law such as section 165 which prohibits the deduction of all farm losses unless a farm is being operated for profit.

HON. LOUIE B. NUNN, GOVERNOR, COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

#### *Farm losses*

States the House proposals would materially and adversely affect the economy of Kentucky and of 26 other States that are involved in horseracing or breeding. Indicates the proposals would directly affect those engaged in the commercial activities of the horse industry (which includes breeding, training, racing, and showing), since people in these activities make their living directly from working on or with horses—horses are the tools of their trade.

Points out that tourism is a significant revenue source to Kentucky, and states that last year the horse industry was responsible (directly and indirectly) for attracting more than 50 percent of its tourists.

Indicates that labor utilized for commercial horses alone in the categories of breeding, training, racing, and showing amounts to more than 125,000 jobs, and that between 25,000 and 33,000 full-time jobs are created among the supportive services and supply

September 24, 1969

industries for horses. Also, in 1968, the horse industry generated \$427 million directly to the States in revenue from parimutuel wagering, and \$19 million in other taxes paid by racetracks—and that this is at a time when the Congress is being asked to provide Federal revenue to the States.

HARRY J. FARNHAM, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE RACING COMMISSIONERS

#### *Farm losses*

Opposes the farm loss tax provisions contained in the House bill, as well as those proposed by Senator Miller (S. 1560) and as proposed by Senator Metcalf (S. 500).

States that the farm loss proposals will discourage investment in the horse breeding industry, resulting in an attrition of good horses and a sharp reduction in number of all horses bred by small breeders. Indicates that a reduction in the breeding of horses will affect the size and number of raising programs, thereby seriously endangering the racing industry.

Urges the deletion of the farm loss provisions from the House bill on the basis that fulfillment of the Federal Government's need for additional revenue should not jeopardize the industry's source of funds for the States' pressing needs.

HERBERT A. FOGL, GENERAL COUNSEL, PENNSYLVANIA HARNESS RACING COMMISSIONERS

#### *Hobby losses*

States that the proposed changes to the "hobby loss" provisions of present law could drive the bulk of racehorse owners out of business. Indicates that the probable result would be that there would not be enough horses to fill the races, thus depriving the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and other States of substantial sources of revenue.

#### *Recommendations*

Believes that there are several approaches which could achieve the desired result of eliminating abuses: (1) supports the proposal that the holding period for horses be at least 1 year after such animal normally would have first been used for its intended purpose before allowing capital gains treatment; (2) suggests that depreciation rules similar to those set forth in section 1245 of the code be adopted with respect to racehorses; (3) believes that the section of the House bill relating to the denial of capital gains when there exists a surplus in an excess depreciation account should be deleted; and (4) urges that the proposed changes to the "hobby loss" provisions of the code be entirely deleted. Argues that these legislative changes, rather than the changes proposed to the hobby loss provisions would achieve the result of correcting the abuses and at the same time would permit the thousands of bona fide persons who own and breed horses to remain in this industry.

CLAUDE M. MAER, JR., ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL LIVESTOCK TAX COMMITTEE

#### *Proposals of National Livestock Tax Committee*

Recognizes certain problems in the tax laws affecting livestock and other agricultural operations. Submitted the following proposals to the Ways and Means Committee to help eliminate tax profit schemes in agricultural operations while at the same time provide fair and equitable tax treatment for the industry: (1) apply the depreciation recapture rules of section 1245 to purchased livestock used for draft, breeding, dairy, or racing purposes; (2) extend the holding period of cattle and horses from 12 to 24 months in order to qualify for capital gains treatment; (3) clarify that male calves or steers cannot be traded tax free for female calves or cows; (4) require a taxpayer to prove the purpose for which he held livestock in addition to proving the period the livestock were held to qualify for capital gains; and (5) establish a sliding scale re-

capture of land improvement expenses when farm or ranch land is sold within 10 years after its acquisition.

#### *Farm loss provisions in House bill*

States that certain provisions in the House bill dealing with farm losses, namely, those dealing with an excess deductions account, a hobby loss presumption (which disallows all farm losses if they exceeded \$25,000 for any 3 of 5 consecutive years) that affects even a legitimate farmer or a rancher who has been in the business all his life, the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions which includes farm losses as a tax preference, are unnecessary and are contrary to the basic objectives of a sound and equitable tax system.

Indicates that these unneeded provisions in the House bill unfairly discriminate between farmers and ranchers based upon accounting systems used and the size of losses sustained; impose restriction on capital gains claimed by persons only in agriculture and classify only certain losses from farming, but not from any other business, as "tax preferences"; and make compliance with and enforcement of these unneeded provisions unworkable and in some instances practically impossible.

#### *General objections to the farm loss provisions in the House bill*

States that the provisions in the House bill would create extreme complexity and confusion to livestock operators, would discourage diversification by farmers and ranchers into nonfarm businesses, would isolate agriculture from the rest of the Nation's economy, would impede vital agricultural programs, would dry up needed sources of outside capital and restrict entry of new blood into industry, and could result in substantial meat price increases to the public consumers.

#### *Recommendations*

States that fair and equitable tax treatment of ranch and farm businesses can be achieved by adoption of the proposals made by the tax committee (listed above) which were included in the House bill (in a somewhat modified form). Indicates that these proposals will eliminate the relatively small amount of tax profiteering and will not substantially harm the industry in that they are simple and easy to apply and will not require complicated cost techniques.

#### *Metcalf and Miller bills*

Opposes the provisions and principles of the bills introduced by Senator Metcalf (S. 500) and Senator Miller (S. 1560). Believes that these bills would seriously harm the whole industry and perhaps cause the greatest damage to the small- and medium-sized family farms and ranches.

#### *Senator Gore's bill*

Favors the approach taken by Senator Gore's bill (S. 2645) because of its simplicity and ease of application. Believes that it would be at least a partial solution to eliminating tax profiteering in the livestock industry. Suggests, however, that the depreciation recapture rules of present law which apply to all depreciable personal property, other than livestock, should also be extended to livestock. Indicates that this would make the restriction on useful life provision in Senator Gore's bill unnecessary.

MARVIN M'LAIN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN FARM BUREAU FEDERATION:

#### *General*

States that the most pressing tax reform needed is general reduction in Federal taxation and for this to be possible more effort will have to be made to bring spending under control. Urges this committee to act slowly and deliberately to make sure that proposed tax reform is not complicated for the average taxpayer.

#### *Tax treatment of farm losses*

Points out that the farm bureau has proposed that the tax loss problem be dealt with by placing a simple limitation of \$15,000 on the amount of farm losses that can be used as an offset to nonfarm income. Opposes sections of the House bill which would (1) extend the holding period required for livestock to be eligible for capital gains treatment, and (2) repeal the livestock exemption from the depreciation recapture provisions of current law. States that the farm bureau does not oppose the proposed creation of an excess deductions amount for taxpayers with farming losses provided the exemption from this requirement is not reduced below the \$15,000 level.

#### *Hobby losses*

Indicates no objection to the proposed tightening of the so-called hobby loss provision of present law.

#### *Treatment of cooperative patronage refunds*

Contends that the provisions of the House bill would unnecessarily increase the Federal Government's role in the management of cooperative fiscal affairs. Maintains that the 15-year payout requirement for retained patronage allocations would force cooperatives to treat these allocations as bad debt rather than equity and reduce their borrowing capacity.

#### *Capital gains*

Opposes the proposed extension of the capital gains holding period to 12 months because it would discourage the investment that is needed to sustain economic growth. Opposes also the proposed elimination of the alternative tax on capital gains because a great many farmers benefit from it when they sell a farm or liquidate their farming operations.

#### *Tax treatment of tax-exempt bonds*

Opposes the section of the House bill which deals with the tax treatment of income from presently tax-exempt State and municipal bonds. Asks the committee to exempt income from State and municipal bonds from the provisions of the House bill which would establish a limit on tax preferences and require the allocation of deductions. Believes that if local governments were forced to pay higher interest rates to borrow money, a part of the cost will fall on overburdened property owners, including farmers.

ANGUS M'DONALD, DIRECTOR OF RESEARCH,  
NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

#### *Tax treatment of cooperatives*

Opposes the non-revenue-producing cooperative provisions of the House bill. Believes that the cooperative provisions would work a hardship on the organizations and that many would be forced out of existence. Maintains that the cooperative provision which would ultimately require 50 percent of the patronage refund to be paid in cash is an unwarranted intrusion into a business. Indicates that it would penalize cooperatives regardless of the wishes of a majority of their numbers and would entail additional bookkeeping. States that the provision requiring all redemption of paper within 15 years would affect adversely the capital needs and credit of cooperatives.

#### *Farm losses*

Supports S. 500 introduced by Senator Metcalf and 22 other Senators. States that this legislation would stop major loophole in our tax laws which permits wealthy individuals to avoid payment of their fair share of taxes. Contends that the so-called tax farmers engage in activities adverse to working farmers by inflating the price of land and entering into competition with farmers who have no off-farm income. Maintains that the excess deduction account provision in the House bill would affect very few tax farmers and bring in little additional revenue.

ROBERT M. FREDERICK, LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE

#### Tax-loss farming

Points out that the House bill undertakes to correct a situation in which some high-income taxpayers not primarily engaged in farming have used farm losses to obtain a deduction in their high-bracket nonfarm income. Indicates that the House bill does this by requiring taxpayers to maintain an excess deductions account (EDA) to record the farm losses. Believes that the EDA account approach does not resolve the tax-loss farming loophole. Indicates that it only postpones the issue and strikes at all farmers, big and small, bona fide as well as the investor who is investing in agriculture for a profit. Supports the amendment (No. 139) introduced by Senator Metcalf to correct the abuse of the liberal tax rules provided for the use of bona fide farmers. Points out that this corrective amendment will affect only non-farmers with large amounts of nonfarm income who invest in farming to obtain tax losses.

#### Hobby losses

Believes that if the Metcalf amendment is adopted, there will be no need to make further provisions in the law for the so-called hobby farmers, as the loss limitation approach in the amendment would include the hobby-loss farmer and would limit the current deductions of his farm losses.

#### Holding period for livestock

States that the House bill discriminates against livestock for dairy, draft, or breeding purposes by requiring that such animals be held for at least 365 days after the animals would have first been used for such purpose. Believes that the tax rules should not be made more stringent against the farm industry at a time when it is undergoing severe economic problems. Believes that the same rules for holding period for capital gains should apply for livestock.

#### Cooperative tax revisions

Believes that the cooperative tax treatment has no connection to tax reform. Indicates that hasty action on a subject of vital concern to the lifeblood of all small co-ops can have a devastating effect and completely wipe out many co-op marketing associations.

Agrees that it is desirable for the farmer to receive as big a cash refund as possible and as quickly as it can be paid. Indicates, though, that this is already being done. States that the 15-year payout provision is one of the least understood but potentially the most damaging of the new rules being proposed for cooperatives. Indicates that this could completely disrupt the capital structure of the cooperative and impair its ability to borrow money.

#### Federal estate tax

Believes that the tax reform legislation should not ignore the problem of Federal estate tax, especially as it affects the family-owned operation or a closely held business. Points out that bills have been introduced by (Congressman Price and Senator Dole) in both Houses to correct this tax inequity. Suggests that this committee include in the Tax Reform Act the provisions contained in these bills.

#### Tax reform recommendations

Proposes the following tax reforms: (1) suggests further changes and simplification in the tax forms; (2) supports the mineral depletion allowances; however, suggests that present legislation be carefully reviewed; (3) approves giving the farmer the option of choosing the limitation of losses that are deductible or reporting his farming operations on an "accrual accounting" basis, but opposes any action requiring farmers to report on an accrual basis; (4) suggests removing the tax-exempt status for industrial development bonds issued by State and local govern-

ments; (5) suggests, when reductions in revenue are possible, the elimination of the income surtax and a substantial increase in the personal exemption; and (6) favors legislation which would press the burden of proof on the Internal Revenue Service whenever it takes action against the taxpayer.

#### COOPERATIVES

HON. E. A. JAENKE, GOVERNOR, FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

#### Cooperatives

States that clarification is needed on two points of law affecting the 13 banks for cooperatives under the Farm Credit Act of 1933, which became taxable only recently when they retired their government capital.

(1) States that the cooperative banks make loans similar to commercial bank loans, and their loans have even greater risk because they are limited to one industry. Maintains that cooperative banks should be entitled to the same bad-debt reserve deduction as commercial banks under existing law but have not been given this deduction because they do not receive deposits, and therefore have not been treated as banks under existing Internal Revenue Service rulings. Urges the committee to indicate in its report on the tax reform bill or otherwise that it sees no objection to a bank for cooperatives being allowed a bad-debt reserve deduction under the rules applicable to commercial banks generally.

(2) States that cooperative banks are required by the Farm Credit Act to pay annual patronage dividends to cooperatives that are borrowers. Maintains that interest from securities temporarily held or from temporary loans to other farm credit banks, which amount to less than 5 percent of gross income, should not have to be accounted for separately but should be included in the income from business done with borrowing cooperatives for purposes of patronage dividends. Urges that this be expressed as the intention of the committee in its report on the tax reform bill or otherwise.

JERRY VOORHIS, PAST PRESIDENT, COOPERATIVES LEAGUE OF THE UNITED STATES

#### Cooperatives

States that no hearings were held on taxation of cooperatives to allow an explanation of opposition to the proposed changes. Recommends deletion of section 531 of the bill. Considers the House provision to be ill conceived, discriminatory, extremely damaging to farmers, and punitive in nature against cooperatives.

Contends that cooperatives would be handicapped in raising development capital, and that the proposed legislation would result in a preemption of the functions of the cooperative's board of directors.

Indicates that the proposed changes would hinder cooperative development at a time when Government policy is to encourage cooperatives as a means of maintaining farm income and assisting those in urban poverty to escape by means of cooperative enterprises.

Argues that the proposals in the bill will not raise additional revenue. Asserts that the Revenue Act of 1962 makes certain that both cooperatives and patrons will pay their full share of taxation.

MELVIN E. SIMS, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF FARMER COOPERATIVES

#### Cooperatives

Opposes section 531 of the bill.

States that there was no opportunity for public testimony on these provisions by any representative of any cooperative before the Ways and Means Committee.

Argues that these provisions are based on the erroneous premise that the members and patrons of farmers' cooperatives do not individually have a choice as to investment of part of their patronage refunds in the cooperative. States that under existing law

members must be given a copy of the bylaws requiring capital contributions of part of their patronage refunds, and each member makes an individual and fully informed decision as to whether he will retain or obtain membership in light of these bylaws.

Contends that the provisions are arbitrary and would be an unwarranted dictation by the Federal Government to the members of cooperatives as to how to finance and operate their business.

Argues that the 15-year payout requirement is discriminatory and punitive in that no such requirement is made of other corporations, partnerships, or other business enterprises.

Maintains that while section 531 is not estimated to yield any revenue gain or loss, it will actually result in the loss of revenue, because the damaging effect of the provisions on cooperatives will eventually result in decreasing the taxable income of the cooperatives or their members and patrons.

Contends that the required conversion of membership capital from equity to debt under the 15-year payout rule would seriously and immediately impair and ultimately destroy the borrowing ability of cooperatives to soundly finance growing farm demand for services and facilities.

Argues that section 531 would produce grave and costly enforcement problems for the Government and compliance problems for farmer cooperatives.

Maintains that section 531 would undermine the "capital fund method of financing" which has been adopted by an increasing number of cooperatives with approval of the Internal Revenue Service.

Maintains that section 531 would impose hardships and inequities on members and patrons through the limitation of the current payout requirement to qualified written notices of allocation. States that the current payout requirement could not be satisfied by redeeming certificates issued for years before 1963.

HON. FRANK CARLSON, ON BEHALF OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF GRAIN COOPERATIVES

#### Cooperatives

Opposes section 531 of the bill. Argues that the 50 percent cash payout requirement and the 15-year payout requirement will do irreparable harm to cooperatives without any increase in revenue. Contends that these provisions result from efforts by competitors of cooperatives to further their own well-being by depriving member-owners of the economic benefits of cooperatives which both Congress and the executive branch have encouraged over many decades.

PATRICK B. HEALY, SECRETARY, NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

#### Cooperatives

Opposes section 531 of the bill for the following reasons:

(1) It serves no valid tax objective since it neither increases nor decreases the tax liability of cooperatives or farmers;

(2) It is a destructive and discriminatory attack upon farmers agricultural cooperatives, designed to undermine their capital and financial structures and make it easier for processors and middlemen to reap a greater profit at the farmer's expense;

(3) It substitutes the judgment of Congress for that of the farmer boards of directors of cooperatives;

(4) It prescribes an across-the-board rule which would be inflexible and inadequate to meet changing requirements;

(5) Problems relating to the internal operation of cooperatives should be considered by the Agriculture Committees and not the tax committees of Congress;

(6) As long as one level of tax is currently paid, farmers should be free to manage their own cooperatives and to finance them with their own money in whatever manner they deem best.

IRVING CLARK, ON BEHALF OF THE FARMERS UNION CENTRAL EXCHANGE, FARMERS UNION GRAIN TERMINAL ASSOCIATION, GREAT PLAINS SUPPLY COMPANY, LAND O'LAKES CREAMERIES, INC., MIDLAND COOPERATIVES, INC., AND TWIN CITY MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, NORTHERN COOPERATIVES, INC., NORTH STAR DAIRY Cooperatives

Opposes section 531 of the bill for the following reasons:

(1) The 50 percent payout requirement would permit small cooperatives with annual earnings of less than \$25,000 to retain only 50 percent of their earnings, although comparable corporations can retain 78 percent.

(2) It is erroneous to treat annual earnings as cash available for distribution, since they are often represented by nonliquid assets, and are subject to prior claims such as outstanding debt or equities which must be retired first and matured revolving fund certificates.

(3) The 15-year retention requirement has the effect of requiring annual cash distributions in excess of 50 percent in the immediate future rather than in 15 years, because the cooperative must retire older certificates first, even if the bill does not apply to them.

(4) The working capital needs of cooperatives are increasing, and their ability to revolve out patrons' capital on a "due date" basis is diminishing, rather than increasing. A considerable part of the earnings of local cooperatives is represented by essential investments in regional cooperatives, and changing economic conditions have seriously reduced the ability of regional cooperatives to make cash distributions to the local cooperatives.

(5) The cash distribution requirements ignore existing debt and other business needs.

(6) The arguments advanced in favor of the provision are mistaken and illusory.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, on Tuesday, September 23, the Committee on Finance began hearings with respect to the tax treatment of income earned on obligations of State and municipal governments. More than 250 witnesses requested to be heard on these features of the House tax reform bill. Five important Governors representing the Governors' Conference and speaking for the Governors of all 50 States opposed each of the three provisions in the House bill which relate to the matter of State and local government indebtedness. In addition, the Mayors' Conference presented testimony to the same effect.

So that Senators might follow the progress of these tax reform hearings, I ask unanimous consent that the attached summary of the testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### TAX TREATMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL BOND INTEREST

HON. HOWARD H. BAKER, JR., U.S. SENATOR, STATE OF TENNESSEE

#### *Limit on tax preferences and allocation of deductions*

Contends that inclusion of tax-exempt interest from State and local bonds in the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions proposals would adversely affect the ability of State and local government to meet their capital requirements. Recommends deletion of tax-exempt bond interest from these proposals.

#### *Tax treatment of State and local bond interest*

Argues that the immunity of State and local governments from Federal taxation is necessary for the preservation of our "con-

stitutionally delineated dual sovereignty" form of government. Believes that if Congress encroaches upon the tax exemption, it has the power to control State and local financing.

Agrees with the attempt to achieve a more equitable tax burden. Emphasizes, however, that Congress must consider the fair distribution of the total tax burden—Federal, State, and local. Indicates that if the proposed limitations on tax-exempt bonds are enacted, interest rates on such bonds will increase even further—resulting in higher sales and property taxes to pay for the added interest expense, the burden of which would fall disproportionately upon middle- and low-income taxpayers.

Considers the proposals affecting municipal financing to be inconsistent with the concept of revenue sharing at a time when State and local governments are lacking in funds.

Points out that the 154 individuals with adjusted gross incomes of over \$200,000 who paid no Federal income tax did not include tax-exempt bond interest since it is not required to be reported on the tax return. Proposes that holders of these bonds be required to report the interest in order to determine if there is substantial abuse of this exemption.

#### NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, COUNCIL OF STATE GOVERNMENTS (PANEL)

HON. JOHN A. LOVE, GOVERNOR, STATE OF COLORADO

##### *General*

Indicates that capital requirements of State and local governments are growing at a rapid rate—outstanding bonds were less than \$50 billion in 1956, \$140 billion in 1969, and an estimated \$210 billion by 1975.

#### *Limit on tax preferences and allocations of deductions*

Believes that although the revenue impact of these proposals would be small, the market impact would be great.

States that comparable municipal and corporate bonds have had a yield relationship of 70 percent; i.e., municipal yields have been about 70 percent of corporates. Notes that this has increased to 80 percent in 1969. Contends that the threat of taxation has caused this reduction in differential.

Estimates that proposals affecting State and local bonds could increase the interest cost for 1970 by up to \$270 million.

HON. DANIEL J. EVANS, GOVERNOR, STATE OF WASHINGTON

#### *Taxation of State and local bonds*

Contends that the provisions of H.R. 13270 dealing with taxation of State and local bonds will result in a basic change in our governmental structure arising from immediate economic pressure.

Argues that the provisions insure a narrowing of the differential interest cost of taxable and nontaxable issues, so that even under the subsidy option the cost of borrowing would increase substantially. Asserts that the current increase in municipal interest yields is due in large part to the proposed provisions, and has resulted in cancellation and postponement of many bond issues due to interest ceilings of these governments.

Considers the net effect of the provisions to only slightly increase Federal revenues but also to substantially increase regressive State and local taxes and utility charges needed to pay the higher interest costs. Feels that the entire Federal, State, and local tax burdens must be considered, not just the Federal.

Believes that the basis of tax exemption is constitutional and that it will result in legal challenge and continuing chaos in the bond market as well as intergovernmental conflict damaging to the federal system of government.

Maintains that the purchaser of municipal bonds now pays a "minimum tax" by accepting a lower interest yield.

States that there is no indication that tax-exempt bond interest was a significant factor in the failure of wealthy individuals to pay income taxes. Urges that a study of this be conducted before accepting the provisions of H.R. 13270.

HON. NORBERT T. TIEMANN, GOVERNOR, STATE OF NEBRASKA

#### *Tax treatment of State and local bonds*

Points out that the Bond Buyers' Index of 20 representative municipal bonds rose from 5.04 percent in February 1969 to 6.02 percent in August, while corporate and 20-year U.S. Government bonds experienced interest rate increases of much smaller amounts. Asserts that the House proposals have been the largest contributor to this unusual rise in municipal yields. Contends that further increases will be forthcoming if Congress actually enacts the proposals.

Argues that the relatively small increase in Federal revenue in these proposals do not justify the severity of the market impact and costs to State and local governments.

Believes that Federal taxation of municipals without consent is unconstitutional.

#### *Alternatives to consider*

Considers it to be ironic that serious consideration is being given to revenue sharing, a mass transit fund, and reformation of welfare systems—and to taxing State and local bond interest. Argues that the latter proposal could cost State and local governments more than the benefits from the former.

Urges that a study be conducted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on the various proposals.

Suggests that if the committee feels compelled to act without further study, it consider—

(1) a Federal interest subsidy system guaranteeing a percentage of the interest cost of future taxable issues, at the choice of the State or local government; or

(2) a federal system of "Urbanks."

Emphasizes four criteria that any plan must contain: (1) State and local determination of all policy questions relative to bonding—free of Federal control; (2) State and local option between any alternative plans; (3) assurance of continuance of plan, with at least 3 years' notice of any termination; and (4) a minimum processing time for the plan.

HON. JOHN J. M'KEITHEN, GOVERNOR, STATE OF LOUISIANA

#### *General*

Notes that Federal grants-in-aid for capital purposes will total \$6.5 billion for fiscal year 1970, and that this requires matching capital outlays financed mostly from bonds.

#### *Tax treatment of State and local bond interest*

Opposes the inclusion of municipal bond interest in the limit on tax preferences and allocation of deductions proposals. Considers the administration's allocation of deductions proposal to be more damaging than the House provision.

Maintains that the immunity from Federal taxation is inherent in the concept of federalism.

Contends that the interest cost to State and local governments will be far greater than the increased revenue to the Federal Government. Asserts that regressive State and local taxes will have to be increased at the same time Congress is reducing the progressive income tax.

States that it is not known to what extent wealthy individuals benefit from tax-exempt interest.

HON. CLAUDE R. KIRK, JR., GOVERNOR, STATE OF FLORIDA

#### *Tax status of municipal bonds*

Argues that changing the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds would result in a loss of faith in the integrity of our Government. States that while Congress has been

considering the tax treatment of State and local bonds, the market situation has deteriorated.

Maintains that the proposal to subsidize a portion of interest costs would lead to Federal control over State and local borrowing. Contends that the "minimum tax" and allocation of deductions proposals would increase the cost of borrowing, increasing State and local taxes even further. Indicates that this would be particularly harmful due to the critical need for capital financing.

States that if the Federal Government violates the doctrine of reciprocal immunity from taxes, States will tax U.S. Treasury obligations.

**NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES AND U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS (PANEL)**

HON. C. BEVERLY BRILEY, MAYOR, NASHVILLE, TENN., AND PRESIDENT, NATIONAL LEAGUE OF CITIES

*State and local bond interest*

Expresses concern with the House proposals and suggests that they would increase the cost of city government and threaten the fiscal rejuvenation of our cities.

States that the actual and the psychological impact of the allocation of deduction rules and the limit on tax preferences will severely curtail the market for municipal bonds.

Urges that interest from municipal bonds should be deleted from the limit on tax preferences and from the allocation of deductions proposals, and that "interest subsidy program" should be deleted and deferred to future hearings.

**OTHER WITNESSES**

HON. W. W. DUMAS, MAYOR-PRESIDENT OF PARISH OF EAST BATON ROUGE, CITY OF BATON ROUGE, LA.

*Tax treatment of State and local bonds*

States that the passage of the House bill has prevented many cities, including Baton Rouge, from proceeding with vital works of public improvement. Maintains that the effort to tax State and local bonds should be turned back by the Senate Finance Committee. Urges the strongest possible pronouncement by this committee that any attempt to tax municipal bonds to any extent will not be allowed now or at any time in the future.

Contends that many projects in the State of Louisiana would simply not be subject to financing if it were not for the advantage of tax exemption. Argues that if these projects were required to compete on the open market without tax-exempt advantage, the burden of increased interest rates would be so great as to delay financing for years or perhaps prevent it forever.

HON. LOUIE WELCH, MAYOR, HOUSTON, TEX.

*State and local bonds*

Opposes the provisions in the House bill which affect State and local bonds. Indicates that the interest subsidy proposal would have dire effects. States that it has been traditional for the people to preserve their right to determine their own destiny in local matters and by imposing this new concept on local governments would severely restrict the right of a community to meet its own challenges.

States that the buyers of municipal bonds ordinarily have paid their taxes when they buy the bonds. Points out that the simple effect of the present treatment is their accepting a lower return on their investments than would be available in fully taxable securities.

Urges the examination of other alternative proposals. Suggests that the proposal prepared by the Urban Institute (Washington, D.C.) is a more effective and acceptable alternative to the interest subsidy proposal. States that this proposal accomplishes the desirable purpose of broadening the market for State and local bonds by inducing new

types of investors to purchase these securities. Points out that this approach would offer, for example, a subsidy to State and local retirement funds, which would lower local government borrowing costs by opening the door to a substantial, new, and rapidly increasing source of funds. Indicates that it would reserve the integrity of tax-exempt bonds and the independence of local governments to finance capital improvements.

HON. ILUS W. DAVIS, MAYOR, KANSAS CITY, MO.

*State and local bond interest*

Is of the opinion that the House proposal could destroy their ability to proceed with and plan any bond-financed capital programs. States that if interest from municipal bonds becomes taxable, there must be a complete reappraisal of the municipal bond as an instrument of financing, and that they would then be competing directly with the vast requirements of private enterprise in its financing of corporate expansion.

Expresses the belief that if the Federal Government starts paying some substantial share of the interest on municipal debt that the next step would be for the Federal Government to exercise control over the issuance of that debt.

Suggests that if the present proposal is enacted, it would be subject to challenge on the basis of its constitutionality, that it would be a period of time before this question could be resolved, and that in the meantime the municipal bond market would be in a state of limbo due to the uncertainty that would be created.

AUSTIN J. TOBIN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY

*State and local bond interest*

States that the Port of New York Authority's contribution to current and future transportation requirements, and the contribution State and local governments generally, would be substantially curtailed by the provisions of the bill relating to State and local bond interest.

Argues that the provisions present a fundamental constitutional issue of Federal control of the powers reserved to the States under the Constitution.

Maintains that the bill would cause additional interest costs on State and local borrowing which would be passed on principally in the form of regressive property sales, and other taxes.

Contends that the threat of impaired tax exemption has thrown the bond market into chaos, and many State and local governments have been unable to borrow at all, or have done so at punitive interest rates. Maintains that the bill would cause a continued disarray of the market for years to come.

Argues that the proposal would capture a mere \$45 to \$80 million annually from wealthy taxpayers, but would increase borrowing costs after 5 years by about \$540 million annually. Maintains that the deduction of the taxes necessary to pay the additional borrowing cost, since they are deductible for Federal tax purposes, would result in a net Federal revenue loss.

Maintains that municipal bondholders pay substantial taxes to State and local governments by accepting interest rates 30 to 35 percent less than those available on comparable corporate obligations.

Argues that the provision for a Federal subsidy of interest rates is unacceptable because the Treasury has too wide a discretion to fix the size of the payment, and the statutory authority for the subsidy could be amended or repealed at any time.

HON. IVY BAKER PRIEST, CALIFORNIA STATE TREASURER

*State and local bond interest*

Contends that the provisions taxing State and local bond interest are unconstitutional

whether or not the Government subsidizes all or part of the increased interest costs of taxable bonds.

Maintains that taxation of municipal bond interest will immediately and automatically increase interest rates, resulting in increased State and local taxes, the burden of which would be borne by low- and middle-income taxpayers.

Argues that once Congress takes the first step away from tax exemption, it can take other steps whenever circumstances make it expedient to do so. States that the Federal interest subsidy can be withdrawn as easily as it was first offered.

Contends that the mere consideration by Congress of the provisions of the bill already has had adverse effects upon the bond market.

Argues that the bill will cause greater dependence upon the Federal Government as a source of major public works funding for State and local needs in direct contradiction to current efforts to bring about better working relationships between National and State Governments.

Argues that the bill will nullify the administration's efforts to curb inflation in the bond market. States that California is in the process of raising the limit on interest, with voter approval, to 7 percent, but the change may become moot if, through Federal taxation, bond interest rates are forced above the new ceiling.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today the Senate Finance Committee continued receiving testimony from State and local government officials, and interested individuals, concerning the tax treatment of interest earned on State and municipal obligations. The National Association of Counties presented a panel of distinguished local government officials from around the country, all vocally opposed to the features of the House bill which affect their bonded indebtedness. Additional Governors, mayors, State legislators, and other public officials also opposed the House bill.

So that Senators might follow the progress of these tax reform hearings, I ask unanimous consent that the attached summary of the testimony be printed in the RECORD.

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

**TAX TREATMENT OF STATE AND LOCAL BOND INTEREST**

(Honorable Jack Williams, Governor, State of Arizona, National Association of Counties, panel)

HON. CONRAD FOWLER, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

*State and local bond interest.—General aspects*

Opposes the provisions in the House bill which would tax the interest on municipal bonds. Believes that the inclusion of the proposed tax has, and would, precipitate irreparable damage to the present municipal bond market.

Feels strongly that any legislation which, directly or indirectly, taxes interest on local government bonds would precipitate fiscal disaster in county government. Points out that the size of the new issue market in local government financing is shrinking as officials postpone or cancel bond sales because of the progressive deterioration of the market. Indicates that the inevitable result of taxing municipal bond interest would be a substantial curtailment in scheduled public construction of projects vitally needed on the State and local level and that new and higher taxes will be required. Believes that the

provisions in the House bill are unconstitutional and threaten the fiscal integrity of local government.

HON. WILLIAM CONNER, VICE PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

*State and local bond interest.—Impact of limit on tax preference and allocation of deductions on county government*

States that taxing the interest on local bonds through limited tax preferences and allocation of deduction strikes at the very keystone of financing State, county, and municipal government; that it poses serious challenges to our Federal system; that it will adversely affect construction employment through the stoppage of essential public works; and most importantly that if this same tax had been applied to the \$16 billion of State and local bonds issued in 1968, those governments' local taxpayers would have a liability to pay over \$12 billion of additional interest costs during the life of 20-year bonds. Indicates that it will raise local taxes and rents for millions of citizens throughout our land.

Points out that since the House began consideration of this package, the interest rate has moved steadily up and is now almost 1 percentage point above the level which would normally be expected at this time.

Believes that in the name of tax reform and in an attempt to close loopholes affecting a few hundred people, increased financial burdens will be imposed on millions of small taxpayers and seriously impair the efforts that had been made in governmental relationships to increase local responsibility and ability to finance local projects.

HON. JOHN BREWER, CHAIRMAN, TAXATION AND FINANCE COMMITTEE, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

*State and local bond interest.—The subsidy provision in the House bill*

States that in those States where there is no maximum ceiling on bond interest, the interest on tax-exempt bonds has already jumped to record levels since this legislation was proposed. Points out that the House bill provides alternative capital financing approaches which would provide a somewhat automatic, but variable, Federal interest payment to those local governments which waive their tax exemption. Indicates that there are several problems in this provision. States that one problem revolves around who will determine the difference in taxable versus tax-exempt yield. Notes that the House bill gives the authority to the Treasury Department and also allows it to vary the subsidy.

Believes that the subsidy plan gives State and local Governments no real options, as the choice is to issue partially taxed bonds without a subsidy or fully taxed bonds with it, when the bonds are now fully exempt from tax. Believes that the crucial flow in the subsidy is that there is simply nothing to prevent Congress from curtailing, or eliminating it at any time. States that if any form of a subsidy is to be acceptable to county government, it must be allowed to operate as an optional alternative and not under the pressures of present tax-reform proposals upon our present market.

Urges that the question of subsidy be removed from the House bill and be the subject of further hearings, including awaiting the results of a significant study being conducted by The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

HON. GEORGE R. LONG, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

*State and local bond interest.—Adverse effects of the House bill on the counties of Virginia*

States that the impact of the consideration of the proposal to tax the interest accruing from local and State government bonds along

with the statutory interest rate (6% in Virginia) has worked to remove local government bonds of Virginia, and nearly all States, from the bond market. Indicates that the removal of such bonds from the market resulting in the reduction in volume offered is reflected in the slight decline in average interest rates in the past several weeks.

States that counties across the country agree with the Virginia counties that it is not the intent of Congress to stem progress in county government across the Nation. Believes, though, this is the effect of the proposed legislation, and that it will increase State and local taxes upon those taxpayers whom it is seeking to relieve.

HILL HEALAN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY, ASSOCIATION OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS OF GEORGIA

*State and local bond interest.—Expected adverse impacts of the House bill on the counties of Georgia*

Points out that many of the rural counties of Georgia are lacking in public improvements such as streets, libraries, schools, water and sewer systems, and many other needed public improvements which can be obtained only through the issue and sale of bonds. Indicates that the local governments are willing to assume these burdens but that it is beyond the power of local governments in Georgia to finance these projects if the principal source of financing, namely, general obligation and revenue bonds, do not find a ready market at reasonable rates of interest.

States that it is important that these bonds be made attractive to big investors, such as local trust banks and other institutions which invest a substantial part of their assets in State and local securities.

Indicates that the threat of the proposed legislation has already adversely affected the sale of millions of dollars of municipal bonds which would have financed vital projects. Notes that the tax-exempt status of a bond is a control of factor in its purchase by such institutions.

States that the threat of taxation has caused alarm to both commercial banks and the small individual investors who in many cases are trying to unload their municipal holdings for fear that Congress will levy income taxes upon the outstanding issues. States that this "unloading" is killing the market for new issues.

Points out that the threat of the proposed legislation has already adversely affected the sale of millions of dollars of municipal bonds which would have financed schools, hospitals, sewage plants, and other vital projects.

ARTHUR R. SYPEK, FIRST VICE-PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY ASSOCIATION OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS

*State and local bond interest.—Expected adverse impact of House bill on the counties of New Jersey*

Points out the specific dollar impact of the proposed changes in the House bill on certain counties of New Jersey. Notes that New Jersey counties, the closest entity there is to regional government in the State, depend heavily on the effective use of municipal bonds. Indicates that if the tax status of municipal bonds is changed, the county colleges, hospitals, bridges, and various other projects and services could be seriously curtailed and additional new tax burdens would fall on already over-burdened New Jersey property taxpayers.

HON. DALE ANDERSON, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES

*State and local bond interest.—Summary of the N.A.C.O.'s position on the House bill*

States that the county governments across the country have been stretched to the complete end of their fiscal capability and are reaching a point where revolt against increasing rates of local taxation is highly probable. Indicates that the assault on the immunity of State and local bonds from

Federal taxation represents a direct and frontal assault on the local homeowners. Points out that the legislation will be felt unfavorably by every person no matter how modest his means: if he owns a house his property taxes will be increased; if he rents his home, the owner's increased taxes will be reflected in the tenant's rent increase.

Estimates that as a result of the inclusion of tax-exempt interest in the allocation of deduction rule alone, State and local taxpayers will have to pay amounts almost 10 times more than the money returned to the Treasury in the fifth year after enactment. Notes that this provision seems even more questionable when it is considered that all of the increased State and local taxes will be subject to deduction from Federal income tax returns.

Urges that the municipal bond interest not be included in the limit on tax preferences or in the allocation of deduction provisions. Indicates that the tax subsidy provisions are not the answer.

HON. LEWIS H. VADEN, TREASURER, STATE OF VIRGINIA

*Tax-exempt feature of State and local bonds*

Asserts that the mere statement of Congressional purpose to infringe the tax immunity has drastically increased the cost of State and local bond financing. Indicates that since July, yields on new issues of local AA-rated bonds has risen from about 5.50 percent to 6.25 percent, or 75 basic points, while similarly-rated corporate bonds have risen about 10 basic points. Notes that the size of the new-issue market is shrinking because of postponements and cancellations of issues.

Argues that this initial impact is likely to be compounded by the uncertainties of litigation of the tax immunity issue. States that Virginia is now unable to market any local bonds due to a 6-percent interest ceiling.

Contends that the purchaser is, in effect, paying a tax to the localities by accepting a lower yield on the tax-exempt issues.

*Proposed Federal subsidy*

Maintains that buyers of taxable local bonds will have to be found apart from the current market for tax-exempt securities, as present purchasers would probably only be interested in short-term taxable bonds and put their money in other equity securities or whatever tax shelters that may still be around.

Expresses the view that the tax-exempt privilege for local governments cannot be waived without consent of the State, and that this must be done by a State constitutional convention rather than by a Governor or State legislature.

Questions the claim that the Federal Government would gain any net revenue after paying the interest subsidy.

Believes that the proposal will result in greater centralization of Government in Washington.

HON. DAVID BUCKSON, ATTORNEY GENERAL, STATE OF DELAWARE

*State and local bond interest*

Protests the inclusion of State and municipal bond interests in the Limit on Tax Preferences and the Allocation of Deductions proposals, as well as the "ill-conceived rebate plan" of the bill and the "arbitrage bond" provision.

Discusses case law and argues that it is unconstitutional for the Federal Government to tax interest from State and local obligations.

States that the House proposals are not optional, that the Limit on Tax Preferences and Allocation of Deduction rules are mandatory, and that these proposals along with the rebate plan coercively drive the States "to take what they can."

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AUDITORS,  
JOINT STATEMENT: HON. LOUIS GOLDSTEIN,  
STATE COMPTROLLER OF MARYLAND; HON.  
JOHN D. HERBERT, STATE TREASURER OF OHIO;  
AND DANIEL B. GOLDBERG, COUNSEL, MUNICIPAL FINANCE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

*Tax treatment of State and local bond interest*

Argues that the bill will drastically increase State and municipal interest rates and force State and local governments to curtail services needed by the average citizen or increase local taxes, principally regressive property and sales taxes.

Contends that the bill has caused State and municipal interest rates to skyrocket and has narrowed the gap between tax exempt and comparable taxable bonds from 30 to 35 percent to only 17 percent. Argues that enactment of the bill would cost fully 1 percent additional interest.

Contends that when new issues equal the present level of \$130 billion, the annual cost of the bill to States and municipalities will be \$1.3 billion, and the added cost over the life of the bonds will be some \$17 billion. States that this enormous extra burden on State and local governments and their taxpayers would offset many times over the mere \$80 million a year which the Treasury estimates would be realized from applying both LTP and the allocation plan to all State and municipal bonds, even those now outstanding.

Argues that the violence of the market reaction contradicts the Treasury assertion that it results only from inclusion in LTP of State and municipal interest, which the Treasury opposes, and not from their inclusion in the allocation plan, which Treasury favors. Contends that the market reaction results from loss of investor confidence in continued exemption, once Congress for the first time repudiates the basic concept of exemption by "gimmick" plans to reduce the value of exemption, and that investor confidence can be restored only by scrapping all the bill's plans to curtail tax exemption of State and municipal bonds.

Argues that there is no evidence of abuse of the exemption, and that the facts on the 154 non-taxpaying millionaires shows no holding of State or municipal bonds by the group.

States that in the highest bracket, adjusted gross income of \$315,000 and over, 38 percent of the individuals had no municipals at all, and only 6 percent derived as much as 25 percent from this source. States that 7 percent of those in the middle income bracket of \$16,400 to \$31,000 adjusted gross income hold municipals, and that they can be caught by the bill.

Argues that gains from tax exemption in recent years have been more than offset by capital shrinkage of the market price of the bonds as interest rates have risen.

Contends that the bill will produce State retaliation in the form of LTP and allocation plans applicable to the \$300 billion of Federal bonds hitherto exempt from State taxation.

Argues that municipal bondholders already pay 30 percent to 35 percent to the cost of government by accepting that much less interest than comparable taxable bonds would yield, and that since 30 percent to 35 percent is the highest level of tax proposed on other "tax preference" income, there is no argument in equity for exacting it a second time from the holder of municipals.

Maintains that the State and municipal bonds exemption is not a congressionally created "tax preference," but derives from the constitutional form of our Federal system which Congress is not free to change.

Contends that the provisions are unconstitutional, and that litigation over their validity would produce market chaos for years.

Maintains that the provision taxing "arbitrage bond" interest is outrageous, since if

properly defined there are no such bonds which can be lawfully issued.

States that the Federal interest subsidy plan is a travesty of a truly optional plan when combined with the inclusion of State and municipal bond interest in LTP and allocation of deductions, because there are no tax-exempt bonds to opt for. Objects to allowing the Secretary of the Treasury to be the arbiter of what the rate of recompense should be. Argues that a 25 percent floor under the recompense rate threatens a return to the issuers of less than tax exemption has saved them. States that the plan would leave the States and municipalities helpless if the recompense was withdrawn by a later Congress after the traditional tax-exempt market had withered away.

WILLIAM SUMMERS JOHNSON, DIRECTOR OF FINANCE, CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU, HAWAII

*State and local bond interest*

Expresses the hope that the tax reform legislation will not increase the borrowing costs of State and local governments, or even leave the matter in doubt, but will help to reduce these borrowing costs.

Believes modification of the bill will reduce borrowing costs for State and local governments, achieve the purpose of the legislation, and avoid some of the philosophical objections to the bill.

Suggests that the interest-cost sharing formula be made definite and that it provide for gradually increasing cost sharing. Believes it appropriate to set the first year rate at 30 percent, and provide for an increase of 1 percentage point each year, until the 40 percent level is reached in 10 years. Contends this would accomplish the equity purposes of the limited tax preference provision, not by taxing the tax-exempt bonds, but by causing them to largely disappear.

States that this would also bring about an orderly shift from non-taxable to taxable municipals outstanding without serious capital losses.

HON. ELMER O. FRIDAY, FLORIDA STATE SENATOR

*Taxation of State and municipal bonds*

Indicates that the Council of State Governments opposes the provisions of the bill which alter the tax treatment of municipal bonds. Maintains that these proposals have disrupted the municipal bond market and have driven interest rates to a height to seriously threaten the fiscal ability of State and local governments to meet the public needs.

Believes that States would have to do one of three things if the bill is enacted: (1) reduce financing by bonds, but increase taxes; (2) pay increased interest costs, increasing the debt and taxes; or (3) reduce needed public services.

Argues that the interest subsidy would be expensive to administer and could be used to coerce local governments to depend more on Washington. States that if the subsidy is high, local governments will be forced to abandon the present system of tax-exempt bonds entirely.

THOMAS M. O'CONNOR, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF MUNICIPAL LAW OFFICERS

*Municipal bonds*

Urges that the present reciprocity of tax immunity between Federal and municipal bonds be continued.

Contends that direct or indirect taxation of municipal bonds is unconstitutional as enunciated in *McCulloch v. Maryland* and *Pollock v. Farmers' Loan & Trust Co.* (1894), and was upheld in *Hale v. Iowa State Board* (1937), *Helvering v. Gerhardt* (1938), *James v. Dravo Contracting Co.* (1937), and *First Agr. Nat. Bank v. State Tax Commission* (1938).

Maintains that the 16th amendment did not have any impact on the Pollock decision holding municipal bonds tax exempt.

Argues that *United States v. Atlas Life Insurance Co.* does not support the con-

stitutionality of the allocation of deductions proposal, as *Atlas* only involved taxation of insurance companies, not individuals, and involved allocation of income, not deductions by individuals.

WILLIAM E. SIMON, MUNICIPAL DIRECTOR, INVESTMENT BANKERS ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

*Tax treatment of State and local bond interest*

Argues that impairment of the income tax exemption of State and municipal bonds will drastically increase the cost of future local government financing, and that the increased cost will be passed along to the average taxpayer, especially homeowners, in the form of higher local taxes.

States that the market for municipal bonds has become almost completely demoralized and many local governments have been unable to issue their bonds at rates within the maximum limits fixed by law, as a result of investor reaction to the bill, specifically the limit on tax preferences and the allocation of deductions provisions. Contends that the mere threat of the proposed change of status has already raised municipal bond interest rates by at least one-half of 1 percent to a full 1 percent.

States that the allocation of deductions would affect many more taxpayers than would the limit on tax preferences. Maintains that under either proposal, the States and their municipalities will pay far more in interest costs than the Treasury will ever gain in revenue.

Argues that the proposal is in effect a capital levy in that it causes a major reduction in the market value of outstanding bonds, and that the breach of what was believed to be a constitutional exemption will permanently deter many investors from buying municipal bonds.

Maintains that the Federal interest subsidy plan would put State and local borrowing into direct competition with Federal bonds, private industry borrowing, and mortgages. This would likely bring about an across-the-board rise of three-fourths of 1 percent in the level of interest rates on taxable securities, both Federal and private. This escalation of interest rates would hit first and hardest at the already depressed home mortgage market. Results of a comprehensive survey of institutional investors conducted by Dr. Sally S. Ronk show that the Treasury would lose \$121 million annually if tax-exempt issues were replaced by taxable issues.

NORTHCUTT ELY, GENERAL COUNSEL, AMERICAN PUBLIC POWER ASSOCIATION

*State and local bond interest*

Opposes the limit on tax preferences and allocation of deductions proposals, because their combined effect would cripple the borrowing power of States and municipalities. Believes the cost of money would thereby increase and impose long-lasting inflation on local taxes which support schools and essential public services.

Also opposes the House proposal which would entitle local governments to a subsidy, contending it would largely deprive local governments of the power of self-help. Believes that to the extent local governments are willing to carry their own burdens, it is in the national interest that they be permitted to do so.

Urges deletion of House provisions affecting tax-exempt interest, and offers amendments which would accomplish this.

RICHARD D. WILSON, GENERAL COUNSEL, CONSUMER POWER, DISTRICT OF NEBRASKA

*State and local interest*

States that the House provision will increase the relative burdens of the lower-income individual and will complicate the Federal income tax system. Expresses doubts as to the constitutionality of the proposals, and believes they will increase the costs of local

governments, and that the increases will be passed on to their taxpayers.

Urge elimination of the provisions for including interest paid on State and local government bonds in the Limit on Tax Preferences and in the Allocation of Deductions proposals, as well as the provision for an interest subsidy.

HON. GRADY L. PATTERSON, TREASURER, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

*State and local bonds*

Urge that all proposals affecting the exempt status of the interest on State and local government bonds be deleted from H.R. 13270.

Contends that these proposals strike at the sovereignty of the State and will substantially increase the local tax burden due to increased interest costs.

Argues that the tax-exempt status will be destroyed by the "minimum tax" proposal, and damaged by the allocation of deductions proposal by jeopardizing investor confidence.

Maintains that the tax exemption is a direct method of revenue sharing. Feels that the interest subsidy proposal would result in administrative complexities.

Believes that investors in municipal bonds are paying a tax by accepting a lower yield. States that the secondary bond market of commercial banks will be irreparably damaged as a result of the proposed change in tax treatment of bond sales by banks.

HON. JAMES H. J. TATE, MAYOR, PHILADELPHIA, PA., AND VICE PRESIDENT U.S. CONFERENCE OF MAYORS

*State and local bond interest*

States the House proposals respecting tax-exempt bonds would permit the Federal Government to begin to exercise the most coercive form of dominion over State and local governmental functions by subjecting them to financial controls through the use of taxing power.

Characterizes the proposals as "fiscal irresponsibility," and states the financial liabilities they would impose upon State and local governments would overwhelmingly exceed any gross return to the Treasury in the form of income taxes. Claims the proposals would actually cause a net loss in tax revenues to the Federal Government.

Suggests that the passage of any legislation which would result in even the indirect taxing of tax-exempt bond interest would insure the continuing chaotic state of the bond market for years to come because litigation challenging the constitutionality of such legislation would be inevitable.

Indicates disapproval of the interest subsidy provisions of the House proposal because of the wide latitude given the Treasury to determine the amount of the subsidy and also because the Congress could curtail or eliminate the subsidy at any time. Believes this proposal would result in a loss of independence by the State and local governments.

**THE PESTICIDE PERIL—LV**

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, many people alarmed about the dangers of persistent, toxic pesticides have lamented the lack of information on how to safely dispose of the pesticides which are presently sitting on their shelves.

Unfortunately, there has been very little published on this problem. The Department of Agriculture 5 years ago put out a booklet on safe disposal of dangerous pesticides, but it apparently badly needs updating. The State of Michigan has been a leader in establishing controls on the use of DDT and related

pesticides and earlier this year ordered a ban on DDT in that State. Following through on that ban, the State Department of Natural Resources has now published a bulletin entitled, "How to Dispose of DDT," which is available on request in single copies, small numbers or large quantities. As this information is of general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

**How To Dispose of DDT**

**HOMEOWNERS**

To get rid of DDT (dichloro diphenyl trichloroethane) products such as aerosol bombs, liquid sprays, powders, and dusts—bury them on your own property. If each homeowner does so, these products will be safely dispersed and will reduce dangerous concentrations of DDT and other toxic materials at public disposal sites. By law, ingredients are listed on the label.

1. Select a place away from trees and other desirable shrubs or plants and at least 50 feet from any well or surface water such as a lake, stream, pond, or drain.

2. Dig a hole deep enough to cover the DDT products and containers with three feet of dirt.

3. Aerosol (pressurized) cans should not be punctured, but put in the hole intact.

4. Glass and metal containers should be opened and put in the hole tilted down to allow drainage. The glass should not be broken.

5. Bags and boxes should be buried intact.

6. The hole should not be left open. It should be filled with three feet of dirt immediately.

The only exception to the above recommendations is if the water table on your property is less than five feet below the ground. (If you do not know your underground water level, call your local health department.) If the water table on your property is less than five feet below the ground, your health department will advise you on what to do.

(NOTE.—DDT and other toxic products should not be flushed down the toilet, poured down a drain, put in the garbage or trash can, or taken to a public dump or landfill.)

**AGRICULTURAL, COMMERCIAL AND MUNICIPAL USERS**

The disposal of DDT in larger quantities should be done in one of the following ways:

*A. Bury on own property*

1. Select a site at least six feet above the highest ground water table in an area that is not likely to be used for crops or building purposes. The site should be at least 300 feet from any well or surface body of water including lakes, streams, ponds and drainage ditches.

2. Dig a hole deep enough to cover the insecticide and containers with three feet of soil.

3. Open containers of liquids before placing them in the hole so as to permit drainage of the insecticide from the containers.

4. Place bags or cartons containing wettable powders or dusts in the hole intact.

5. Fill in the hole with soil immediately.

*B. Disposal through Michigan Department of Natural Resources*

Notify your field office, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, of products to be disposed of, particularly those in 30 and 55 gallon drum lots. The Michigan Department of Natural Resources will take them to central collection facilities. Here, storage facilities will be posted and locked and materials will be held for proper disposal.

In case of accidental poisoning or suspected poisoning—a local poison control center or physician should be contacted immediately.

**PACE OF TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM TOO SLOW**

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I welcome the administration's announcement of further troop withdrawals from Vietnam by December, but I am disappointed. Our disengagement from the war is too slow.

It is time to recognize our mistakes in Vietnam, to wind down the tensions of the war, to end needless American deaths and to end the costs and inflation brought by the war. We must turn the war back to the South Vietnamese, fairly and systematically, but completely.

According to a recent editorial in the Minneapolis Tribune the administration's total scheduled withdrawal of 60,000 men in about 6 months is an average of 10,000 men a month—an average which would keep U.S. troops in Vietnam until 1974. This is not "ending" the war.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Withdrawal of 35,000 More Troops" from the Minneapolis Tribune for Wednesday, September 17, be printed in the RECORD.

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

**THE WITHDRAWAL OF 35,000 MORE TROOPS**

President Nixon's decision to withdraw 35,000 more troops from Vietnam by Dec. 15 is another step toward winding down U.S. involvement in the war. But it is not enough.

The total scheduled withdrawal of 60,000 men in about six months represents an average of about 10,000 a month. At this rate, if it were to be continued, American troops would not leave Vietnam until nearly 1974—or four years from next Christmas. Four years is longer than Americans fought in World War II.

In reaching his decision, Mr. Nixon apparently sought a middle ground between the recommendations of some advisers (civilians) who wanted a bigger troop cut and of other advisers (military) who are resisting pressures to withdraw from Vietnam.

Since President Nixon first pledged 18 months ago that a new administration would end the war, 19,000 Americans have died in Vietnam, died in a war that few still say is vital to our national interest. Meanwhile, while the President tells the nation that he will not negotiate the right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future free from outside influence, this country continues to prop up a repressive, unrepresentative, corruption-scarred government in Saigon. And this country continues a massive presence in Vietnam which not only is devastating vast areas of that country but which saps the will of many South Vietnamese to fight what should be their cause, not ours.

Through his announcement Tuesday, Mr. Nixon has moved in the right direction and has demonstrated, we believe, his desire to end the war. But he has again made an end of U.S. involvement dependent upon a response from North Vietnam and the Viet Cong and dependent upon the actions of the South Vietnamese generals. The President has not—or at least his announcement suggests he has not—made the decision to get out of Vietnam within a reasonable time. Ten thousand troops a month is too slow.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARD ASSOCIATION ENDORSES S. 2625, THE URBAN AND RURAL EDUCATION BILL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the National School Board Association whose president is Mr. Boardman W. Moore, a distinguished Californian and a former president of the California School Board Association, has strongly urged the enactment of the Urban and Rural Education Act of 1969 which I introduced on July 15, 1969. In addition, Mr. August Steinhilber, the director of Federal and congressional relations for the National School Boards Association sent me a more detailed endorsement from the National School Boards Association. Mr. Steinhilber said:

As correctly indicated in your statement introducing the bill, NSBA is worried that the dire necessity for providing compensatory education cannot be accomplished because the financial resources are not available. Many cities and rural areas simply cannot pay the costs.

Your bill, if enacted and funded, would provide this additional support for those districts whose needs are greatest with additional financial assistance to bolster programs for our younger children in the elementary schools. We hope this concept might be incorporated in the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act now being reviewed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I ask unanimous consent that these letters and an accompanying chart be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,  
Evanston, Ill., August 6, 1969.

The Honorable GEORGE MURPHY,  
The U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: As indicated in our testimony before the Senate Education Committee June 17, NSBA is acutely aware of the education needs of the urban and rural children and supports full funding of all ESEA programs as well as Title I.

Your Bill S. 2625 will increase the opportunity to reach the children early in their school careers. It is well documented at the local level that early identification and remediation pays off manyfold financially as well as educationally.

Your presentation of your bill on the floor of the Senate eloquently describes the need for this legislation. We heartily endorse the measure.

Sincerely,

BOARDMAN W. MOORE.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,  
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1969.

Honorable GEORGE MURPHY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MURPHY: Although our President Mr. Boardman Moore wrote to you on August 6 endorsing your bill S. 2625, the problems of the educationally disadvantaged are so acute that we believe our position should be very clear.

We applaud your interest in the education of the disadvantaged and support your bill. As correctly indicated in your statement introducing the bill, NSBA is worried that the dire necessity for providing compensatory education for disadvantaged children cannot be accomplished because the financial

resources are not available. Many cities and rural areas simply cannot pay the costs.

Some of the great cities of the nation are characterized by a disproportionately large low-income population, above average number of school children coming from deprived home environments, and a deteriorating economic base. Frequently a large low-income population, declining or at best stagnant property values, and the flight of commerce, industry and middle-income residents combine with very high social costs (that pre-empt a rising share of available revenue resources) to restrict the capability to finance schools. Often they even fare poorly under state and federal grant programs. Increasingly, tax rates in these cities are among the highest; the quality of their governmental programs, once among the best, are now second rate; municipal structures are poorly maintained.

These old cities, particularly frequent in the Northeast and Middle West—some at the hub of urban areas, others scattered throughout the area—are obliged to spend less and less per child relative to their more prosperous neighbors, despite the fact that their children are particularly in need of the stronger education programs. The financial problems of the cities are further increased by rising costs of regular educational programs. For example, land costs for new schools in Baltimore have reached \$300,000 an acre.

Poorer rural communities, particularly conspicuous in the South and Middle West, are characterized by consolidation and mechanization of farm holdings with reduced job opportunities and declining populations, by abandoned rural and town structures, and by little or no new construction. Taxable values on property tax rolls lag far behind national growth rates. An increasing proportion of properties in these places is financed by out-of-area institutional investors (rather

than the town bank), producing a continuing out-flow of cash income from the community. At best, the local economy just manages to hold its own. Appalachia-type pockets of poverty abound. Frequently, the school fiscal problem is further aggravated by diseconomies of scale, because the school population is declining at the same time that progress in educational technology calls for larger school units.

By contrast, high income suburbia is financially well off. Using Cleveland, Ohio and some of its suburban areas for examples: Last year Cleveland spent approximately \$578 per child for public education; Shaker Heights spent \$958; Bratenahl \$1,342; and, Cuyahoga Heights \$1,344. The attached table, based on 1964-65 data, further illustrates these differences.

It is well documented that students from good homes in middle- and high-income environments make better progress in school than underprivileged children. They may be able to progress even under relatively weak school programs. Students without these advantages require more school resources. Since some children's education is considerably more expensive than that of others, the undertaking to afford each child an equal educational opportunity requires an unequal investment per child.

Your bill, if enacted and funded, would provide this additional support for those districts whose needs are greatest with additional financial assistance to bolster programs for our younger children in the elementary schools. We hope this concept might be incorporated in the extension of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act now being reviewed by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Sincerely yours,  
AUGUST W. STEINHILBER,  
Director, Federal and Congressional  
Relations.

PER CAPITA AND PER PUPIL CURRENT EXPENDITURE FOR LOCAL SCHOOLS, CENTRAL CITY (CC) AND OUTSIDE CENTRAL CITY (OCC) AREAS, 37 LARGEST STANDARD METROPOLITAN STATISTICAL AREAS (SMSA), 1964-65

	Per capita			Per pupil		
	SMSA	CC	OCC	SMSA	CC	OCC
Los Angeles-Long Beach, Calif.	\$118	\$94	\$134	\$558	\$424	\$654
San Bernardino-Riverside-Ontario, Calif.	123	142	115	578	498	631
San Diego, Calif.	107	89	129	549	485	621
San Francisco-Oakland, Calif.	127	79	158	701	565	758
Denver, Colo.	111	95	124	471	493	457
Washington, D.C.	107	90	117	545	508	562
Miami, Fla.	94	94	94	503	503	503
Tampa-St. Petersburg, Fla.	67	67	67	362	362	362
Atlanta, Ga.	86	69	100	318	234	403
Chicago, Ill.	86	67	109	508	433	578
Indianapolis, Ind.	106	79	176	471	407	579
Louisville, Ky.-Indiana	71	45	97	416	350	455
New Orleans, La.	57	50	71	333	310	369
Baltimore, Md.	85	81	90	429	407	452
Boston, Mass.	84	68	88	493	490	499
Detroit, Mich.	108	81	129	509	454	539
Minneapolis-St. Paul, Minn.	108	80	135	564	527	587
Kansas City, Mo.-Kans.	91	59	117	494	425	531
St. Louis, Mo.-Illinois	82	68	88	532	411	594
Newark, N.J.	106	96	109	595	515	619
Paterson-Clifton-Passaic, N.J.	95	76	101	557	477	579
Buffalo, N.Y.	125	74	157	694	507	777
New York, N.Y.	121	96	181	790	728	889
Rochester, N.Y.	138	104	172	807	700	885
Cincinnati, Ohio-Kentucky-Indiana	79	78	79	472	439	494
Cleveland, Ohio	94	81	105	528	433	609
Columbus, Ohio	82	70	115	410	368	500
Dayton, Ohio	101	100	102	431	431	432
Portland, Ore.-Washington	115	92	133	543	444	616
Philadelphia, Pa.-New Jersey	88	63	108	586	477	656
Pittsburgh, Pa.	90	58	100	521	419	544
Providence, R.I.	70	64	72	430	436	427
Dallas, Tex.	73	60	93	422	334	597
Houston, Tex.	86	62	164	430	311	794
San Antonio, Tex.	65	(1)	(1)	310	(1)	(1)
Seattle, Wash.	119	74	169	527	476	556
Milwaukee, Wis.	85	66	116	485	421	568
Unweighted average	97	82	113	524	449	573

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

Source: Compiled from various reports of the Government Division, U.S. Bureau of the Census and from the Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

September 24, 1969

**UNDERSTANDINGS COULD BE ADDED TO THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION**

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, public hearings on the Genocide Convention were held in January and February 1950, by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. On May 23, 1950, the subcommittee reported the Convention to the full committee and recommended that four specific understandings and one declaration be embodied in the resolution consenting to ratification if the full Foreign Relations Committee decided to recommend approval of the Convention.

Those understandings were as follows:

First, that article IX shall be understood in the traditional sense of responsibility to another state for injuries sustained by nations of the complaining state in violation of principles of international law, and shall not be understood as meaning that a state can be held liable for damages for injuries inflicted by it on its own nations.

Second, that the United States Government understands and construes the crime of genocide, which it undertakes to punish in accordance with this Convention, to mean the commission of any of the acts enumerated in article II of the Convention, with the intent to destroy an entire national, ethnical, racial, or religious group within the territory of the United States, in such manner as to affect a substantial portion of the group concerned.

Third, that the United States Government understands and construes the words "mental harm" appearing in article II of this Convention to mean permanent physical injury to mental faculties.

Fourth, that the United States Government understands and construes the words "complicity in genocide" appearing in article II of this Convention to mean participation before and after the fact and aiding and abetting in the commission of the crime of genocide.

The Declaration read:

In giving its advice and consent to the ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Senate of the United States of America does so considering this to be an exercise of the authority of the Federal Government to define and punish offenses against the law of nations, expressly conferred by Article I, section 8, clause 10 of the United States Constitution, and consequently, the traditional jurisdiction of the several States of the Union with regard to crime is in no way abridged.

Mr. President, since the 82d Congress, no further action has been taken on this convention. I think that many of the objections raised to this Convention can be answered by the language contained in these "Understandings," or similar reasonable language that could be worked out. Let us then consider the possibility of just such reservations but let us take action on this Convention.

**FOREIGN AID FOR GHANA—SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBERS WITHOUT A PROGRAM**

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the American taxpayers might

be interested in knowing that last year the U.S. Government under the AID program approved a project estimated to cost over \$1 million the purpose of which was to provide identification cards for prospective voters in Ghana.

Allegedly this short-term project was for the purpose of aiding the citizens of that country in the elections which were about to be held. Later when it became apparent that this would not be feasible, rather than abandoning the project and saving money the Agency just changed the stated purpose of the program and called it a 3-year project to supply the citizens of that country with social security identification numbers.

Of just what use social security numbers would be for citizens of Ghana, a country without a social security program, is unexplained.

The Electoral Commission of Ghana has expressed strong doubt as to the need for any such program and has indicated a reluctance to meet any portion of the cost; but the fact that the Government of Ghana is not enthusiastic about the project seemed unimportant to our AID officials, and as of the last notice they indicated their intention to proceed as long as the money lasted.

This is just one example of the loose manner in which those administering this AID program are handling the tax-payers' money.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter dated July 14, 1969, signed by Mr. J. K. Mansfield, Inspector General of Foreign Assistance, Department of State, and addressed to Mr. John A. Hannah, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, wherein he comments on this project, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE,

July 14, 1969.

HON. JOHN A. HANNAH,  
Administrator, Agency for International Development.

DEAR DR. HANNAH: Early this year, we examined a proposed AID-financed voter identification card program for Ghana. As then conceived, the program was to provide identification cards for voters in the elections scheduled for this fall.

We found it hard to see how a program of this complexity and magnitude could be carried out before the elections. On February 7 we accordingly wrote to the Agency and expressed our doubts that the program had a reasonable chance of producing benefits worth its very considerable cost—then estimated at over \$1 million.

The Agency's reply of March 14 stressed the critical importance of giving the citizens of Ghana faith in the integrity of the forthcoming elections, and said that the identification card project could do much to help.

When my associates Joseph A. O'Hearn and James L. South visited Ghana a few weeks later, they learned that the planned program had been very much changed. Now, it was seen as a three-year project, in which only a portion of the voters in this fall's election would receive cards, and in which it would not be necessary to have a card to vote. This change increased our doubts about the worth of the project.

Last week, we checked with the Ghana Desk and learned that the project has been changed for a third time. Now, we were told,

it is no longer planned to use the identification cards for this fall's elections, and that the cards are now to be multipurpose—for social security identification, and the like. We were told also that it now appears that the Ghana Electoral Commission may be unwilling or unable to pick up the local currency costs of the program.

These successive transformations of this project have served only to reinforce the doubts we had originally concerning its worth.

I would be most grateful if the Agency could now review this matter in the light of these changed circumstances and give us its judgment as to whether the program merits continued United States financial support.

Sincerely,

J. K. MANSFIELD.

**COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS**

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, there is presently pending in the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee a bill, S. 2523, the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1969. This bill would extend, amend, and improve legislation under which millions of Americans who are touched by the tragedy of mental and emotional illnesses may find new hope, and through which this country may move toward preventing mental illness.

I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and hope we may see it reach the floor sometime during the first session. I am proud to represent a State whose citizens have made such great progress in meeting their responsibilities in the treatment of our mentally ill population.

The North Dakota State Hospital administrator, Mr. Henry A. Lahaug, has just informed me that North Dakota received a gold award for comprehensive mental health services to rural communities by the American Psychiatric Association. The basis for this award is explained in a September 17 article in the Jamestown Sun. I ask unanimous consent that this article and Dr. Lahaug's September 19 letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Jamestown Sun, Sept. 17, 1969]

**GOLD AWARD ACCEPTED FOR STATE HERE**

The Mental Health and Retardation Division of the North Dakota State Department of Health has been given a gold award for comprehensive mental health services to rural communities.

The award was announced at the American Psychiatric Association's Hospital and Community Psychiatry Service meeting in Houston.

The award said North Dakota had effectively demonstrated that a sparsely populated rural area can offer comprehensive mental health services to its citizens.

The program included five community mental health centers available to nearly 500,000 of the state's residents and the state hospital which has upgraded its services and reorganized into regional units corresponding to regions served by the centers.

Dr. Hubert A. Carbone, M.D., received the award for the hospital.

In addition to the state hospital here, the five comprehensive mental health centers cited in the award include facilities located in Bismarck, Grand Forks, Fargo and Minot.

Henry Lahaug, hospital administrator, announced in addition to the award, the Jamestown mental health center is moving to a new location. The center, formerly located at 424 4th Ave. NE, will move its facility to a recently completed building on I-94 business loop east.

The state hospital has full accreditation.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE HOSPITAL,  
Jamestown, N. Dak., September 19, 1969.  
Hon. QUENTIN N. BURDICK,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BURDICK: We are taking the liberty of calling your attention to the fact that North Dakota just received a National Award, *A Gold Medal Award* for its outstanding program in Mental Health. A clip from the Jamestown Sun release is enclosed.

The American Psychiatric Association each year awards a gold, silver and bronze medal to outstanding programs.

It may also be mentioned that North Dakota now is 2nd in the nation in terms of Community Mental Health Service coverage to its citizens. The State of Kentucky is No. 1 covering 87% of its citizens, North Dakota, No. 2, with 80% and Vermont No. 3 with 44% coverage. Colorado, Massachusetts, Montana and Michigan came 4th with 39-42%. The areas in North Dakota not yet fully covered with Mental Health Services are the Dickinson, Williston and Devils Lake regions.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY A. LAHAUG,  
Hospital Administrator.

#### A CALL TO ACTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of the Congress and the public an excellent editorial, "A Call to Action," in Parade magazine for Sunday, September 21, 1969. What the editorial calls for is for the Nation to set goals which we can achieve by the 200th anniversary of the Nation in 1976.

This Nation set a goal to place a man on the moon before 1970. By concentrating on that goal, we achieved it. While we have done this we have failed in other even more pressing areas. In the field of health, housing, hunger, education, and pollution, to name only a few, we have yet to meet the challenge they present.

Twenty years ago we said we believe in a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American family. We failed to achieve that goal because we failed to set precise numbers and appropriate specific resources. In the Housing Act of 1968 we finally did set a national housing goal of 2.6 million units a year for a decade. But we still must build those houses.

We have not yet even set specific targets and goals for other programs. Why not eradicate hunger by 1976? Let us set that as a goal, determine what resources are needed to do it, establish the programs, and get the job done.

We should do the same for air pollution, water pollution, and education. Surely we should set a goal of finding a way to eradicate cancer and to reduce heart disease. The funds and resources could be concentrated to achieve it.

This is what Parade calls for. The time has long passed when we should follow their advice. Let us act now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

#### A CALL TO ACTION

In less than seven years, the United States will celebrate its 200th anniversary as a nation.

On July 4, 1976, our President and assorted orators will congratulate us as a people on our many and monumental achievements.

Not the least of course, will be our landing of Americans on the moon.

Having harnessed our special strengths—money, men, materials and the organizational genius to control them—we conquered space before 1970.

Why can we not conquer some of our social problems on earth by 1976?

PARADE today suggests that if we can put men on the moon, then surely we can eradicate hunger in our nation by that target-date.

Surely by then we can cleanse the air we've poisoned and the water we've polluted.

Surely—by concentrating our scientists and resources in a crash program such as the Manhattan Project in World War II that created the A-bomb in five years—we can produce a cure for cancer.

Surely we can build adequate housing for the poor and end some of our educational and economic injustices.

But first we must make one or some or all of these achievements a national goal and July 4, 1976, a national deadline.

Can we do this? A nation that has conquered the secrets of space and nature in record time can with strong leadership conquer problems of poverty, pollution, and spirit.

In part it will be a matter of money. More important, it will be a matter of attitude—of discipline and compassion.

If each of us can change his mind and heart, only a little, America will have entered the Age of the Possible. And we will proudly record on the 200th anniversary of the Republic that we reached the moon and put our glory to work at home.

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

#### FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2547) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. SPONG obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, 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. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, according to statistics recently released by the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, 24 percent of the Virginia population had poor diets in 1965. Although persons with poor diets could be found in all income strata, those with low incomes, especially those with incomes of less than \$3,000 annually, were particularly likely to have inadequate diets.

During the Easter and Memorial Day recesses I toured various parts of Virginia, discussing nutritional problems with low-income persons and health and welfare personnel. I also studied the operation of the existing commodity distribution and food stamp programs.

In my opinion, four modifications in the program are needed. First, free food stamps should be available to families with very little or no income.

Second, food stamps should be offered for sale at least several times a month and in additional places such as banks, post offices, and other public and non-profit agencies.

Third, persons should be allowed to purchase less than a full month's supply of stamps at one time. For many low-income persons it is simply impossible to obtain enough money at one time to purchase a full month's supply of stamps as is currently required.

Fourth, limited items necessary for personal hygiene and household sanitation should be covered by food stamps.

I have long felt that programs which are well operated on the local level are preferable to federally administered programs, since those on a local level are more likely to understand the specific nature and problems of the political jurisdictions. At the same time, I believe that recent statistics indicate the need for food assistance programs in every locality. In some localities the need for such assistance will, of course, be quite small. It is, however, unlikely that there is any political jurisdiction which does not have a few low-income persons.

Under proposals which will be made during consideration of this bill, all counties would be required to have food assistance programs by January 1971. In my State this would mean more than 40 jurisdictions would need to establish such programs in the next 15 months.

There are a number of flaws in the existing food assistance programs. The ideas behind these programs are, however, basically good. We are now working on a bill which seeks to eliminate existing inadequacies.

I commend Senator ELLENDER and the other members of the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee for their work on this bill and for reporting it so promptly to the Senate in order that we may give consideration to these pressing matters.

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

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to state that the four conditions named are incorporated in the bill, except the one to buy soap.

Mr. SPONG. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Many Senators desire free food stamps for people having a low income. The bill provides that the stamps be free to recipients, but that they be paid for by the State or local organizations, and that amount is only \$3.

It is my belief that in order to get complete cooperation on this bill with the Federal Government and the local authorities, the local authorities should at least be made to participate in it to that extent.

Mr. SPONG. I commend the Senator from Louisiana and the committee for the attention they have devoted to these areas and to this matter of free food stamps particularly.

I listened with great interest yesterday when he made his presentation. My own views are more nearly akin to those of the Senator from Kansas, who also spoke yesterday afternoon on the subject of free food stamps.

But I do think that it is a salutary thing that the committee has come to the floor with such a thoughtful and extensive bill and that there will be an opportunity today for us to fully weigh the alternatives with regard to the food stamp program.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose the Senator concedes that this program can be made effective by having the local people participate in it.

Mr. SPONG. I said that in my remarks. I think that is always desirable.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I have said, historically, much of the work has been done, in some cases, by the Salvation Army and church societies in various parts of the country.

The bill before the Senate does contemplate free food stamps for persons whose income is, say, \$30 or even \$40. But inasmuch as the Federal Government assumes all the expenses of the food stamps, it strikes me that the amount to be paid by the State or the local charities, say, up to \$3 per family, is truly a small amount. The only difference is that our bill while it provides for free food stamps to recipients, we also provide that they be paid for by the local people or the county, whereas the amendment of the Senator from Kansas would provide for payment by the Federal Government.

Mr. SPONG. I understand that. I am glad that this matter will be discussed thoroughly. I thank the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I urge immediate passage of S. 2547, a bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964. I feel strongly about the need to pass this bill because it incorporates many provisions of S. 1864, the food stamp bill I offered on April 18.

The committee bill represents the culmination of a tremendous effort on the part of several members of the committee. Everyone here is familiar with

the fine job Senator McGOVERN has done in focusing attention on the problem of hunger and malnutrition in America. His Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has brought together, for the benefit of the Senate and the Nation as a whole, the best available data and testimony with regard to the incidence and extent of hunger in this country.

Many Members of the Senate have chosen to travel around the country to acquire firsthand information about hunger and malnutrition. I toured my own State to examine the school lunch, food stamp, and commodity distribution programs which are operating in Georgia. When the American public became aware of the grave problem of hunger in America, it was quick to express its indignation. Many citizens felt that their elected public officials had done too much talking and too little legislating on the problem.

Realizing that our current food assistance programs have serious flaws, I introduced corrective legislation. My study of the commodity distribution program convinced me that it could never prove satisfactory in providing food assistance for those individuals who are unable to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. There are grave problems of logistics and distribution in this program. Moreover, it is inflexible and not easily adaptable to the special diets required by so many of the elderly and the very young. However, the most damning aspect of the commodity distribution program is that it is a dole and a complete giveaway. Therefore, it tends to be destructive of human dignity and self-respect.

Upon reaching these conclusions about the commodity distribution program, I sought ways to improve our food stamp program. Although the food stamp program has great potential, shortcomings in present law make it less attractive than the commodity distribution plan in many cases. The flaws of the current food stamp program may be divided into three categories: First, the high cost of coupons; second, inadequate food bonuses, and third, inaccessibility of food stamps.

For example, a southern family of four with a monthly net income of \$130 is required to pay \$48 for food stamps under the present system. My bill provided that no eligible family would be required to pay more than 25 percent of its income to purchase food stamps.

Under the committee bill, the maximum charge for food stamps is limited to 30 percent of household income. While I prefer the 25-percent figure of my bill, I believe that the 30-percent figure is a substantial improvement over the present system.

It is a sad commentary that under the present system even those families who qualify for assistance under the food stamp program and are able to pay the price of the coupons do not, in many cases, get a nutritionally adequate diet. The southern family of four, to which I previously referred, is allowed only \$72 for total food purchases under the present system. With today's rapidly inflating food prices, \$72 is hardly adequate

to provide food for a family of four for 1 month. The committee bill makes a substantial improvement in this area by raising the coupon allotment to an amount equal to the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.

The third shortcoming, the inaccessibility of food stamps to eligible households, is somewhat ameliorated by the committee bill. The committee adopted a provision contained in my bill which provides for the deduction of the charge for coupons from an eligible family's public assistance payments when authorized by the household. This provision will be especially helpful to aged families who find it difficult to make a separate trip each time coupons are being issued. Also, the committee would assure greater accessibility of food stamps by providing that coupons shall be issued on at least monthly and semimonthly schedules. This provision was also contained in my bill.

One provision of my food stamp amendments, which would have greatly improved distribution of food stamps, was the section authorizing the sale of food stamps in the Post Office. Unfortunately, the committee did not see fit to adopt this provision of my bill.

I regret that the committee rejected my proposals for free food stamps for families with no income or minimal income. The committee bill provides that the State agency would be required to arrange for payment from State or local sources such portion of the coupon charge as may be necessary to insure participation by those individuals having no income. I feel that it would be more desirable for the Federal Government to provide free food stamps for those individuals with little or no income. Such a provision would cost little, and would be a more efficient and effective means of providing adequate nutrition to the poorest of the poor. Therefore, I will support Senator DOLE's amendment to provide free stamps to those individuals with incomes of less than \$30 per month.

Of course, no member of the Senate Agriculture Committee would claim that we have reached a perfect solution in our attempt to deal with the problem of hunger and malnutrition. As we learn more and more about the extent of hunger in this country, and as we develop more sophisticated methods of dealing with this problem, there will be a need to revise existing programs, both by regulation and legislation. Therefore, I am happy that the committee saw fit to include my proposal for the establishment of an interdepartmental committee to be known as the National Nutrition Committee. Under this section, the Secretary of Agriculture would establish an interdepartmental committee to coordinate the efforts of all departments of the Federal Government and the private food industry in the field of nutrition. This committee would utilize the technical expertise and imaginative ideas of private industry in attacking the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

As Chairman ELLENDER has explained, the other sections of S. 2547 will provide

substantial improvements over the present system. Under this bill, various State eligibility standards will be more uniform. The bill would permit direct commodity distribution during the transition to a food stamp program. With the adoption of this bill, the food stamp program should prove so attractive that most counties would prefer to participate in the program rather than the commodity distribution program.

Of course, no program changes would mean anything without a massive infusion of additional funds. I believe that the Senate Agriculture Committee has responded generously by increasing the appropriation authorization from \$315 million in fiscal year 1969, to \$750 million in fiscal 1970, and one and fifteen billion dollars in each fiscal year, 1971 and 1972.

In my mind, one of the strong points of S. 2547 is the fact that it provides for needed improvements in the food stamp program within the framework of the Department of Agriculture. Here of late, there has been substantial agitation to move the food programs from the Department of Agriculture to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I can see no justification for such a move. An objective appraisal should convince any observer that the shortcomings of our food programs in the past have not been due to the inherent inadequacy of the Department of Agriculture, but to restrictive legislation and inadequate funding. Employees of the Department of Agriculture have considerable expertise in administering food programs. They are some of the most dedicated and capable of our public servants.

Certainly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appears to have enough problems it cannot solve without giving it the additional responsibility of feeding the hungry of the Nation. Until such time as I am shown that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can do a better job of feeding hungry people than the Department of Agriculture, I shall fight the transfer of food programs with every resource at my command.

The bill now before the Senate provides the legislative framework and necessary funding to enable the Department of Agriculture to get the job done. Let us give that Department a chance.

Mr. President, I do not believe that any Member of this body will deny that there is considerable hunger and malnutrition in this country. I believe that we all realize that it is indefensible for a country with as much agricultural abundance as ours to continue to tolerate this national disgrace.

I urge the Senate to act now to pass this food stamp legislation so that the House may have an opportunity to act before the end of the year. There is no excuse for delay. The facts are on the table. It is within our capacity to alleviate hunger and malnutrition in this country now.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, 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. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

#### THE ARAB REFUGEE PROBLEM IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, since the June 1967 Arab-Israeli war, we have all rediscovered the tragedy of the Arab refugees. Unfortunately many have concluded either that their fate was unavoidable or that the Israelis must be at fault. Articles appear frequently with full-scale color photos of ragged children with empty soup bowls. Columnists note that Al Fatah finds its recruits primarily among the Arab refugees. United Nations relief workers shake their heads and complain that no solution appears possible. We are led to believe that it was always so. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Arab refugee has a little-known counterpart. In the aftermath of the 1948 war for independence, the Arab States summarily expelled or condoned harassment of their substantial Jewish populations. From Algeria to Yemen and Egypt to Syria, Jewish communities dating from the fall of the second temple in A.D. 70 were uprooted and thrust toward Israel. In many states the largest part of the nation's merchant classes left with the clothes they could pack in a duffel bag.

In the 21 years since, the energies and compassion of Israel have absorbed almost all of this second diaspora. It was an act of faith that embraced the dispossessed and sponsored in the first months of Israel nationhood, the largest refugee settlement program the world has ever seen.

The problem was very similar to the problem facing the Arab States. There were 450,000 Jewish refugees, perhaps a hundred thousand more than the original Arab exodus. They were Sephardic Jews, often illiterate, with Arabic backgrounds completely foreign to the Western, modern culture of Israel. They had been expelled from communities with nearly 2,000 years of family and tradition.

All of the rhetoric of imperialism self-righteously used by Arab socialists—the expropriation of land traditionally belonging to the native, the displacement of the native artisan—applies as well to the Middle Eastern Jew expelled by Arab socialists. Like many other third world refugees, he too was suddenly deprived of property valued for thousands of years; he too faced a new and incomprehensible world; he too suffered the trauma of scampering from a reign of terror.

Unlike the Arab refugee, though, the Middle Eastern Jew had no offer of compensation and surely no offer to return to the home of his fathers. Unlike the Arab refugee, he escaped to a world of technology, industry, and knowledge which he barely, if at all, understood. And unlike the Arab refugee, he and one-half million others fled to a nation already burdened with the survivors of

Auschwitz. It is one of the human wonders of our age that nearly no American has ever heard of a Middle Eastern Jewish refugee. Twenty years later, they are the citizens of Israel, the sinews of one of the world's newest and fastest growing nations and a reproach to every nation that has refused its compassion to the poor.

The fate of the Arab refugees is a chilling contrast. In the paroxysm of Israel's birth, with Arab armies poised on three sides, terrified Arabs succumbed to the urging of Palestinian newspapers and Egyptian radios and fled their homes. Believing that the victorious Arab legions would wipe the Israelis off the face of the earth, they left with their kitchenware, children and clothes, expecting to return in a matter of weeks and share in the spoils of a new Palestine.

The bravado of Arab airwaves in 1948 began the wandering trek, that over 21 years has led to hopelessness. Rejected, despite the rhetoric of Arab brotherhood, by the states surrounding Palestine, the refugees languish in explosive boredom. Life degenerates to a fantasy where violence and violence alone intersects reality. It is here that Al Fatah recruits. It is here that the Middle East burns. It is here that hatred is fueled by squalor. Until the Arab refugee is embraced by societies that want him, the Middle East will continue to burn.

The responsibility for the million lives that waste in refugee camps belongs uniquely to no one source, but should lie heavily on the Arab conscience. Even the Israelis have been more willing to bear their burden of responsibility for the Arab refugee. Lands formerly belonging to Arabs have long since become part of the Israeli economy and should either be returned or compensated for. While obviously reluctant, since Palestinian Arabs would be an extraordinary security problem, Israel nonetheless has offered to 100,000 the possibility of return, and to the rest, compensation for their losses. Similar offers have been made throughout the last 20 years. The Arab world has refused to accept an offer from the Israeli Government which would mean implicit recognition of the existence of the State of Israel—something no Arab politician has been willing to do for the last 20 years. While we might sympathize with the outraged pride of the losers in 1948, we must weigh in the balance the squalor of the refugee camps in 1969.

Far less excusable than Arab refusal to accept Israel funds is the treatment doled out to the refugees by their brothers in Islam. Channing B. Richardson, professor of political science at Hamilton College, N.Y., in his study of the refugee problem, reports:

With a few exceptions, the refugees have not been wanted in the countries into which they have fled. Egypt evacuated the few thousand refugees who fled there, turning them back into the tiny Gaza strip and maintaining close guard lest any of the 200,000 slip back. Lebanon places severe restrictions on the refugees who have fled into her territories. Syria, with the largest usable area of arable land upon which hundreds of thousands could begin life anew, will accept no more.

September 24, 1969

Only the tiny kingdom of Jordan granted the refugees citizenship and began some tentative resettlement programs.

The reasons involved reflect no credit on the Arab nations. In many cases, tight control of the land by a few wealthy families has led to exploitation that no Palestinian would accept. At times as much as four-fifths of the crop could be demanded in return for seed and the use of land. In many cases governments were more interested in the foreign exchange available in U.N. relief payments than they were in genuine resettlement. Each successful self-supporting Palestinian represented one less relief check and the end to an easy flow of hard Western currency. Nearly \$425 million in relief has flowed into the region; and with the demands of modernization, Arab regimes have, in effect, decided to sacrifice the refugees to the exigencies of development. Finally, the refugees, subsisting on United Nations checks, can afford to work for far lower wages than the already low-paid Arab worker. Fear of a flood of cheap labor has led to legal restrictions on employment very similar to American immigration policy on the Mexican border. While all of these reasons are in some way understandable, they do not add up to an impressive or humanitarian record, and they certainly undercut the often outrageous moral self-righteousness of Arab spokesmen crying about the fate of refugees.

The United States, itself, is not entirely free from blame. Since 1948, we have blindly, though of good will, financed the U.N. refugee camps, supporting nearly 70 percent of the cost. The Soviets, meanwhile, despite their claims of undying friendship for the Arab peoples, have refused all along to contribute that first penny for refugee relief. With such policies, much like our welfare programs, we have made it economically profitable for both the host country and the refugee to remain unsettled. The entire program is a huge disincentive to solutions. Clearly a more humane and ultimately successful approach would provide incentives in the form of foreign credits for U.S. goods and materials. Tied to a settlement program, the credits could be limited to agricultural or industrial development programs that employ and settle the residents of the refugee camps. Naturally, some provision would have to be made for the old, sick, or disabled among the refugees, but surely that is not an insurmountable barrier.

There is a precedent for refugee settlement. Following the 1948 war, nearly 100,000 Arab refugees remained in Israel. Over a several year period, the Israelis managed to assimilate all but the "hard core"—the disabled, the sick, the old, the very young. The program produced the high Arab per capita wage in the Middle East. No one should delude himself into thinking that a U.S.-sponsored program is going to succeed immediately, but we must, I think, take the first step. With the lure of American dollars, to be given or withheld, Arab lands might yet assimilate the refugees.

Mr. President, I have directed my remarks today to the particular problem

of the Arab refugees, because there it seemed that the United States might make an immediate impact. But the deeper problem remains—the problem of finding a path to lasting peace in the Middle East. For as we all recognize, the tragic plight of the refugees will not be fully alleviated until peace is attained.

Five months ago in this Chamber I had occasion to remark that a settlement could not be imposed by outside parties. Nothing that has happened since then leads me to change that view. Let me therefore repeat:

Peace will come to the Middle East when, and only when, the direct parties to the conflict sit down together, and together resolve their differences. This, in turn, will come when, and only when, the Arab states are prepared to concede the most elementary point in international relations: Israel's right to exist, and that, finally, will come when, and only when, Israel's own strength and America's firmness of purpose make it finally and unequivocally clear that Israel is not going to be overwhelmed by the weight of Arab numbers and Soviet arms.

Let us hope, Mr. President, that responsible Arab leaders will grasp that point before they themselves are engulfed by the tidal wave of fanaticism which their maneuverings threaten to loose.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The 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.

#### RECESS UNTIL 12:45 P.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 12:45 o'clock today.

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

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 12:45 p.m.

At 12:45 p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON in the chair).

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1075) to establish a national policy for the environment; to authorize studies, surveys, and research relating to ecological systems, natural resources, and the quality of the human environment; and to establish a Board of Environmental Quality Advisers, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. GARMATZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. PELLY, and Mr. SAYLOR were appointed

managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 474) to establish a Commission on Government Procurement, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, September 24, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1888) to change the composition of the Commission for Extension of the U.S. Capitol.

#### FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2547) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill now before the Senate, and ask that it be made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be suspended.

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

Mr. McGOVERN's amendment is on page 1 line 3 strike everything after the enacting clause through page 8 line 6, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Sec. 2. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

"(1) Section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress in order to promote the general welfare, that the Nation's abundance of food should be utilized cooperatively by the States, the Federal Government, local governmental units, and other agencies to the maximum extent to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and provide adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition among low-income households. The Congress hereby finds that increased utilization of foods in establishing and maintaining adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition will tend to cause the distribution in a beneficial manner of our agricultural abundances and will strengthen our agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act, a food stamp program, which will permit those households with low incomes to receive a share of the Nation's food abundance sufficient to provide them with adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition, is herein authorized."

"(2) Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows:

"The term "food" also means such products as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation."

"(3) The second sentence of subsection (e) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"The term "household" shall also mean (1) a single individual living alone who has cooking facilities and who purchases and prepares food for home consumption, or (2) an elderly person who meets the requirements of section 10(h) of this Act."

"(4) Subsection (f) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows:

"Such term also means a private non-profit institution, boarding house (other than a fraternity, sorority, or other social club) or school which provides meals to persons of sixty-five years or over who are not residing in an institution or boarding house; a private nonprofit organization that prepares and delivers meals to persons of sixty-five years or over in their homes; and commissaries operated by the Department of Defense which shall accept coupons in exchange for food for any participating household which otherwise is eligible under regulations of the Department of Defense to utilize the services of such commissaries."

"(5) Subsection (j) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"'(j) The term "State" means the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.'

"(6) Subsection (a) of section 4 is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The Secretary is authorized to formulate and administer a food stamp program under which eligible households within a State will be provided with coupon allotments of sufficient monetary value to enable them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. Such program shall be carried out in any State at the request of the appropriate State agency of such State or pursuant to section 10(f) of this Act.'

"(7) Subsection (b) of section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"'(b) In areas where the food stamp program is in operation, there shall be no distribution of federally donated foods to households under the authority of any other law except that distribution thereunder shall be made: (1) during temporary emergency situations when the Secretary determines that commercial channels of food distribution have been disrupted because of a disaster; (2) in any county where a food stamp program is being initiated and where federally owned foods have been distributed to households during any one of the three months immediately prior to initiation of a food stamp program, until such time as the number of persons participating in a food stamp program exceeds the monthly average number of persons who received federally owned foods during the three month period immediately prior to the initiation of a food stamp program; or (3) on request of the State agency if the State agrees to finance, from funds available to the State or political subdivisions thereof, all of the costs, subsequent to the delivery of such foods within the State, of handling, storing and issuing federally donated food to eligible households in the area.'

"(8) Section 5 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 5. (a) Households whose income is determined, as provided in this section, to be insufficient to permit them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet shall be eligible to participate in the food stamp program. The Secretary shall prescribe, not less often than once a year, the minimum level of income a household must have in order to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for the members of such household and be financially able to meet the other normal living expenses of a household. He shall prescribe such level of income for households composed of varying numbers of individuals, but in no case shall the minimum income level prescribed by the Secretary be less for any household than the equivalent of \$4,000 per year for a household composed of four persons. In prescribing minimum income levels for households under this section the Secretary may take into consideration such relevant

factors as the regional variations in the cost of food described in the low-cost food plan published by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or such other relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. The Secretary shall also prescribe the maximum level of income for households composed of varying numbers of individuals above which households shall be ineligible to participate in the food stamp program. Income limitations prescribed under this subsection shall be revised annually to reflect any increase in the cost of living, as determined on the basis of the Consumer Price Index (all items, United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

"'(b) In complying with the limitations on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such eligibility standards shall comply with the maximum and minimum income levels prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section and shall also place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households, but such limitation shall apply to the income, if any, realized from such resources and not to any income which might be realized through liquidation of such resources. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary.'

"(9) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 are amended to read as follows:

"'(a) Except as hereinafter provided in this subsection, the face value of the coupon allotment which is issued to any household certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be not less than the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for the members of such household. The amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for households composed of varying numbers of individuals shall be determined by the Secretary and shall be revised annually by the Secretary. In determining the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household the Secretary shall take into consideration such relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. In no event shall the amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household be less than the amount which the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determines to be necessary to permit a household of comparable size to purchase the kinds and amounts of food contained in the low-cost food plan established by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and published in the "Family Economics Review." The Agricultural Research Service shall revise and publish the amount which it determines to be necessary to purchase such food at least annually to reflect changes in the prices of food published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor.

"'(b) Households shall be charged such portion of the face value of the coupon allotment issued to them as is determined not to exceed a reasonable investment on the part of the household: *Provided*, that (1) any eligible household whose income is less than two-thirds the current amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet prescribed by the Secretary under section 7(a) of this Act shall not be charged any amount for such coupon allotment; and (2) in no case shall any eligible household be charged an amount greater than an

amount equal to 25 per centum of the income of such household for such coupon allotment.'

"(10) Subsection (a) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"*Sec. 10. (a)* The food stamp program shall be administered to insure that participants are afforded the opportunity to receive at schools, at approved retail food stores, in their homes, or at other appropriate places convenient to participants such instruction and counseling as will best assure that they are able to use their increased purchasing power to obtain those nutritious foods most likely to insure that they receive a nutritionally adequate diet. The food stamp program shall also be administered to insure that all households eligible to participate in the program are informed of its existence and given such assistance as may be required to enable them to make application for the benefits of this Act. In addition to such steps as may be taken administratively, the voluntary cooperation of existing Federal, State, local, or private agencies which carry out informational and educational programs for consumers shall be enlisted for the purpose of providing nutrition counseling and home economics services for eligible households using such authorities as may be available to the Secretary, or in cooperation with other agencies of the Federal Government or private agencies. The Secretary is authorized to use the educational potential of the national school lunch program and its extension to introduce better eating patterns and better nutrition to eligible households under this Act.'

"(11) Subsection (b) of section 10 is amended by striking everything following the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"*Provided*, That the State agency shall comply with the requirements of clauses (2) and (3) of section 10(e) of this Act. The operating agency may delegate its responsibility for the issuance of coupons and the collection of the amounts charged from eligible households to the United States Post Offices, banks, credit unions, or any other public agency or private nonprofit agency. There shall be kept such records as may be necessary to ascertain whether the program is being conducted in compliance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Such records shall be available for inspection and audit at any reasonable time and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of three years, as may be specified in the regulations.'

"(12) Subsection (c) of section 10 is amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence the following:

"Any household making application for the benefits of this Act shall be certified for eligibility solely by execution of an affidavit, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, by the member of such household making application. Certification of a household as eligible in any political subdivision shall, in the event of removal of such household to another political subdivision in which the food stamp program is operating, remain valid for participation in the food stamp program for a period of sixty days from the date of such removal."

"(13) Subsection (d) of section 10 is amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence the following:

"Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase. The amount charged any household for any portion of a coupon allotment less than the full coupon allotment shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would have been charged such household for the full coupon allotment as such portion of the full coupon allotment

bears to the full coupon allotment such household was entitled to purchase. The Secretary shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. Such general guidelines and minimum requirements shall include at least the following provisions: (1) that the issuance of coupons shall take place no less often than once per week and (2) that at each issuance of coupons any household may purchase the entire monthly coupon allotment to which it is entitled or any portion of that coupon allotment which it has not previously purchased. The State agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, institute procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program shall be entitled, if it so elected, to have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under any federally aided public assistance program and have its coupon allotment distributed to it with such grant or payment."

"(14) Subsection (e) of section 10 is amended by striking '(3)' and '(4)' and inserting in lieu thereof '(4)' and '(5)', respectively, and by striking clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) that the State agency shall make every possible effort to insure that all households who meet the eligibility requirements set forth in this Act are certified to participate in the food stamp program;

"(3) that the State agency shall arrange for the issuance of coupons to eligible households and for the collection of sums required from eligible households as payment therefor through the facilities of United States Post Offices directly or by mail, through the facilities of participating retail food stores or in such other manner convenient to participating households as shall best insure their participation."

"(15) Subsection (f) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall administer a food stamp program through any private nonprofit organization or through any Federal, State or county agency he deems appropriate in any political subdivision of a State if

"(1) he determines that in the administration of the program in such political subdivision there is a failure by the State agency to comply with the provisions of this Act, or with the regulations issued thereunder, or with the State plan of operation approved by the Secretary and he has informed such State agency of such failure and such failure has not been corrected after a reasonable period of time; or

"(2) he determines that a food stamp program is needed in such political subdivision and the appropriate officials of such political subdivision or the State have not requested a food stamp program for such political subdivision after the Secretary has made an offer of Federal payments as authorized by this section; or

"(3) a food stamp program is not being operated, or is not being operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act, in such political subdivision on January 1, 1971, or thereafter; or

"(4) he determines that the ratio of the number of persons participating in the food stamp program in such political subdivision to the number of persons classified by the Office of Economic Opportunity as low income in such political subdivision is not adequate to effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act.

When the Secretary administers a food stamp program under the provisions of this subsection, he shall observe, or require the administering organization or agency to observe, all of the appropriate provisions of this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

"(16) Section 10 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, food stamps issued under this Act to any elderly person may be exchanged by such person for meals prepared and served by any group authorized to prepare and serve meals under subsection (f) of section 3 of this Act if:

"(i) such person does not have facilities for the preparation of food in his living quarters, or does not have reasonable access to such facilities, and the meals served by such organization are served in a common dining room and are prepared and served primarily for the benefit of elderly persons; or

"(ii) such person is housebound, feeble, physically handicapped, or otherwise disabled to the extent that he is unable to prepare nutritious meals for himself, and such organization prepares and delivers meals to such person."

"Section 14 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) No person shall be charged with a violation of this or any other Act, or of any regulation issued under this or any other Act, or of any State plan of operation on the basis of any statements or information contained in an affidavit filed pursuant to section 6(d) of this Act, except for fraud."

"(18) Section 15 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall pay to the State agency of a State the costs of issuing coupons to eligible households and of collecting the sums required from eligible households as payment therefor."

"(19) Section 16 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To carry out the provisions of this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and not in excess of \$2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for purposes of this Act until expended.

"(b) Upon written notification to the Congress of his intent to do so, the Secretary is authorized in any fiscal year to obligate sums in excess of the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, if such excess obligations are necessary to meet unanticipated increases in participation. In no event shall the amount of excess obligations in any fiscal year exceed an amount equal to 15 per centum of the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. The amount of any excess obligation incurred in any fiscal year shall be paid for out of funds appropriated to carry out this Act in the succeeding fiscal year.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that any portion of the funds in the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have just offered embraces the principal parts of the series of amendments I submitted in the Senate on Tuesday of this week and had printed in the RECORD. This substitute amendment is cosponsored by the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), and the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL).

I would like to thank each of these Senators for their confidence.

In particular I would like to thank the distinguished senior Senator from New York, Senator JAVITS, and the very capable Senators from Illinois and Kentucky, Senators PERCY and COOK, for their diligence, hard work, and cooperation as minority members of the Select Committee on Nutrition. Without their help neither that committee, nor the substitute which we offer today, would have been possible.

I wish to make it clear, Mr. President, that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), in joining as a cosponsor, has one reservation concerning the amendment, relating to the level at which families would become eligible for free food stamps, and he will doubtless join in an effort to write in a different figure than the one in the substitute bill. But with that exception, it is my understanding that the cosponsors are in support of all phases of the proposed substitute.

Mr. President, I want, first of all, to express my personal appreciation to the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, who has been my chairman on that committee during the entire 6½ years that I have served as a member of the committee, and with whom I also have the privilege of serving on the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. Both as a member of the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and as a member of Select Committee, I have enjoyed the friendliest and most cordial relations with him, and I think he knows the growing admiration and high regard that I have for him and for his leadership, particularly in the field of food-stamp legislation which the Senate is considering today. He was the principal author, years ago, of some of the major parts of our food-assistance programs, under which millions of people have been fed in this country over the last quarter of a century.

I also express appreciation for the forward steps that are proposed in the committee bill as reported by our chairman, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), with reference to the problems of hunger and malnutrition.

There is not the slightest doubt but that the committee bill represents a very important improvement over our existing food stamp program. The reason I

offer a substitute is that I want to go somewhat beyond the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to incorporate what I firmly believe to be the principal findings of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, findings based on the studies, investigations, and hearings of that committee over the past 10 months.

Mr. President, the debate on hunger and malnutrition in the United States, a land of plenty, has come a long way, especially in 1969.

We have investigated. We have debated the issue. Now, finally we are called upon to act. I hope that our action will be commensurate with the enormous significance of the issue of hunger in our country.

This debate really began 3 years ago when four of our colleagues first saw the results of hunger and malnutrition engraved on the faces of little children in the United States. Two of those colleagues are still with us. One was defeated for reelection—former Senator Clark of Pennsylvania. One was the victim of an assassination—Senator Kennedy of New York.

From that time until today we have labored to establish the proposition that what they saw on the faces of these little children was not simply an isolated circumstance, but was the sign of a much larger nationwide tragedy. The fact of this larger tragedy is now established beyond doubt.

Mr. President, this fact has been established by three different committees of the Senate—perhaps most clearly by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, which has addressed itself exclusively to this issue.

The fact of the existence of hunger has also been accepted by the administration. I am confident that it has been recognized by the American people at large. It has been documented by a careful Government-sponsored medical survey, by private studies, newspaper, magazines, and television networks across the land.

As awareness of the existence of malnutrition has grown, so has an understanding of the disastrous effects that hunger and malnutrition have on the people of our country.

In what I personally believe to be one of the most politically courageous statements I have ever been privileged to hear, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), one of the cosponsors of the substitute amendment, said before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs: "It is cheaper to feed the child than to jail the man."

Stating that he personally was late in recognizing the problem, the Senator said:

Many is the time that my friends have pointed a finger and said, "Look at that dumb Negro."

The charge too often is true. He is dumb. He is dumb because we have denied him food. Dumb in infancy, he has been blighted for life.

That sad confession can be made with reference to millions of white as well as black citizens in our country who will carry the irreparable damage of malnutrition throughout their lives. They were

afflicted with this damage either before birth or in the early stages of their lives.

In page upon page of testimony, experts have added convincing documentation to the moving statement of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. Expert after expert has testified that malnutrition is an important cause of premature birth and infant mortality. It is an important cause of brain damage, an important cause of decreased learning capacity, of low work productivity, of disease, and, in some cases, of death.

Had we known in 1964 what we now know—that the hungry child does not learn and the hungry adult cannot work—I suspect that the war on poverty might have been more successful.

While we may continue to argue about the extent to which ending hunger would eliminate poverty, it is a fact that if we fail to do battle against hunger in America, we will never win the war on poverty.

Mr. President, one of the first witnesses before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, the so-called Hunger Committee, was the distinguished social scientist, Margaret Mead. She stated categorically that hunger is the No. 1 social challenge before the people of this country. And she said:

If we can't solve the problem of hunger and malnutrition in the United States, we are not going to solve anything.

None of the problems of the cities, the unemployed, disease, the low educability of many of our people, will be solved if we cannot solve this chronic problem of malnutrition and hunger that is such a terrible blight on millions of people in this country.

I have no hesitancy in saying that I regard this matter as being of first priority. Of all the social problems facing this country, this is the one that we ought to begin working on. This is the one on which we can score a decisive victory with a modest investment of money, and effort, and administrative improvement. This is problem No. 1. And it ought to have the commitment of every Member of the Senate.

Mr. President, in both a study by the Bureau of the Budget and in a study undertaken for the select committee it has been pointed out that it actually costs our Government at least three times as much to provide a lifetime of care for the diseased or damaged victims of infant malnutrition as it would to provide the food which would prevent that malnutrition in the first place. In other words, laying aside the moral issue or the human factors involved, if one wants to look at this matter purely from a benefit-cost ratio in terms of dollars and cents, for every dollar that it would cost to close the hunger gap, it would cost us \$3.50 to permit that hunger gap to remain open, \$3.50 to deal with the ravages of malnutrition that bring about decreased job effectiveness, low learning capacity and chronic disease.

All of those factors, according to the Bureau of the Budget study that has been circulated in tentative form, add up to a cost of over 3 times as much to this country in dollars and cents to permit malnutrition to exist as it would cost to close that hunger and malnutrition gap

under the formula spelled out in the pending substitute amendment.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, when the Indian Education Subcommittee was on a visit to Alaska, we went to many of the schools throughout that area.

One of them that I will never forget was a visit to a second-grade class in Nome, Alaska. When the class that we were viewing concluded, I went to the teacher and I asked her, "What kind of educational problems do you have? Are your textbooks adequate? Are the physical facilities adequate? What is the basic problem?"

She said:

Senator, the fact is that most of these children are hungry and they cannot learn. I have adjusted to that. I did not when I first came here. I used to take the money that I and my husband earned, and we tried to buy sandwiches for them and had them over to the house and gave them something to eat.

But we found we just couldn't afford it. The local school district either can't afford or refuses to afford any kind of programs to help these children, and the truth of it is that I can't educate them. They react in one of two ways: Either they go to sleep very early in the morning during class, because they are so malnourished that they can't stay awake, or they become serious behavior problems. They are working out their frustrations caused by hunger in that fashion.

You could look at the children's faces, and the tragedy of certain failure was apparent on each of them.

The statistics about the lost money are impressive. But what I cannot get out of my mind is the sight of these children who simply did not have enough to eat and who did not have the capacity to learn.

We saw the same phenomenon less than a mile away from here, in the District of Columbia. They have a Headstart program here—an early childhood effort—and they would send tutors into the homes on an experimental basis, to try to teach 2- and 3-year-old children to read. The tutors reported that they could not get the child's attention because the child was searching the floor for crumbs, something to eat.

The same phenomenon has been reported around this country, and the truth of it is that we are destroying millions of children who have never had a chance—in part because they do not have the basic elements of adequate nutrition. I do not know how to cost that item out, but I do know that it is a national disgrace to permit it to continue.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President (Mr. SPONG in the chair), I want to respond to the excellent points that were made by the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), who is a member of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and also has been an important member of the Special Committee on Indian Education.

It seems to me that the point he makes is beyond question—that we cannot talk seriously about the education of children without also recognizing the fact that perhaps the principal barrier to the educational development and educational growth of children, at least from the mil-

lions of poor families in this country, is malnutrition. I do not know of a teacher of any experience who has had any contact at all with children from poor families who cannot attest to that fact.

It makes no sense at all for us to appropriate billions of dollars for educational programs, for special educational programs to deal with disadvantaged children, funds for mentally retarded children and the whole range of programs related to child development, and then stop short by a few hundred million dollars of what we need to really put an end to malnutrition and hunger in this country.

I know that all Senators share the objective of wanting to end hunger and malnutrition. What we are going to be talking about here for the next few hours at least is the question of what it will take to accomplish that. It is the belief of those of us who have cosponsored the substitute bill that we have a modest proposal that will close the hunger gap. We do not think that will happen in the bill S. 2547, which was reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

I thank the Senator from Minnesota for this helpful contribution. I understand that he is going to speak at greater length a little later.

Mr. President, it is facts such as these, facts which so dramatically expose the utter folly of permitting hunger to scar the lives of children in this land—a land with a gross national product that is now approaching a trillion dollars—that have brought us to the point of decision on the question of hunger in the United States. On the surface, this decision would seem easy. Certainly, no Member of the Senate is going to advocate hunger. So, surely, every Senator is going to vote one way or another, as he sees it, for a program designed to bring this unacceptable tragedy to an end.

President Nixon has pledged his support toward that end. He has called flatly for an end to hunger in America for all time. And nearly every Senator has at one time or another echoed that resolve. I want to commend the administration for going as far as it has in this matter, although I would like to see steps somewhat more substantial than those outlined so far.

But, deep down, the decision is much harder than simply making a declaration against hunger. Quick, effective action against poverty-related hunger requires both new expenditures and new Federal authority. Some Senators may, on conscientious ground, oppose both of those steps, both the funds we believe are needed and the new authority that we think is needed.

If it can be said that in some measure it has been the work of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs which has helped to bring us to this point of decision, then it can also be said that it has been the nonpartisan cooperation of every member of the committee which has enabled us to carry on our investigation effectively. I believe that the same spirit of nonpartisan cooperation will carry over to the Senate as a whole, if we are to act effectively against hunger today.

For this reason, I am pleased to join with the Senators whose names I read a few moments ago in offering what I believe to be the most comprehensive reform of the food stamp program ever seriously suggested in this Chamber. The case for this reform, which is offered in a single, bipartisan substitute for the bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, is strong, is straightforward, and is not in need of rhetorical embellishment, and I intend to present it in that fashion.

I am aware that Senators are weary after the marathon debate over defense procurement; but I am glad, in a sense, that this issue follows as closely as it does the debate on the military bill, because I am certain that, having labored for 2 months to understand the needs of the Pentagon, we will be willing to devote at least a day or two to understand the legislative needs of the hungry people of this country.

As the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), knows, I have deep appreciation, as I have said, for his leadership in this area; and our only disagreement rests on the question of whether S. 2547, the committee bill, is adequate to reach the end that we both wish to achieve. If we seriously expect to make the food stamp program into an effective vehicle for the elimination of poverty-related hunger in America, I think we must write a program which meets at least three basic minimal criteria.

First, we must write a program which provides the poor family with enough food stamps to insure that it is actually able to purchase an adequate, nutritious diet.

Second, we must provide those stamps at a price the family can afford.

Third, we have to make food stamps available through an administrative system which insures that the people who qualify for them actually receive the stamps. I have no hesitancy in saying that no one of the three criteria is met by the present system.

I believe that on each of these three key points the substitute I propose offers the kind of reform we must have if this is to be the year in which we finally begin to move effectively against hunger. The difference between the substitute bill and the committee bill on these three points is not hard to understand. Let us look at them in detail.

On the first point, the provision of enough food stamps to a poor family to be sure they are able to purchase an adequate diet, I think that only the substitute bill really meets that criteria.

The practical effect of enacting the committee bill would be to provide a family of four with a monthly stamp allotment of \$100. Yet according to the Department of Agriculture:

Less than 10 percent of the families spending \$100 a month on food as recommended by the Economy Diet Plan are actually able to achieve a nutritious diet.

Then, the Department continues:

The public assistance agency that is interested in the nutritional well-being of its clientele will recommend a money allowance

for food considerably higher than the \$100 cost level of the economy plan.

To speak of ending hunger with a program which the Department of Agriculture itself admits provides only enough stamps to adequately feed one out of every 10 poor families does not achieve the criteria as outlined. It raises false hopes that it cannot satisfy.

Mr. President, the substitute provides a more adequate though still modest stamp allotment—one equal in value to the \$125 per month low cost diet which the Department of Agriculture recommends for those interested in the nutritional well-being of the poor.

That is the first clear difference in these two bills, the committee bill suggesting food stamps worth \$100 per month for a family of four, and the substitute bill setting that figure at \$125 a month.

I think the Senate is interested in the nutritional well-being of the poor and that it will adopt the adequate low cost stamp allotment at the \$125 figure.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. On page 3, section 3 (a), I would like the Senator to interpret the language that appears there. I refer to the top of page 3.

Mr. McGOVERN. Is that language in the substitute bill?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. That language is in the bill that was reported by the committee. The section reads as follows:

(a) The face value of the coupon allotment which State agencies shall be authorized to issue to any households certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.

Does not that mean that the Secretary may supplement the income of the recipient with food stamps so as to do the very thing the Senator is talking about?

Mr. McGOVERN. It has been my understanding that the legislative history as outlined by the committee in writing in that section is that a nutritionally adequate diet would be set in the so-called economy figure which is \$100 a month; and the Secretary of Agriculture stated that if this bill, that is, the committee bill, which represents at least a part of the administration point of view, were enacted as presently stated he would set that figure at \$100.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would not mean that under the section I have just read he could not raise it, would it?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly. In his bill the Senator is tying it to \$125.

Mr. McGOVERN. Whatever the Secretary sets as an adequate diet year by year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Which is provided for in the section I have just read.

Mr. McGOVERN. I again come back to say to the Senator that the Secretary has stated and told the committee, as the Senator will recall, that without a specific figure in the legislation he would set that diet level at \$100 a month. That is why I

have specified that the level be set at the \$125 figure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Who sets that \$125 figure?

Mr. McGOVERN. I think this is where the confusion comes in. I wish to say to the Senator that we are setting a minimum of \$125.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where is it in the Senator's bill? It is not in the bill. The Senator uses virtually the same language as is provided in the section I have just read; that it will be up to the Department of Agriculture, through the Secretary, to provide stamps in order to purchase food sufficient to give a nutritionally adequate diet.

Mr. McGOVERN. I shall read the language in the substitute bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have one further point.

We have the Secretary fix that amount whereas the Senator would have the Agricultural Research Service to fix it. We provide that the Secretary would fix it.

Mr. McGOVERN. I shall read the language that relates to that point in the substitute bill. It is found on page 6 of the substitute bill beginning on line 11:

In no event shall the amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household be less than the amount which the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determines to be necessary to permit a household of comparable size to purchase the kinds and amounts of food contained in the low-cost food plan established by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and published in the "Family Economics Review."

Mr. ELLENDER. Is that fully adequate? Does it state it is fully adequate?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes. That is my understanding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the language I have just read the Secretary must provide food stamps sufficient to buy food for a nutritionally adequate diet. It is not a question of low or high diet, but it must be nutritionally adequate.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Secretary had told our committee that he regards the nutritionally adequate diet to be based on the findings of the Agricultural Research Service, which says a family of four cannot be fed on \$100 a month, that they must have at least \$125 at today's prices, then I would accept that language without any further spelling out. However, in the absence of that kind of assurance we should write in a provision that would state that a family of four gets not less than \$125 a month.

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not wish to continue to press the point, but the Secretary is the one who must fix it to provide a nutritionally adequate diet. If the research board states \$100 or \$125 that is what it is going to be because the Secretary fixes the amount.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree with the Senator, but then the Secretary tells us he is going to fix it at \$100 a month and his own research service says not more than 10 percent of the people of this country can be fed an adequate diet at that level.

Mr. ELLENDER. Whom are we to believe, the Secretary or his subordinates?

Mr. McGOVERN. When I interrogated the Secretary, I thought he was quite wobbly on trying to assure us that a family could be adequately fed on \$100 a month. The Senator will recall that he did not come back with very much conviction that a family could eat adequately on \$100 a month. He was talking more in terms of budget pressure than he was of the pressure of a hungry stomach.

Mr. ELLENDER. If it requires more than \$100 a month, he will have to provide more money under the language provided for in the committee bill, would he not?

Mr. McGOVERN. If the Senator could develop legislative history to support that, I believe that would strengthen the committee's bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt of it. It is as plain as it can be, where it says:

The face value of the stamp or coupon allotment which the State agency shall be authorized to issue to any household certified as eligible to participate in the Food Stamp program shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.

I do not see how we can make it any plainer than that.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I would think that putting the responsibility on the Agricultural Research Service, rather than the Secretary would be the same thing, in effect, as putting the State Department above the President in formulating foreign policy.

The Secretary, of course, would probably use the Agricultural Research Service, but there might be other agencies he would also want to use. In the final analysis, he has the responsibility. He is the only one we can hold responsible.

Mr. McGOVERN. I agree.

Mr. AIKEN. I would put the responsibility on the Secretary of Agriculture rather than on a subordinate agency.

Mr. McGOVERN. Let me say to the Senator from Vermont that my substitute bill does put the responsibility on the Secretary. It says, "He shall determine it," but that, "he shall not do so at a level less than the amount determined by this agency as constituting an adequate nutritional diet." In other words, this sets a guideline below which the Secretary cannot go. It still makes him responsible for establishing—

Mr. AIKEN. That would be the same as saying the President could make foreign policy but he could not make it above or below that recommended by the State Department. It does not seem to me that that would work. After all, the Agricultural Research Service is under the Secretary, and I suppose the Secretary could change the personnel of that agency whenever he saw fit to do so. He has the final responsibility. Thus, I think that the responsibility should be placed on him, with the expectation that he would use the Agricultural Research Service to the best of its ability.

I am wondering whether the Senator from South Dakota expects a vote on the substitute bill as a whole. I realize that some of the amendments to be offered

will, doubtless, receive greater consideration by the Senate than others.

Mr. McGOVERN. I would anticipate that there would be a vote on the bill as a whole.

Mr. AIKEN. And then the Senator will offer his amendments one by one.

Mr. McGOVERN. If the substitute carries, as I hope it will, that will not be necessary.

Mr. AIKEN. I think maybe it will be necessary. With particular reference to the use of food stamps for the purchase of bathtubs—

Mr. McGOVERN. I beg the Senator's pardon. Is the Senator against bathtubs?

Mr. AIKEN. They could use food stamps for the purchase of bathtubs?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes; but I think before people eat, they should wash their hands.

Mr. AIKEN. Some of the amendments will probably be considered by the Senate. Thus, I hope we would be able to get to them one by one. Of course, they are the Senator's amendments, not mine. I was just trying to get the "lay of the land."

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with our discussion, I wonder whether the Senator from South Dakota would tell us what he means relative to page 9, which has a provision which states:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase.

What does the Senator mean by that?

Mr. McGOVERN. If a family were entitled to buy \$125 worth of stamps at a price, let us say, of \$25 and they did not have the \$25 in a particular month, but they had \$10, they would be permitted to buy \$10 worth of stamps with the total proportion reduced in accordance with what they have paid. If at some later time in the month they received additional money, they could go back and use the unused allotment to make other purchases. In other words, this is to get away from the contention that they have to buy the whole allotment at one time, or they have to buy the same amount month after month.

Mr. ELLENDER. If that language is left in there, would it not mean the recipient would not have to buy a sufficient number of coupons so as to provide him with an adequate diet?

Mr. McGOVERN. If he did not have the money at any given time in any given month, if he were short in any given month, what this would mean is that he would not be out of the program entirely. He could buy such stamps as his funds would permit, and then, as his financial condition improved, he could come back the next month at the regular level. This is the so-called variable feature.

Mr. ELLENDER. Would it not also mean that he could use them as cash for purposes other than to buy food? That, I presume, would be what would cause him to desire to spend less money and get less diet.

Mr. McGOVERN. I believe that every one of these poor families, of the kind we would probably be dealing with at

some time or other, will be faced with the situation that they will have rent pressing in, medical bills to pay, and other problems. What was revealed, as I am sure the Senator will recall from the testimony we took, was that there are times when it is almost impossible for a family to make its normal food stamp purchases. But why not let them go as far as the funds they have will permit them in that month, and then come back the next month at their regular level?

Mr. ELLENDER. That could be easily accomplished if the State decided to have them buy four times a month, if they so desired. We provide a minimum here of twice a month, but the States could provide for four times a month if they desired.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is the provision in the substitute bill, that there would be a provision for weekly purchases.

Mr. ELLENDER. We have that in our bill. We fix a minimum of two per month, but the States would have authority to make it four times a month, or five times a month, at their convenience.

Mr. McGOVERN. I understand the Senator's point.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. The point I want to make is that administration testimony the other day indicated it felt there was great need for the kind of variable purchase plans which I think are contemplated in the substitute amendment. I am glad to see it is reached, in part, by the committee. I think they are both trying to deal with the same problem.

Mr. McGOVERN. That was brought out on page 15, in testimony from Secretaries Hardin and Finch, that they favored the so-called variable provision that would permit a family to purchase differing amounts of food stamps from month to month, and also at different times during the month.

The second major provision required of a realistic food stamp program is that it offers stamps at a price which the poor can fairly be expected to pay. What is this price?

Some 1.3 million Americans have no cash income at all. OEO estimates that 561,000 are unrelated individuals; 770,000 live in families of varying size.

The Agriculture Committee not only rejected a proposal to authorize free stamps to families with incomes of less than \$40 a month, it wrote into its bill a minimum charge of 50 cents per person per month—a provision more restrictive than present law which, at least technically, authorizes free stamps to households with no "normal expenditures for food."

To require that families with no income pay for their stamps will simply write out of the program 1.3 million poor who have no cash income, on the false assumption that the poor need some incentive to save their money for food and learn to budget their food dollar.

More than 5 million poor people have incomes lower than the amount they must have for food alone—less than the equivalent of \$125 a month for a family of four. Food is the first necessity of life

which they need desperately. Food is what they buy with the money they have left over—if they have any left—after they pay to keep from being evicted by the landlord, to keep their lights from being shut off, and to keep from freezing in winter. It is cruel to ask such a family to choose between food and medicine and other necessities and call that choice an education in effective budgeting.

We have given free food to poor families for decades under the commodity donation program. Yet we do not call that program a dole. Instead, we use the rationalization that we need to dispose of the surplus our farmers produce. I have never been really able to understand why it is acceptable—and it has been acceptable for years—to Members of Congress to provide free direct food without any cost and yet we feel that, somehow, there must be a charge for food stamps that in turn are converted into food. We provide free education for American families whether they are poor or rich. We provide income supplements in the form of public assistance, based, theoretically, on a family's minimum basic living expenses, including food, and we do not ask the poor to pay into those programs on a "let's not give something for nothing" rationalization. The food stamp program is the only Federal poverty program that requires the poor to pay an admission fee—a token fee except for those who cannot pay, designed to put us safely on record against "the dole."

We should have the compassion and decency to waive that admission fee for those whose incomes and standards of living are so low that they are in a state of hopeless poverty. A family whose income forces it into a perpetual state of hunger and malnutrition should receive its food stamps free.

One of the most important provisions of the substitute will provide free stamps to such families—families whose entire monthly income is less than \$80.00.

In other words, any family of 4 with an income of \$80 per month, an average of \$20 per person, or below, would receive its stamps without cost.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield.

Mr. MONDALE. Am I correct that the pending committee bill prohibits the distribution of free stamps?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. No.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think I am correct. Is there not a minimum charge made?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, but that charge must be paid by the State agency.

The bill reads, on page 3, beginning at line 18:

The State agency shall arrange for payment from State or local sources, including sums made available by charitable and similar organizations, of such portion of the minimum charge as may be necessary to insure the participation of all households certified for participation at the minimum charge.

Mr. McGOVERN. In other words, the stamps would not be made available free by the Federal Government, but whatever minimum cost was involved would be picked up by the State and local agencies?

Mr. ELLENDER. By the State, that is right.

As I stated on the floor yesterday, this program will be better administered if it is on a cooperative basis, the same as our school lunch programs. The Senator well knows that what made the school lunch programs so popular and so effective was that it was a cooperative effort on the part of the Federal Government, the State government, and the children involved, as well as the counties and the school districts. In that way we have been able to put on a program involving the expenditure of over \$2 1/4 billion, with the Federal Government paying out a substantial portion of it. We want to get the State governments involved to some extent.

Under the bill the only thing the States would pay would be the cost of administering the program and being responsible for the stamps. The Federal Government would pay, I think, half of the cost of servicing people not on welfare. It is a very small charge.

The Senator will remember that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) or the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) offered an amendment to require the States to pay at least 10 percent of the cost of the program. The committee voted down that amendment. It strikes me that \$3 is a very small amount that they will have to contribute. That is the only amount the State would have to pay, plus the cost of administration.

Mr. McGOVERN. There is much logic in the Senator's point in that it seems to me the State and local agencies would be willing to pick up part of the cost; but, as the Senator knows, we have had great trouble in getting States and counties to participate in the program. I do not know whether it is because they are so hard-pressed that they do not want to spend a few dollars, but it occurs to me that the problem of hunger and malnutrition is so important, particularly when we are talking about families at the bottom economically, that for the few additional dollars it would cost to make that food available to the very poorest of families, we would avoid much delay and confusion if we wrote into the bill that those stamps would be made available without cost to the recipient.

It seems to me we are going to spend as much money collecting that little fee and getting the machinery set up as we would to write off the cost of the whole program. It is a small amount, the Senator will agree, in terms of the cost of the total effort we are talking about here.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a small amount, but, in my opinion, it would mean more cooperation on the part of the States with the Federal Government and would make a better program.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the Senator's point of view, and I know he feels strongly about it.

I yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from South Dakota unduly at this point, but I believe the point he makes about the need for free food stamps to assist desperately poor people—some of whom have no income

or incomes that are hardly worth mentioning—is essential if we are to get food to those who are, by definition, most desperately in need.

We have seen many unintended effects of our food programs, but I think one thing was apparent wherever we went in our field trips: that the people who most desperately needed food were the ones receiving no assistance at all.

This is not a problem in only one sector of the country. A series of articles published in the Minneapolis Tribune, which I had printed in the RECORD, reported the fact that there were hundreds of families in Minnesota making \$20, \$30, or \$40 a month, who could not possibly afford food stamps.

Thus, I see this part of the Senator's proposal as the key to any hope for reaching the national objective, declared by the President of the United States, of eliminating hunger.

One thing that bothers me about the pending committee proposal is that it does not deal effectively with one of the most disappointing aspects of the present programs—the failure of a number of States and counties to participate in the program. There are seven States not even in the food stamp program, and a number of counties with no food programs at all; but, more important than that, seven or eight hundred counties have programs that are only token programs, in which fewer than 20 percent of the needy receive any help at all.

If we go on from that point, and add a total charge of \$200 million to build an incentive, we will discourage States and local governments because anyone who receives help imposes a larger charge on the counties. If we have learned anything from the program, we know that many counties would be even less inclined to be helped.

Mr. McGOVERN. I appreciate the points the Senator has made.

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

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I realize that, under the laws that now exist, State could not participate or did not participate as much as they should have. But this new act would make it possible for the Federal Government to supply a needy family with an adequate diet at a cost which would mean that all that the participant would have to contribute would be a token amount of, say, \$3, either directly or through a local church organization, the Salvation Army, or what have you. Under the present law that could not be done, but under this new bill, we have made the requirement so flexible that the Secretary of Agriculture has a right to expand its features to the fullest extent, so as to provide for an adequate diet for every family.

The bill, as presented to the Senate, does provide for that; and it also goes farther than the present law in this respect: The Senator stated an example a while ago of the need for keeping a little cash on hand for certain purposes. Under this proposal, relief can be obtained in cases where it is needed. For

instance, it would be possible that if, for example, a family of five has an income of \$1,000, and that family could show that it must have more than half of that for medical care, it could retain that much cash for that purpose; or if it could show that \$750 would be necessary to take care of that need, that amount could be exempted. The Secretary of Agriculture would then be bound, under this measure, as I understand it, to furnish sufficient stamps, irrespective of what total income the recipient has, to give that family an adequate diet.

That is how far the committee bill goes; and I think it is far enough.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, another important provision of the substitute stipulates that no poor family be asked to pay over 25 percent of its total income for stamps. Since the average American family spends only 17 percent of its income for food, I can see no reason for asking the poor to spend the 30 percent of their tiny incomes which S. 2547 requires them to spend on stamps.

The third critical requirement of a decent stamp program is that it provide administration and regulations which help the needy family to participate, rather than hindering or even prohibiting its participation.

The present food stamp program is part and parcel of the welfare system which President Nixon branded a "colossal failure." In order to reform that system and provide what he called "elementary justice," the President proposed that applicants for assistance should be certified by simple personal self-declaration and that any family earning less than about \$4,000 per year should be eligible. Neither of these very important reforms is made by S. 2547. Both reforms, reforms which would replace costly, humiliating eligibility investigations with simple, effective spot checks, and would substitute an adequate national eligibility standard for the patent inequity of wildly varying State-by-State standards, are contained in the substitute.

Also written into our substitute for S. 2547 is a workable guarantee that every county in the Nation will have a food stamp program by 1971. Since it is widely agreed that the food stamp program is our best food program, and since it is obviously unfair to offer the poor either no program at all, or an inadequate substitute for the food stamp program, the substitute provides appropriate authority for the Secretary to operate stamp programs as a last resort to insure that we will finally have a real national program by 1971. S. 2547 sets no date, and provides no authority for creating a truly national food stamp program.

Each of these administrative and regulatory reforms—national eligibility standards, self-certification, and national program coverage—have been accepted as vital to a workable welfare system. They are equally vital to that step-child of the welfare system, the food stamp program. Without these reforms it will make little difference whether our food stamp program offers the poor family a chance to eat properly, for few families

will be able to cut through the existing administrative mess to take advantage of that chance. Only if the substitute for the committee bill is adopted can we fairly announce that we have written a program which offers food assistance to all of the poor, and offers that assistance solely on the basis of the family's need.

The final, and in the last analysis decisive, prerequisite to any real effort to end hunger is the provision of enough money to do the job. The only honest statement which can be made about the annual cost of an adequate food stamp program is that this cost cannot be accurately estimated. By juggling "guessimates" of future participation and unemployment rates, one can obtain whatever cost estimate suits his purpose. I do not think we should engage in such guessing games with respect to this substitute. It will cost more than the Agriculture Committee bill—perhaps 25 percent more per person reached. How much the entire program might cost depends entirely on factors which neither I, USDA, nor anyone else can predict.

The only way to absolutely guarantee an adequate food stamp program is to provide the sort of financial flexibility which we already guarantee to our farmers through the back-door funding scheme operated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and to our schoolchildren through the open-ended authorization. But because I am aware of the Senate's longstanding opposition to financing of this sort, except for the agricultural program, I have dropped my publicly stated insistence on an open-ended authorization for the food stamp program. I do that only as a concession to the strong feeling on the part of many of the Senators against open-ended authorization.

I fully agree with the cosponsors of the substitute that the authorization levels which it contains—\$1.25 billion for fiscal 1970, \$2 billion for fiscal 1971, and \$2.5 billion for fiscal 1972—over the next 3 fiscal years represent the most far-reaching commitment of resources to the battle of hunger ever considered by the Senate.

In addition to the changes which I have mentioned, a substitute for the Agriculture Committee bill makes a number of other improvements. All are important. All meet needs exposed in long days of hearings before the Select Committee on Nutrition. All would amend the food stamp program so as to insure that it becomes at last what we have long promised it to be—a strong first line of defense against the hunger which afflicts our poor.

Mr. President, there are some issues that cannot be compromised. Ending the hunger of America's poorest families is one such issue. We have the opportunity now to enact the first program which can offer real hope to the very poorest families in America—families which for years have watched helplessly while their children followed the same dismal cycle that has ruined their own lives. This cycle leads from infant malnutrition through adult dependency to total despair. It must be broken. In the words of Dr. Charles Lowe:

The most readily accessible step is also the most critical. Were we to ensure that the infants, children and pregnant mothers of this country receive adequate nutrition, we could interrupt the cycle and remodel the future.

"Interrupt the cycle and remodel the future." It sounds too simple to resolve the seemingly insoluble problems we face. Yet, as is often the case with what seems insoluble, it may be the simple but basic approach, rather than the complex remedy, that provides the ultimate solution.

I ask that the Senate take this simple, basic approach to ending poverty by voting today for the kind of strong, expanded food stamp program which will finally win the long battle against hunger in America. Only the bipartisan substitute to S. 2547 would create such a program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I rise to support the substitute proposal offered by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and several other cosponsors. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the measure.

Before I begin my remarks on behalf of the substitute, I express my admiration for the magnificent work which the Senator from South Dakota has done—first, in proposing the creation of the Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and next in chairing a truly remarkable series of hearings and visits to provide us with a thorough knowledge of the problems of hunger in our land and recommendations as to what we must do if we are to eliminate them.

The speech we have just heard and the reports that have been issued by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs reflect the inspired and creative dedication of the Senator from South Dakota toward the end that we eliminate the curse of hunger and malnutrition in our land.

Mr. President, there are many aspects to this issue. I do not intend to deal with all of them in my remarks.

On July 30, 1968, the Senate unanimously approved Senate Resolution 281, establishing the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. That decision was a turning point in the effort to end hunger in the United States—for the first time, the Senate was willing to face up to the possible existence of widespread hunger and malnutrition in the world's most prosperous country. Our creation of this committee demonstrated a willingness to come to grips with this problem in a meaningful fashion.

In its relatively brief existence, the select committee has thoroughly and comprehensively documented the widespread existence of hunger and malnutrition in this country. And it has produced substantial evidence of the failures of Federal food programs.

I have served on this committee, and I have heard witness after witness describe the existence of hunger, its devastating effects, and the inadequacies of existing programs.

The testimony of these witnesses confirmed what I suspected to be true. But testimony alone cannot adequately convey the shocking reality of hunger and

dire poverty. It was not until I traveled with the committee to southwest Florida that I truly understood the meaning of what I had read and heard.

In Florida, we saw many who lived in shacks which were unfit for human habitation. We saw children and old people who regularly missed one or two meals a day and who depended on grits and fatback to survive. And we saw people of all ages who were obviously defeated by these conditions.

In the evenings, I met privately with migrant workers, who constitute a large segment of the population of southern Florida. They told me a story of unequalled human misery and despair—of seldom having enough to eat, of seldom knowing where or when their next job would be, of seldom being eligible for community services we take for granted.

What I saw during the day and heard at night had a profound impact on me. But it is the faces of listless and undersized young children that I cannot get out of my mind—faces which stared straight ahead, indicating no comprehension of the world around them. The condition of these children was the vivid and terrible proof of what nutritionists and pediatricians had been telling our committee for several months; that children who are malnourished suffer irreversible brain damage, as well as injury to the body's tissues.

I could see the result of many years of malnutrition and sordid living conditions in the parents of these children. It is not overdramatic to characterize their existence as a "shadow life"—hemmed in by poverty in its most extreme form and yet too weak, too ill, and simply too worn down to press for change.

These conditions are not unique to one State or to one region. The committee saw essentially the same thing in the District of Columbia, in California, and in Illinois. And we heard witnesses from almost every area of the country describe to us what we had seen for ourselves in other places.

Few of us would quarrel with President Nixon's statement that "millions of Americans are simply too poor to feed their families properly." And I think that few of us would quarrel with the select committee's finding in its interim report on the failure of family food assistance:

In relation to the dimensions of the problem, the impact of the two major Federal food assistance programs, the food stamp and commodity distribution programs, has been minimal. They have neither served a significant proportion of those in need of assistance, nor been administered to provide sufficient food or food stamps to enable the few who do participate to provide themselves and their families with an adequate diet. They have been neither funded nor administered to alleviate the problem of poverty-related hunger.

The bill reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is an attempt to correct many of the deficiencies in the most important of these Federal programs—the Food Stamp Act. This bill is a step in the right direction. The distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee (Mr. ELLENDER), who was the author of the Food Stamp Act and who has been one of the most diligent

and hard-working members of the select committee, deserves an enormous amount of credit for his efforts to improve Federal food programs of all varieties. If there is a more informed, honest, and diligent Member of the Senate, I have not met him.

But I believe that some aspects of the program need strengthening. I believe that the substitute proposed by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) fully deals with these problems.

The bill reported by the Agriculture Committee does not eliminate some of the most basic deficiencies in the food stamp program. That is why nine of the 13 members of the select committee have joined together in a bipartisan effort to improve the Agriculture Committee's bill. We have offered a substitute bill which, in our opinion, contains essential reforms which are lacking in the committee bill.

For example, the substitute bill would provide free coupons to families whose total income is less than two-thirds the cost of purchasing an adequate diet; the committee bill prohibits free stamps. The substitute bill would require the simultaneous operations in a county of both the food stamp and commodity programs during the transition from commodities to stamps until participation in the stamp program equals previous participation in the commodity program; the committee bill prohibits the simultaneous operation of these programs except for 90 days after transition to stamps if the State agency requests and pays for it. And the substitute bill would simplify the method of certification for food stamp eligibility by requiring only a personal declaration in the form of an affidavit; the committee bill leaves the present cumbersome certification procedure substantially intact.

Each of these provisions, as well as other basic reforms in the substitute bill, have been fully explained by the chairman of the select committee. But there is one reform contained in the substitute bill which I believe to be absolutely essential to the successful operation of the food stamp program. It is found in section 15 of this bill, and reads as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall administer a food stamp program through any private nonprofit organization or through any Federal, State, or county agency he deems appropriate in any political subdivision of a State if

(1) he determines that in the administration of the program in such political subdivision there is a failure by the State agency to comply with the provisions of this Act, or with the regulations issued thereunder, or with the State plan of operation approved by the Secretary and he has informed such State agency of such failure and such failure has not been corrected after a reasonable period of time; or

(2) he determines that a food stamp program is needed in such political subdivision and the appropriate officials of such political subdivision or the State have not requested a food stamp program for such political subdivision after the Secretary has made an offer of Federal payments as authorized by this section; or

(3) a food stamp program is not being operated, or is not being operated in accord-

ance with the provisions of this Act, in such political subdivision on January 1, 1971, or thereafter; or

(4) he determines that the ratio of the number of persons participating in the food stamp program to the number of persons classified by the Office of Economic Opportunity as low income in such political subdivision is not adequate to effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act.

When the Secretary administers a food stamp program under the provisions of this subsection, he shall observe, or require the administering organization or agency to observe, all of the appropriate provisions of this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto.

Without this provision, the other reforms in the substitute bill, vital as they are, will not dramatically improve the administration of the present food stamp program. For we have seen that the absence of food programs in some counties and the token nature of these programs in most counties is a result of one basic flaw in the present legislation—no level of government is ultimately responsible for finding and feeding the poor.

I emphasize that because it is, in my opinion, the fundamental findings of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. It is the fact that hits one in the face whenever he goes out on a tour to investigate hunger and malnutrition. It is dramatically and unarguably set forth in certain statistics that I shall submit for the RECORD: That is, that today no single level of government is ultimately responsible for finding and feeding the poor. The problem of doing so is still a political football or a hot potato. It is thrown from one level of government to another. No one feels responsible, and no one is. That is why millions of Americans are hungry and malnourished today.

Under present legislation there is little that a person needing food assistance can do if he has the misfortune of living in a county with no food program. As of June 13, 1969, there were 413 such counties throughout the United States. A person could be starving, he could be demonstrably near death from hunger, and there would be nothing he could do insofar as the official programs of the county are concerned; there is no direct commodity food program or food stamp program in these counties.

A county's failure to request a food program may be a result of the callousness and indifference of local officials or it may be due to the fact that the county cannot afford to pay the administrative expenses of these programs. Whatever the cause, the only real losers are the poor and needy living in these counties.

In Collier County, Fla., county officials repeatedly refused to participate in the commodity program, ignoring their citizens' pleas for participation and ignoring the overwhelming need for such a program. In a county where there are often as many as 22,000 migrants in residence, the attitude of these local officials was best expressed by one commissioner, who told the select committee that the county had no responsibility for its migrants, since, as he put it:

The migrants themselves are Federal people. They are not Immokalee people. They

are not Collier people, they are not Florida people. They are Federal people, and if there is free food, these people will come early and stay late. We will have them in town all year long.

He went on to say that he thought it was illegal to provide food to the hungry migrants and farm workers in his county. He is not unusual in this respect, nor is this an unusual county. The figures I am about to introduce will show that this is not a localized problem, not a Southern problem; it is a national problem, and it exists throughout this country. Unfortunately, up until this point, the record has been as I have described it. No one is really responsible, and thus the job is not being done.

Despite this incredible abdication of local responsibility, despite the pressure generated by the committee's visit to Collier County, and despite the Department of Agriculture's authority to directly administer a commodity program, the people of that county still have no food program—some 7 months after the committee's visit.

But it is not just those people living in the counties without any food program who are suffering as a result of the "local option" feature of present legislation. I wish to emphasize this, because in recent testimony, by the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Agriculture, there was an assumption that the Federal Government had fulfilled its responsibility when a county joined the program. None of their testimony focused on the question of token programs, and that is the biggest problem of all. Counties which join a program and serve very few, and only a nominal or token part of the hungry within their county, comprise the largest part of the present Federal food stamp program.

The Secretary of Agriculture was asked how he intended to deal with that problem. He said he was going to deal with it through persuasion. It boggles the imagination to know, in the light of the record that has been established over the years and the figures I am going to produce, how "persuasion" could possibly work.

Thus, even in those counties where there is either a food stamp or commodities program, most of the poor do not participate in these programs. I emphasize that: Even in those counties where there is either a food stamp or commodities program, most of the poor do not participate in these programs.

There are 1,125 counties with a commodity distribution program: In 327 of these counties less than 20 percent of the poor participate in the program; in 431 of these counties, less than 40 percent participate; in 241 counties, less than 60 percent participate; and only in 126 of these counties—less than 12 percent of the total number of counties in the program—does the participation of the poor rise to more than 60 percent.

These statistics are shocking, but they are not as shocking as going and looking at the situation firsthand; because the people who are denied the help are almost invariably the worst off—the poor, the sick, the aging, the young, the enfeebled, the illiterate, who are so incapacitated because of deprival that they

are unable to assert any rights they might have. They suffer silently, in a sort of shadow life, suffering from hunger and malnutrition, which often takes their lives or stunts them so thoroughly that they would be better off dead.

The statistics on participation in the food stamp program are even worse. Only 20 of the 1,139 food stamp counties show a level of participation in excess of 60 percent. In other words, most of the food stamp programs today—several years after institution of the program—serve fewer than 20 percent of those estimated to need food stamp assistance. Only 20 of the 1,139 food stamp counties show a level of participation in excess of 60 percent. In 701 of the counties enrolled in this program, participation by the poor is less than 20 percent. In 322 counties, participation is less than 40 percent, and in the remaining 96 counties, participation is less than 60 percent. I might say that at this point, that there are seven States in this Union that have yet to join the food stamp program—seven sovereign States out of 50 which refuse to have any food stamp program whatsoever.

Indeed, in the past year, the California Legislature passed a bill providing that every county in the State must have a food program, and the distinguished Governor of that State vetoed the bill.

What accounts for the massive failure of these programs to reach the people they were designed to serve? A large part of this failure can be explained by the various deficiencies of the programs—bureaucratic certification procedures, the inability to pay for stamps, and rigid eligibility standards. The substitute bill would correct, or partially correct, most of these deficiencies.

But there is another basic cause of these shamefully low levels of participation: In many of these counties, local officials are simply unconcerned by the fact that most of those needing food assistance are not receiving it. In some of these counties, officials are indifferent to the condition of malnutrition and make no real efforts to improve the level of participation in these programs; in other counties, officials are motivated by the belief that it is their duty to protect the public purse from "welfare chiselers."

In Lee County, Fla., the harsh and restrictive administration of the commodity program by the county welfare director—who is known lovingly by the community as "Mr. Crab"—has led to a situation in which less than 2 percent of the county's population receive commodity foods, while 32 percent of the population earns less than \$3,000 per year. The officials in this county have repeatedly refused to hire outreach workers or to set up food distribution centers nearer to the depressed areas of the county.

The substitute bill and its provision assigning ultimate responsibility for these programs to the Federal Government will make it possible to reach those most in need of food assistance. The bill is based on the premise that the food stamp program is the most effective means of ending hunger and malnutrition. Section

(15) empowers the Secretary of Agriculture to assure that every county in America has a meaningful food stamp program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the finding of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs as set forth on page 33 of the committee print entitled "The Food Gap: Poverty and Malnutrition in the United States."

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

#### LOCAL OBSTRUCTION

The committee believes that local cooperation is essential to the operation of all Federal food assistance programs. In most food stamp and commodity counties, local officials do the best they can with what they have to work with. But the committee has found some counties where local officials refuse to help their own citizens and others where local program administrators simply have little or no regard for the people they are serving.

In those counties, such as Collier, Fla., where local officials simply refuse to feed the poor, the committee sees no alternative to Federal administration. The law now permits the Department of Agriculture to administer the commodity distribution program directly where a county will not assume this responsibility. The Department should use this power in any county that refuses to feed its poor regardless of whether the county is among the thousand poorest in the Nation. Similarly, the Department should be allowed to administer the food stamp program directly in counties which arbitrarily refuse to participate in the face of clear need. In other counties, ways must be found to deal with the all too familiar litany of long lines, too few administrators, too short hours, humiliating investigations and other inconveniences which discourage participation.

Far too many counties either have no food programs or programs in which so few participate that they can only be described as token. Bureaucratic inefficiencies as well as statutory inadequacies often combine with the obstruction of local officials with the result that most of the poor in these counties remain hungry and malnourished. Some level of government must be given the ultimate responsibility for finding and feeding the poor.

Ending hunger in America is a national objective. The responsibility for fulfilling that objective should encompass Federal authority to override recalcitrant local officials so that those who most desperately need Federal food assistance will receive the help they need to overcome malnutrition.

Mr. MONDALE. I would like to refer to this language, because I think it underscores the feeling and the findings of our committee. It concludes with this language:

Far too many counties either have no food programs or programs in which so few participate that they can only be described as token. Bureaucratic inefficiencies as well as statutory inadequacies often combine with the obstruction of local officials with the result that most—

I underscore the word "most"—of the poor in these counties remain hungry and malnourished. Some level of government must be given the ultimate responsibility for finding and feeding the poor.

Ending hunger in America is a national objective. The responsibility for fulfilling that objective should encompass Federal authority to override recalcitrant local offi-

cials so that those who most desperately need Federal food assistance will receive the help they need to overcome malnutrition.

Under present food programs, there is clear evidence of resistance at the local county level. Some local officials do not like to set up convenient distribution centers because they cost money; they do not like to hire outreach workers because it costs money to do so. However, the pending committee proposal would require local counties or States, or both, to assume the cost of assisting the impoverished in paying the cost of food stamps.

It is estimated that initially the cost to local governments would be \$200 million. To the extent that a county has a successful program to reach all the hungry, those costs would rise; to the extent that it was a token program and most of the hungry ignored, those costs would drop. In light of the record of token participation—and the statistics are unarguable—we are creating a financial incentive to ignore the hungry.

Under the select committee's substitute bill, the Secretary of Agriculture is directed to establish a food stamp program in any county which has refused to request such a program in the face of evident need.

Section 15 also provides for the establishment of a nationwide food stamp program by 1971.

In order to deal with the most prevalent problem of inadequate participation by the poor, section (15) requires the Secretary to administer the program, either directly or indirectly, in any county where he determines that the ratio of the numbers of persons participating in the food stamp program to the number of low-income persons in the county is inadequate to effectuate the purposes of the act; or that local officials have failed to comply with the provisions of the Food Stamp Act and its regulations.

The committee bill does not deal effectively with this problem of indifference or inaction on the part of local officials. The bill does authorize direct Federal administration in counties which refuse to accept a food stamp program. But as Senator McGOVERN observed in his individual views to the committee report:

This provision . . . is so encumbered by conditions and restrictions as to be almost totally ineffective. First, the Secretary must find and notify the State welfare agencies that there is a "manifest and urgent need" for the program. Then, if the State agency "fails and refuses" to request a program for the area concerned for 90 days, and if the Governor requests, the Secretary may administer a program directly.

Not only does this provision seem to require that the Secretary all but declare an emergency before finding a need for a program, it makes the State welfare agency responsible for the recalcitrance of local county officials and then puts the Governor in the position of having to overrule his own welfare department and invite Federal intervention.

The assignment of ultimate responsibility for finding and feeding the poor to the Federal Government is both proper and essential. For as the select committee observed in its interim report—

Ending hunger in America is a national objective.

This is not to say that it is desirable for the Department of Agriculture to directly administer the food-stamp program in any county where the poor remain hungry and malnourished. Section (15) gives the Secretary the flexibility to administer the program "through any nonprofit organization or through any Federal, State, or county agency he deems appropriate in any political subdivision of a State." The bill thus recognizes that "local cooperation is essential to the operation of all Federal food-assistance programs" and would allow the Secretary to turn to another local organization or agency where local officials with primary responsibility have failed.

Nor is the select committee's substitute bill designed to end local control over the food-stamp program in those counties which simply cannot afford to pay the administrative costs of the program. The bill authorizes the Federal Government to pay the largest part of the administrative costs of the program where a county is unable to do so. I think this is a very important part of the measure.

The bill, then, is not aimed at centralizing the operation of the food-stamp program. Rather, its purpose is to assure that some level of government will be ultimately responsible for providing food assistance throughout the country. The buck must stop somewhere, and this bill will enable those who are barred from receiving needed food assistance to look to the Federal Government for help.

It would be tragic if Congress enacts legislation which improves aspects of the food stamp program but fails to solve the problem of indifference and obstruction on the part of local officials. That is why section 15 of the substitute bill is so vital. It is the key to any real and lasting improvement in the food stamp program.

Today, we have the opportunity to create, for the first time, a truly meaningful food stamp program. If we fail to take this opportunity now, each passing year without action means millions of children are born to face hunger and the shadow-life existence of their parents.

I do not mean to be overly dramatic. But I am convinced that if there was ever a time for decisive action, it is now. We have studied, analyzed, and talked to the poor to the point of embarrassment. The decision to approve the select committee's substitute bill is another crucial turning point—for the time has come to see if the Senate meant what it said when it mandated the committee to study the extent of hunger in America and to make recommendations to alleviate and eliminate this condition.

Mr. President, I have several documents to substantiate the remarks I have just made. The first document is a table which shows the percentage of poor people served by food stamp programs by State and county as of February, 1969. The table shows that as of February 1969, out of 1,139 counties participating in the program, 701 counties distributed food stamps to fewer than 20 percent of

those estimated to be needing assistance in those counties. In very few counties, indeed, have we had a higher percentage. There are many counties in which there was no food stamp program whatsoever.

The policy of the Department of Agriculture is to shift from direct commodity

food programs to food stamps. Where this occurs, there has been, on the average, a 50 percent dropoff in participation in the number of families being served by food stamps as against direct commodities. One wonders what happened to the lives of those people who cannot

afford to participate in the food-stamp program. I ask unanimous consent that the table to which I have just referred be printed in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 30.—THE PERCENTAGE OF POOR PEOPLE SERVED BY FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS BY STATE AND COUNTY, FEBRUARY 1969<sup>1</sup>

State	Number of programs	Average participation in State <sup>2</sup> (percent)	Number of counties reaching given percentages of the poor <sup>3</sup>				State	Number of programs	Average participation in State <sup>2</sup> (percent)	Number of counties reaching given percentages of the poor <sup>3</sup>			
			0 to 19	20 to 39	40 to 59	60 plus				0 to 19	20 to 39	40 to 59	60 plus
Alabama	19	17.4	10	7	2	0	Nebraska	45	13.7	43	2	0	0
Alaska <sup>4</sup>	33	0	0	0	0	0	Nevada <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona <sup>5</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	New Hampshire <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	52	18.8	37	10	5	0	New Jersey	12	27.9	3	7	2	0
California	9	35.3	1	4	4	0	New Mexico	20	38.7	5	8	6	1
Colorado	43	27.2	25	14	3	1	New York	7	29.3	4	2	1	0
Connecticut <sup>6</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	North Carolina	27	17.1	17	9	1	0	
District of Columbia	1	40.5	0	1	0	0	North Dakota	29	15.8	23	6	0	0
Florida <sup>5</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	Ohio	50	28.1	34	14	2	0	
Georgia	72	17.1	53	14	4	1	Oklahoma <sup>5</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hawaii	4	16.4	4	0	0	0	Oregon	1	25.1	0	1	0	0
Idaho <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	Pennsylvania	39	24.6	20	18	1	0	
Illinois	69	19.2	63	6	0	0	Rhode Island <sup>6</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	21	17.0	17	4	0	0	South Carolina	37	21.6	19	15	3	0
Iowa	73	11.3	68	5	0	0	South Dakota	4	18.5	2	2	0	0
Kansas	7	9.8	7	0	0	0	Tennessee	73	17.0	41	26	5	1
Kentucky	51	29.3	14	19	14	Texas	10	12.6	7	3	0	0	
Louisiana	35	23.1	14	19	1	Utah	26	12.5	24	2	0	0	
Maine	1	12.2	0	1	0	Vermont <sup>4</sup>	23	0	0	0	0	0	
Maryland	16	17.0	14	2	0	Virginia	27	11.3	24	3	0	0	
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	Washington	37	48.3	3	14	15	5	
Michigan	22	18.2	12	8	1	West Virginia	54	29.1	16	29	8	1	
Minnesota	42	21.3	27	12	1	Wisconsin	30	26.0	24	6	0	0	
Mississippi	43	36.6	4	24	14	Wyoming	23	24.5	17	4	2	0	
Missouri	1	21.0	0	1	0	U.S. total	1,139	21.6	701	322	96	20	
Montana	8	32.1	5	1	1								

<sup>1</sup> Participation rates are based on USDA figures for February 1969 for those counties that had food stamp programs established before September 1968. Counties in which programs operated in only part of the county are not included in the analysis since data concerning the number of poor was available only on a countywide basis except for independent cities in Virginia and for New York, Baltimore and St. Louis. The number of poor was calculated by taking the 1960 census data for the number of poor and multiplying it by ½ to reflect the decreased number of poor in 1968 relative to 1959 (26,000,000 compared to 39,000,000). The definition of poverty used is that of the Social Security Administration which defined a nonfarm family of 4 as poor if their income was below \$3,060 in 1959 or \$3,335 in 1968. This table differs slightly from the table that appeared in the Congressional Record on June 24, 1969 page 16907. The table in the Record was based on figures calculated by USDA that used a total base of 39,000,000 poor people rather than the base of 26,000,000 poor people used in this table. The above table does not include counties in which programs have been recently established and thus are likely to have lower participation rates.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the per-

centage of poor people served by commodity distribution programs by State and county as of February 1969.

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

TABLE 31.—THE PERCENTAGE OF POOR PEOPLE SERVED BY COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS BY STATE AND COUNTY, FEBRUARY 1969<sup>1</sup>

State	Number of programs	Average participation in State <sup>2</sup>	Number of counties reaching given percentages of the poor <sup>3</sup>				State	Number of programs	Average participation in State <sup>2</sup>	Number of counties reaching given percentages of the poor <sup>3</sup>			
			0 to 19 percent	20 to 39 percent	40 to 59 percent	60 percent and over				0 to 19 percent	20 to 39 percent	40 to 59 percent	60 percent and over
Alabama	46	44.7	0	19	19	8	Nebraska	2	38.4	0	1	0	1
Alaska <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	Nevada	10	24.9	5	2	2	1
Arizona	12	45.6	2	5	2	3	New Hampshire	10	16.1	5	5	0	0
Arkansas	21	27.5	7	9	4	1	New Jersey <sup>3</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
California	25	42.6	7	5	8	5	New Mexico	10	43.4	1	2	6	1
Colorado <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	New York	40	38.9	1	13	24	2
Connecticut	3	25.8	1	1	1	0	North Carolina	59	21.3	25	27	6	1
District of Columbia	3	59.1	0	0	2	1	Ohio	18	25.4	9	7	1	1
Florida	47	24.5	7	17	22	1	Oklahoma	71	53.1	1	23	28	19
Georgia	79	34.0	10	30	33	6	Oregon	34	60.9	2	3	12	17
Hawaii	0	0	0	0	0	0	Pennsylvania	16	15.3	10	6	0	0
Idaho	11	42.5	2	6	2	1	Rhode Island <sup>6</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois	12	19.7	9	3	0	0	South Carolina	35	35.3	21	9	0	5
Indiana	67	15.6	52	15	0	0	Tennessee	14	27.8	5	8	0	1
Iowa	13	25.1	9	3	1	0	Texas	128	20.1	45	62	15	6
Kansas	14	35.4	8	5	1	0	Utah <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	64	25.2	19	42	2	1	Vermont <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	16	63.2	0	1	3	12	Virginia	38	23.4	17	20	1	0
Maine	15	24.9	7	6	2	0	Washington <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Maryland	1	14.4	1	0	0	0	West Virginia <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts	0	0	0	0	0	0	Wisconsin	30	21.9	17	7	5	1
Michigan	47	36.6	6	23	12	6	Wyoming <sup>4</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	21	18.8	15	6	0	0	U.S. total	1,125	32.7	327	431	241	126
Mississippi	38	58.1	0	6	15	17							
Missouri	57	39.6	9	25	11	12							
Montana	4	71.3	0	1	1	2							

<sup>1</sup> Participation rates are based on USDA figures for February 1969 for those counties that had commodity programs established before September 1968. See footnote 1, table 30, for further information concerning methodology.

<sup>2</sup> The average for the State refers to the percentage of poor people being served by commodity distribution programs in those counties that had programs in operation before September 1968. An average based on the total number of poor people in the State would be much lower since many counties have a food stamp program, rather than a commodity program, or have no program at all. Average figures for the combined programs can be found in table 32.

CXV—1693—Part 20

<sup>3</sup> The term "county" refers to all administrative units of government that operate commodity distribution programs. This would include independent cities, parishes, and Indian reservations where appropriate.

<sup>4</sup> No commodity distribution program.

<sup>5</sup> Commodity distribution program on city basis only so calculations for this table are impossible.

September 24, 1969

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture which sets forth—on a State and county basis—the percentage of persons participating in food stamps and direct commodity distribution programs.

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

## EXHIBIT 2

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>ALABAMA</b>		
Autauga	46	
Baldwin	43	
Barbour		10
Bibb	27	
Blount	18	
Bullock		41
Butler	35	
Calhoun	18	
Chambers	33	
Cherokee	25	
Chilton	28	
Choctaw		15
Clarke		5
Clay	30	
Cleburne	30	
Coffee	25	
Colbert	22	
Conecuh	38	
Coosa	27	
Covington	27	
Crenshaw	26	
Cullman	28	
Dale	28	
Dallas		24
De Kalb	16	
Elmore	33	
Escambia	41	
Etowah	24	
Fayette	27	
Franklin	16	
Geneva	22	
Greene		42
Hale		24
Henry	47	
Houston		9
Jackson	23	
Jefferson		8
Lamar		9
Lauderdale	23	
Lawrence	35	
Lee	36	
Limestone	26	
Lowndes	92	
Macon	74	
Madison	25	
Marengo	63	
Marion	16	
Marshall	27	
Mobile		19
Monroe	55	
Montgomery		10
Perry	28	
Pickens		16
Pike		10
Randolph	28	
Russell		14
St. Clair	18	
Shelby	24	
Sumter		19
Talladega	38	
Tallapoosa	27	
Walker		19
Washington		16
Wilcox	68	
Winston	23	
<b>ALASKA</b>		
Total		30
<b>ARIZONA</b>		
Apache	5	
Cochise	18	
Coconino	9	
Gila	26	
Graham	63	
Greenlee	18	
Maricopa	30	
Mohave	18	
Navajo	40	
Pima	31	
Pinal	58	
Santa Cruz	32	
Yavapai	10	
Yuma	21	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>ARKANSAS</b>		
Arkansas		6
Ashley		18
Baxter		9
Benton		8
Boone		3
Bradley		6
Calhoun		5
Carroll		4
Chicot		28
Clark		11
Clay		21
Cleburne		11
Cleveland		13
Columbia		4
Conway		9
Desa		15
Drew		14
Faulkner		9
Franklin		36
Fulton		18
Garland		6
Grant		5
Greene		8
Hempstead		8
Hot Spring		4
Howard		10
Independence		8
Izard		8
Jackson		16
Jefferson		14
Johnson		8
Lafayette		14
Lawrence		10
Lee		34
Lincoln		24
Little River		14
Logan		7
Lonoke		8
Madison		14
Marion		6
Miller		3
Mississippi		23
Monroe		36
Montgomery		17
Nevada		16
Newton		42
Quachita		5
Perry		14
Phillips		37
Pike		12
Poinsett		23
Polk		6
Pope		6
Prairie		9
Pulaski		8
Randolph		7
St. Francis		38
Saline		6
Scott		8
Searcy		27
Sevier		4
Sharp		4
Stone		14
Union		6
Van Buren		23
Washington		4
White		17
Woodruff		34
Yell		6
<b>CALIFORNIA</b>		
Alameda		30
Amador		6
Colusa		19
Contra Costa		61
El Dorado		41
Fresno		35
Humboldt		25
Inyo		12
Kern		43
Kings		11
Lake		25
Lassen		30
Los Angeles		20
Madera		48
Mendocino		3
Merced		2
Modoc		6
Monterey		40
Napa		25
Plumas		20
<b>CALIFORNIA—Continued</b>		
Sacramento		42
San Francisco		17
San Joaquin		38
San Luis Obispo		20
San Mateo		13
Santa Barbara		35
Santa Clara		32
Santa Cruz		20
Shasta		57
Sonoma		20
Stanislaus		30
Sutter		5
Tehama		14
Tulare		10
Tuolumne		36
Ventura		28
Yolo		32
Yuba		3
<b>COLORADO</b>		
Adams		33
Alamosa		14
Arapahoe		15
Archuleta		14
Baca		4
Bent		18
Boulder		8
Chaffee		6
Cheyenne		6
Clear Creek		8
Conejos		40
Costilla		48
Crowley		13
Custer		4
Delta		7
Denver		28
Dolores		14
Eagle		11
Elbert		3
El Paso		12
Fremont		8
Garfield		5
Gilpin		(1)
Grand		4
Gunnison		12
Huerfano		17
Jefferson		8
Kiowa		6
Kit Carson		10
Lake		20
La Plata		14
Larimer		29
Las Animas		16
Lincoln		7
Logan		8
Mesa		11
Mineral		(1)
Moffat		14
Montezuma		12
Montrose		10
Morgan		15
Otero		21
Phillips		4
Prowers		14
Pueblo		31
Rio Blanco		8
Rio Grande		19
Routt		8
Saguache		10
Sedgwick		3
Teller		9
Washington		4
Weld		9
Yuma		3
<b>CONNECTICUT</b>		
Hartford: Hartford (Dist.)		26
Litchfield		3
New Haven:		
New Haven (Dist.)		23
Waterbury (Dist.)		38
New London		16
Tolland		5
Windham		28
<b>DELAWARE</b>		
Kent		35
New Castle		51
Sussex		28
District of Columbia: Washington		
<b>FLORIDA</b>		
Alachua		23
Baker		37

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued</b>		
Sacramento		42
San Francisco		17
San Joaquin		38
San Luis Obispo		20
San Mateo		13
Santa Barbara		35
Santa Clara		32
Santa Cruz		20
Shasta		57
Sonoma		20
Stanislaus		20
Sutter		5
Tehama		14
Tulare		10
Tuolumne		36
Ventura		28
Yolo		32
Yuba		3

Footnotes at end of table.

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>FLORIDA—Continued</b>		
Bay	12	
Bradford	33	
Broward	10	
Collier	0	
Calhoun	41	
Columbia	35	
Dade	11	
De Soto	20	
Dixie	30	
Duval	18	
Escambia	26	
Franklin	24	
Gadsden	74	
Gilchrist	25	
Glades	29	
Gulf	37	
Hamilton	37	
Hardee	15	
Hernando	24	
Highlands	13	
Hillsborough	13	
Holmes	28	
Jackson	28	
Jefferson	51	
Lafayette	26	
Lake	10	
Lee	9	
Leon	22	
Levy	26	
Liberty	38	
Madison	39	
Morgan	8	
Okaloosa	18	
Okeechobee	18	
Palm Beach	16	
Pasco	14	
Pinellas	8	
Polk	48	
St. Lucie	23	
Santa Rosa	31	
Sumter	33	
Suwannee	29	
Taylor	28	
Union	27	
Volusia	9	
Wakulla	41	
Walton	30	
Washington	35	
<b>GEORGIA</b>		
Appling	24	
Atkinson	47	
Bacon	25	
Baker	50	
Baldwin	14	
Banks	18	
Barrow	17	
Bartow	14	
Ben Hill	12	
Berrien	4	
Bibb	13	
Bleckley	13	
Brantley	32	
Brooks	43	
Bryan	38	
Bulloch	25	
Burke	22	
Butts	35	
Calhoun	8	
Camden	47	
Candler	33	
Carroll	6	
Catoosa	11	
Charlton	35	
Chatham	10	
Chattahoochee	68	
Chattooga	22	
Cherokee	11	
Clarke	12	
Clayton	13	
Cobb	12	
Coffee	24	
Colquitt	25	
Cook	20	
Coweta	7	
Crawford	41	
Crisp	9	
Dade	14	
Dawson	6	
Decatur	13	
De Kalb	19	
Dodge	18	
Dooly	41	
Dougherty	14	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>GEORGIA—Continued</b>		
Douglas	13	
Early	49	
Echols	37	
Effingham	48	
Elbert	9	
Emanuel	29	
Evans	32	
Fannin	15	
Fayette	6	
Floyd	20	
Forsyth	3	
Franklin	12	
Fulton	23	
Gilmer	5	
Glascock	32	
Glynn	16	
Gordon	5	
Grady	12	
Greene	6	
Gwinnett	15	
Habersham	5	
Hall	6	
Hancock	27	
Haralson	19	
Harris	35	
Hart	8	
Heard	13	
Henry	19	
Houston	14	
Irwin	35	
Jackson	16	
Jasper	14	
Jeff Davis	21	
Jefferson	37	
Jenkins	12	
Johnson	18	
Jones	11	
Lamar	6	
Lanier	12	
Laurens	12	
Lee	34	
Liberty	36	
Lincoln	10	
Long	48	
Lowndes	11	
Lumpkin	11	
McDuffie	4	
McIntosh	34	
Macon	61	
Madison	4	
Marion	38	
Meriwether	14	
Miller	29	
Mitchell	22	
Monroe	24	
Montgomery	34	
Morgan	12	
Murray	11	
Muscogee	18	
Newton	22	
Oconee	8	
Oglethorpe	6	
Paulding	26	
Peach	7	
Pickens	5	
Pierce	11	
Pike	17	
Polk	5	
Pulaski	17	
Putnam	14	
Quitman	78	
Rabun	21	
Randolph	36	
Richmond	6	
Rockdale	26	
Schley	35	
Scituate	41	
Seminole	15	
Spalding	9	
Stephens	6	
Stewart	39	
Sumter	37	
Talbot	33	
Taliaferro	56	
Tattnall	30	
Taylor	38	
Telfair	27	
Terrell	58	
Thomas	16	
Tift	12	
Toombs	7	
Towns	12	
Treutlen	12	
Turner	28	
Twigs	21	
Union	21	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>GEORGIA—Continued</b>		
Upson		7
Walker	23	7
Walton	32	18
Ware		15
Warren		15
Washington		15
Wayne	33	
Webster	40	
Wheeler		10
White		4
Whitfield	16	
Wilcox	38	
Wilkes		7
Wilkinson	47	
Worth	34	
<b>HAWAII</b>		
Hawaii		14
Honolulu		17
Kauai	(1)	
Maui		14
<b>IDAHO</b>		
Benewah	16	
Bonner	21	
Boundary	17	
Clearwater	71	
Fremont	12	
Idaho	19	
Kootenai	26	
Latah	10	
Lewis	24	
Nez Perce	47	
Shoshone	32	
Teton	14	
<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
Adams		6
Alexander		12
Bond	3	
Brown	2	
Bureau	1	
Calhoun		6
Carroll		3
Cass		3
Champaign	4	
Christian	2	
Clark	1	
Clay	5	
Clinton	2	
Colee	3	
Cook		18
Crawford		3
Cumberland		3
De Witt	1	
Douglas	5	
Edgar	4	
Edwards	1	
Effingham	5	
Fayette	2	
Ford	5	
Franklin		11
Fulton		3
Gallatin	6	
Greene	4	
Grundy	1	
Hamilton	2	
Hancock	2	
Hardin		10
Henderson		14
Henry	5	
Iroquois	1	
Jackson	9	
Jasper	2	
Jefferson	9	
Jersey	2	
Jo Daviess	3	
Johnson		6
Kane		2
Kankakee		7
Knox	4	
La Salle	2	
Lawrence	9	
Lee		12
Livingston		2
Logan	1	
McDonough		1
McHenry		4
McLean		1
Macon		9
Macoupin		3
Madison		13
Marion		8

See footnotes at end of table.

September 24, 1969

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>ILLINOIS</b>		
Marshall	3	
Mason	4	
Massac.	8	
Menard	2	
Mercer	10	
Monroe	4	
Montgomery	2	
Morgan	3	
Moultrie	3	
Ogle	5	
Peoria	12	
Perry	3	
Piatt	1	
Pike	5	
Pope	9	
Pulaski	20	
Putnam	1	
Randolph	4	
Richland	2	
Rock Island	17	
St. Clair	27	
Saline	9	
Sangamon	5	
Schuylerville	3	
Scott	3	
Shelby	1	
Tazewell	4	
Union	6	
Vermilion	3	
Wabash	3	
Warren	7	
Washington	1	
Wayne	17	
White	3	
Whiteside	10	
Will	1	
Williamson	5	
Winnebago	22	

## INDIANA

Adams	4	
Allen	18	
Bartholomew	12	
Benton	1	
Blackford	9	
Boone	2	
Brown	17	
Carroll	6	
Cass	6	
Clark	13	
Clay	10	
Clinton	2	
Crawford	12	
Daviess	4	
Dearborn	10	
Decatur	7	
De Kalb	4	
Delaware	11	
Dubois	3	
Elkhart	5	
Fayette	9	
Floyd	11	
Fountain	7	
Franklin	10	
Fulton	2	
Gibson	6	
Grant	10	
Greene	12	
Hamilton	3	
Hancock	5	
Harrison	5	
Hendricks	3	
Henry	6	
Howard	6	
Huntington	1	
Jackson	13	
Jasper	3	
Jay	4	
Jefferson	8	
Jennings	12	
Johnson	9	
Knox	6	
Kosciusko	3	
Lagrange	2	
Lake	26	
La Porte	11	
Lawrence	11	
Madison	7	
Marion	9	
Marshall	4	
Martin	17	
Miami	6	
Monroe	12	
Montgomery	3	
Morgan	10	
Noble	6	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>INDIANA—Continued</b>		
Ohio	8	
Orange	13	
Owen	10	
Parks	13	
Perry		18
Pike		10
Porter	5	
Posey		9
Pulaski	3	
Putnam		3
Randolph	7	
Ripley	6	
Rush	3	
St. Joseph	10	
Scott	19	
Shelby	4	
Spencer		11
Starke	15	
Sullivan	13	
Switzerland		6
Tipppecanoe	7	
Tipton		5
Union	4	
Vanderburgh		11
Vermillion	14	
Vigo	21	
Wasbash	1	
Warren	2	
Warrick		9
Washington	8	
Wayne	13	
Wells	1	
Whitley	2	
<b>IOWA</b>		
Adair		2
Adams		1
Allamakee	8	
Appanoose		9
Audubon		3
Benton		2
Black Hawk	34	
Boone	16	
Buchanan	9	
Buena Vista		2
Butler		2
Bremer		3
Calhoun		3
Carroll		6
Cass		5
Cedar	6	
Cerro Gordo		7
Cherokee		3
Chickasaw	10	
Clarke		2
Clay		5
Clayton		5
Clinton		7
Crawford	7	
Dallas		5
Davis		6
Decatur		5
Delaware		4
Des Moines		15
Dickinson		3
Dubuque		4
Emmet		3
Floyd		4
Franklin		3
Fremont		3
Greene		3
Grundy		2
Guthrie		2
Hamilton		2
Hancock		2
Harrison		2
Hendricks		2
Henry		2
Howard		6
Huntington		1
Jackson		13
Jasper		3
Jay		4
Jefferson		8
Jennings		12
Johnson		9
Knox		6
Kosciusko		3
Lagrange		2
Lake		26
La Porte		11
Lawrence		11
Madison		7
Marion		9
Marshall		4
Martin		17
Miami		6
Monroe		12
Montgomery		3
Morgan		10
Noble		6
Ohio		8
Orange		13
Owen		10
Parks		13
Perry		18
Pike		10
Porter		5
Posey		9
Pulaski		3
Putnam		3
Randolph		7
Ripley		6
Rush		3
St. Joseph		10
Scott		19
Shelby		4
Spencer		11
Starke		15
Sullivan		13
Switzerland		6
Tipppecanoe		7
Tipton		5
Union		4
Vanderburgh		11
Vermillion		14
Vigo		21
Wasbash		1
Warren		2
Warrick		9
Washington		8
Wayne		13
Wells		1
Whitley		2
<b>IOWA—Continued</b>		
Marion		8
Marshall		4
Mitchell		2
Mills		5
Monona		5
Monroe		16
Montgomery		2
Muscatine		18
O'Brien		2
Osceola		2
Page		4
Palo Alto		10
Plymouth		2
Pocahontas		4
Polk		28
Pottawattamie		10
Poweshiek		2
Pingold		4
Sac		3
Scott		20
Shelby		1
Sioux		3
Story		7
Tama		3
Taylor		3
Union		5
Van Buren		3
Vapello		14
Warren		5
Washington		2
Wayne		4
Webster		25
Winnebago		9
Winneshiek		3
Woodbury		18
Worth		3
Wright		4
<b>KANSAS</b>		
Atchison		7
Bourbon		2
Cherokee		8
Clark		5
Crawford		5
Elk		2
Ford		4
Grant		7
Greenwood		18
Hamilton		5
Harper		4
Hodgeman		3
Kearny		9
Kingman		1
Labette		4
Leavenworth		4
Meade		3
Sedgewick		25
Shawnee		16
Sherman		15
Wilson		3
Wyandotte		39
<b>KENTUCKY</b>		
Adair		4
Allen		4
Anderson		4
Ballard		8
Barren		13
Bath		19
Bell		34
Boone		6
Boyd		27
Boyle		13
Bracken		13
Breathitt		48
Breckinridge		18
Bullitt		12
Butler		10
Caldwell		17
Calloway		8
Campbell		12
Carlisle		16
Carroll		12
Carter		17
Casey		13
Christian		14
Clark		9
Clay		43
Clinton		23
Crittenden		12
Cumberland		18
Daviess		20
Edmonson		25
Elliott		30
Estill		26

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>KANSAS—Continued</b>		
Atchison		7
Bourbon		2
Cherokee		8
Clark		5
Crawford		5
Elk		2
Ford		4
Grant		7
Greenwood		18
Hamilton		5
Harper		4
Hodgeman		3
Kearny		9
Kingman		1
Labette		4
Leavenworth		4
Meade		3
Sedgewick		25
Shawnee		16
Sherman		15
Wilson		3
Wyandotte		39
<b>KENTUCKY—Continued</b>		
Adair		4
Allen		4
Anderson		4
Ballard		8
Barren		13
Bath		19
Bell		34
Boone		6
Boyd		27
Boyle		13
Bracken		13
Breathitt		48
Breckinridge		18
Bullitt		12
Butler		10
Caldwell		17
Calloway		8
Campbell		12
Carlisle		16
Carroll		12
Carter		17
Casey		13
Christian		14
Clark		9
Clay		43
Clinton		23
Crittenden		12
Cumberland		18
Daviess		20
Edmonson		25
Elliott		30
Estill		26

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>KENTUCKY—Continued</b>		
Fayette.	9	
Fleming.	16	24
Floyd.		
Franklin.	19	
Fulton.	40	
Gallatin.	18	
Garrard.	11	
Grant.		6
Graves.	9	
Grayson.	13	
Greene.	13	
Greenup.	20	
Hancock.	17	
Hardin.	11	
Harlan.		36
Hart.	15	
Henderson.	11	
Henry.	10	
Hickman.		10
Hopkins.	7	
Jackson.		28
Jefferson.	6	
Jessamine.	13	
Johnson.		28
Kenton.		13
Knott.		50
Knox.		36
Larue.	11	
Laurel.		22
Lawrence.	27	
Lee.		37
Leslie.		59
Letcher.		30
Lewis.	26	
Lincoln.		14
Livingston.	17	
Logan.		7
Lyon.	19	
McCracken.	20	
McCreary.		40
McLean.	21	
Madison.		12
Magoffin.		47
Marion.	24	
Marshall.	6	
Martin.		53
Mason.	12	
Meade.		6
Menifee.		19
Mercer.	15	
Metcalfe.	10	
Monroe.	17	
Montgomery.		14
Morgan.	28	
Muhlenberg.		7
Nelson.	22	
Nicholas.	22	
Ohio.	21	
Oldham.	15	
Owen.	15	
Owsley.		42
Pendleton.	14	
Perry.		38
Pike.		14
Powell.		31
Pulaski.		12
Robertson.	12	
Rockcastle.		29
Rowan.		16
Russell.		13
Scott.	11	
Shelby.		3
Simpson.		5
Spencer.	10	
Taylor.		10
Tood.		5
Trigg.		21
Trimble.		10
Union.	13	
Warren.		9
Washington.		16
Wayne.		20
Webster.		18
Whitley.		23
Wolfe.		33
Woodford.		18
<b>LOUISIANA</b>		
Acadia.		18
Allen.		16
Ascension.		46
Assumption.		25
Avoyelles.		31
Beauregard.		8
Bienville.		44
Caddo.		6

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>LOUISIANA—Continued</b>		
Calaesieu.		19
Caldwell.		15
Cameron.		6
Catahoula.		48
Clairborne.		45
Concordia.		20
De Soto.		8
East Baton Rouge.		9
East Carroll.		26
East Feliciana.		61
Evangeline.		41
Franklin.		29
Grant.		45
Iberia.		8
Iberville.		25
Jefferson Davis.		11
Lafayette.		18
La Salle.		28
Livingston.		71
Madison.		22
Morehouse.		22
Natchitoches.		18
Orleans.		6
Pointe Coupee.		26
Rapides.		12
Red River.		26
Richland.		25
Sabine.		45
St. Bernard.		53
St. Charles.		35
St. Helena.		14
St. John the Baptist.		18
St. Landry.		29
St. Martin.		25
St. Mary.		37
Tangipahoa.		53
Tensas.		18
Union.		13
Vermilion.		7
Vernon.		13
Washington.		45
West Baton Rouge.		61
West Carroll.		21
West Feliciana.		68
Winn.		10
<b>MAINE</b>		
Androscoggin.		19
Aroostook.		35
Cumberland.		18
Franklin.		4
Kennebec.		14
Knox.		18
Lincoln.		7
Oxford.		10
Penobscot.		14
Piscataquis.		21
Sagadahoc.		24
Somerset.		2
Waldo.		7
Washington.		10
York.		11
<b>MARYLAND</b>		
Allegany.		8
Anne Arundel.		12
Baltimore.		5
Caroline.		8
Carroll.		4
Dorchester.		31
Frederick.		3
Garrett.		3
Harford.		10
Kent.		4
Montgomery.		9
Prince Georges.		15
Queen Anne's.		4
St. Mary's.		10
Somerset.		3
Talbot.		3
Wicomico.		7
Worcester.		1
<b>Independent city</b>		
Baltimore City.		19
<b>MASSACHUSETTS</b>		
Bristol: New Bedford (city).		21
Essex: Lynnfield (city).		(1)

Footnotes at end of table.

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MASSACHUSETTS—Continued</b>		
Franklin:		
Bernardston (city).		(1)
Buckland (city).		(1)
Deerfield (city).		(1)
Springfield (city).		20
W. Springfield (city).		(1)
Hampshire:		
Amherst (city).		(1)
Easthampton (city).		(1)
Goshen (city).		(1)
Northampton (city).		30
Williamsburg (city).		(1)
Middlesex:		
Cambridge (city).		15
Lowell (city).		28
Maiden (city).		14
Norfolk: Quincy (city).		7
Plymouth:		
Brocton (city).		34
Whitman (city).		(1)
Suffolk: Boston (city).		28
Worcester:		
Gardner (city).		(1)
Winchendon (city).		(1)
<b>MICHIGAN</b>		
Alcona.		24
Alger.		19
Allegan.		12
Alpena.		25
Antrim.		24
Arenac.		21
Baraga.		39
Barry.		10
Bay.		29
Benzie.		29
Berrien.		14
Branch.		15
Caihoun.		37
Cass.		17
Charlevoix.		16
Cheboygan.		26
Chippewa.		30
Clare.		15
Clinton.		7
Crawford.		19
Delta.		27
Dickinson.		29
Eaton.		6
Emmet.		15
Genesee.		19
Gladwin.		20
Gogebic.		13
Grand Traverse.		16
Gratiot.		10
Hillsdale.		6
Houghton.		24
Huron.		4
Ingham.		16
Ionia.		12
Iosco.		21
Iron.		13
Isabella.		11
Jackson.		15
Kalamazoo.		9
Kalkaska.		52
Kent.		29
Keweenaw.		47
Lake.		35
Lapeer.		9
Leelanau.		10
Lenawee.		16
Livingston.		18
Luce.		31
Mackinac.		13
Macomb.		11
Manistee.		25
Marquette.		16
Mason.		20
Mecosta.		11
Menominee.		16
Missaukee.		32
Monroe.		32
Montcalm.		15
Montgomery.		22
Muskegon.		25
Newaygo.		23
Oakland.		9
Oceana.		22
Ogemaw.		17
Ontonagon.		10
Osceola.		20
Oscoda.		43
Otsego.		11
Ottawa.		16
Presque Isle.		19

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MICHIGAN—Continued</b>		
Roscommon	29	
Saginaw		28
St. Clair		14
St. Joseph		6
Sanilac		5
Schoolcraft	32	
Shiawassee		21
Tuscola	15	
Van Buren		7
Washtenaw		4
Wayne		13
Wexford	26	

## MINNESOTA

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MISSISSIPPI—Continued</b>		
Claiborne		31
Clarke		52
Clay		40
Coahoma		49
Copiah		41
Covington		25
DeSoto		50
Forrest		18
Franklin		34
George		51
Greene		53
Grenada		22
Hancock		20
Harrison		12
Hinds		24
Holmes		48
Humphreys		40
Issaquena		61
Itawamba		9
Jackson		14
Jasper		31
Jefferson		73
Jefferson Davis		31
Jones		27
Kemper		44
Lafayette		31
Lamar		19
Lauderdale		32
Lawrence		48
Leake		60
Lee		17
Leflore		43
Lincoln		18
Lowndes		19
Madison		30
Marion		15
Marshall		73
Monroe		20
Montgomery		25
Neshoba		23
Newton		26
Noxubee		75
Oktibbeha		21
Panola		31
Pearl River		22
Perry		31
Pike		19
Pontotoc		23
Prentiss		14
Quitman		36
Rankin		54
Scott		24
Sharkey		89
Simpson		14
Smith		31
Stone		30
Sunflower		35
Tallahatchie		44
Tate		50
Tippah		29
Tishomingo		18
Tunica		53
Union		16
Walthall		57
Warren		15
Washington		29
Wayne		43
Webster		25
Wilkinson		66
Winston		40
Yalobusha		24
Yazoo		40

## MISSISSIPPI

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MISSISSIPPI—Continued</b>		
Adams	35	19
Alcorn		
Amitte	51	
Attala		26
Benton	64	
Bolivar		48
Calhoun	32	
Carroll	54	
Chickasaw		21
Choctaw	43	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MISSISSIPPI—Continued</b>		
Claiborne		31
Clarke		52
Clay		40
Coahoma		49
Copiah		41
Covington		25
DeSoto		50
Forrest		18
Franklin		34
George		51
Greene		53
Grenada		22
Hancock		20
Harrison		12
Hinds		24
Holmes		48
Humphreys		40
Issaquena		61
Itawamba		9
Jackson		14
Jasper		31
Jefferson		73
Jefferson Davis		31
Jones		27
Kemper		44
Lafayette		31
Lamar		19
Lauderdale		32
Lawrence		48
Leake		60
Lee		17
Leflore		43
Lincoln		18
Lowndes		19
Madison		30
Marion		15
Marshall		73
Monroe		20
Montgomery		25
Neshoba		23
Newton		26
Noxubee		75
Oktibbeha		21
Panola		31
Pearl River		22
Perry		31
Pike		19
Pontotoc		23
Prentiss		14
Quitman		36
Rankin		54
Scott		24
Sharkey		89
Simpson		14
Smith		31
Stone		30
Sunflower		35
Tallahatchie		44
Tate		50
Tippah		29
Tishomingo		18
Tunica		53
Union		16
Walthall		57
Warren		15
Washington		29
Wayne		43
Webster		25
Wilkinson		66
Winston		40
Yalobusha		24
Yazoo		40

## MISSOURI

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MISSOURI—Continued</b>		
Benton		14
Bollinger		27
Buchanan		19
Butler		35
Caldwell		1
Cape Girardeau		18
Carter		49
Christian		17
Clay		10
Dade		13
Dallas		24
Daviess		11
De Kalb		1
Dent		25
Douglas		21
Dunklin		34
Gentry		1
Greene		23
Harrison		10
Hickory		18
Howell		21

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>MISSOURI—Continued</b>		
Iron		43
Jackson		17
Jefferson		17
Lewis		13
Linn		1
Livingston		16
McDonald		14
Madison		26
Maries		12
Marion		16
Mercer		10
Mississippi		54
New Madrid		44
Nodaway		1
Oregon		27
Osage		13
Ozark		23
Pemiscot		52
Perry		1
Pike		15
Polk		27
Putnam		14
Ralls		11
Reynolds		70
Riley		38
St. Charles		45
St. Clair		12
St. Francois		31
St. Louis		20
Schuylerville		1
Scott		42
Shannon		36
Shelby		19
Stoddard		37
Stone		21
Sullivan		11
Texas		23
Washington		44
Wayne		43
Webster		17
Worth		9
Wright		22
St. Louis		15

## MONTANA

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
Cascade		27
Deer Lodge		18
Flathead		30
Glacier		8
Lewis and Clark		8
Lincoln		38
Roosevelt		65
Silver Bow		22
Valley		12
Wibaux		17

## NEBRASKA

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>NEBRASKA</b>		
Antelope		3
Boone		4
Boyd		6
Box Butte		4
Buffalo		4
Butler		2
Cedar		4
Clay		3
Cuming		3
Custer		3
Dakota		8
Dawson		4
Deuel		3
Dixon		5
Dodge		5
Douglas		23
Franklin		2
Gage		3
Garfield		4
Gosper		3
Greeley		9
Hall		5
Harlan		6
Holt		2
Howard		3
Johnson		1
Kearney		3
Keith		5
Knox		13
Lancaster		6
Madison		1
Merrick		3
Morrill		4
Nance		1
Nemaha		3
Phelps		4

**EXHIBIT 2—Continued**

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY  
(CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

**Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)**

(In percent)

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>NEBRASKA—Continued</b>		
Pierce.....		1
Pawnee.....		3
Rock.....		6
Sarpy.....		9
Saunders.....		3
Scotts Bluff.....		10
Sheridan.....		7
Sherman.....		2
Stanton.....		3
Thayer.....		2
Thurston.....	48	
Valley.....		3
Washington.....		2
Wheeler.....		3
York.....		2

NEVADA

	NEVADA	
Churchill	21	
Clark	13	
Elko	20	
Eureka	16	
Humboldt	51	
*Lincoln	15	
Lyon	29	
Mineral	34	
Ormsby	9	
Pershing	27	
Washoe	18	
White Pine	28	

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

Belknap	18
Carroll	14
Cheshire	19
Coos	23
Grafton	7
Hillsborough	11
Merrimack	15
Rockingham	5
Strafford	8
Sullivan	12

**NEW JERSEY**

Atlanta	20
Bergen	6
Burlington:	
Mount Holly (city)	(1)
Mount Laurel (city)	(1)
North Hanover (city)	(1)
Camden	18
Cape May	15
Cumberland	21
Essex: Newark (city)	22
Gloucester:	
Glassboro (city)	(1)
Washington (township)	(1)
Monroe (city)	(1)
Hudson	27
Mercer	15
Middlesex	19
Monmouth:	
Asbury Park	(1)
Keyport (city)	(1)
Ocean	24
Passaic	6
Salem	23
Somerset: Millstone (city)	(1)
Sussex: Franklin (city)	(1)
Union	12
Warren	10

NEW MEXICO

NEW MEXICO	
Bernalillo	49
Catron	17
Chaves	18
Colfax	19
Curry	19
De Baca	11
Dona Ana	34
Eddy	25
Grant	25
Guadalupe	41
Harding	12
Hidalgo	34
Lea	13
Lincoln	10
Luna	41
McKinley	47
Mora	44
Otero	18
Quay	21

#### Footnotes at end of table.

**EXHIBIT 2—Continued**

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY  
 (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>NEW MEXICO—Continued</b>		
Rio Arriba		60
Roosevelt		20
Sandoval		49
San Juan	50	
San Miguel		50
Santa Fe		47
Sierra	23	
Socorro	56	
Taos		4
Torrance		32
Union		8
Valencia	47	

卷之三十一

NEW YORK	
Albany	13
Allegany	22
Broome	22
Binghamton (city)	46
Union (city)	(1)
Cattaraugus	12
Cayuga	28
Auburn (city)	29
Chautauqua	(1)
Jamestown (city)	(1)
Chemung	32
Clinton	14
Columbia	19
Cortland	27
Delaware	25
Erie	20

— — — — —

Fulton	38
Genesee	28
Greene	13
Hamilton	31
Herkimer	18
Jefferson	28
Lewis	50
Livingston	19
Madison	30
Monroe	25
Montgomery	22
Nassau	20
New York (city)	27
Niagara	24
Oneida	27
Onondaga	39
Orleans	30
Oswego	40
Oswego (city)	(1)
Rensselaer	32
St. Lawrence	39
Saratoga	14
Schenectady	11
Schoharie	29
Schuyler	30
Seneca	24
Steuben	33
Suffolk	29
Tioga	34
Tompkins	20
Ulster	12
Warren	27
Washington	33
Wayne	8
Westchester	18
Wyoming	5
Yates	25

**NORTH CAROLINA**

Alexander	12
Alleghany	15
Anson	12
Ashe	12
Avery	23
Beaufort	11
Bertie	32
Bladen	29
Brunswick	12
Buncombe	12
Burke	5
Cabarrus	4
Caldwell	6
Camden	30
Carteret	11
Caswell	16
Catawba	4
Chatham	6
Cherokee	13
Chowan	11
Clay	17
Cleveland	22
Columbus	5

**EXHIBIT 2—Continued**

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY  
(CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>NORTH CAROLINA—Continued</b>		
Craven	18	
Cumberland	17	
Currituck	24	
Dare	6	8
Davidson		
Davie		5
Duplin	14	
Durham		14
Edgecombe	31	
Forsyth		7
Franklin		17
Gaston	11	
Gates	19	
Graham	17	
Granville		9
Greene		26
Guildford	14	
Halifax		24
Harnett		4
Haywood	20	
Henderson	8	
Hertford	38	
Hoke	34	
Hyde	46	
Jackson	15	
Johnston	12	
Jones	40	
Lee		15
Lenoir	17	
McDowell		7
Macon	10	
Madison	23	
Martin		25
Mecklenburg	20	
Mitchell	30	
Montgomery	13	
Moore		7
Nash		18
New Hanover		8
Northampton		19
Onslow	11	
Orange		6
Pamlico	15	
Pasquotank	17	
Pender	15	
Perquimans	23	
Person		13
Pitt	37	
Richmond		4
Robeson	17	
Rockingham		3
Rowan	7	
Rutherford	7	
Sampson	15	
Scotland		18
Stokes	9	
Surry		5
Swain	22	
Transylvania	10	
Tyrrell	40	
Union		6
Vance	28	
Wake	18	
Warren		29
Washington	39	
Watauga	25	
Wayne	22	
Wilkes	11	
Wilson	21	
Yadkin	6	
Yancey	18	
<b>NORTH DAKOTA</b>		
Barnes		13
Benson		21
Billings		5
Bottineau		5
Burke		5
Burleigh	24	
Cass	14	
Cavalier		18
Dickey		12
Divide		7
Dunn		5
Emmons		25
Foster	9	
Golden Valley		(*)
Grand Forks	18	
Grant		5
Griggs		7
Hettinger		7
Kidder		4
La Moure		11
Logan		7
McHenry		10

September 24, 1969

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
-----------------	------------------------	------------

## NORTH DAKOTA—Continued

McIntosh	7
McLean	5
Mercer	6
Morton	12
Mountrain	12
Nelson	3
Oliver	7
Pembina	11
Pierce	9
Ramsey	4
Ransom	5
Richland	7
Rolette	15
Sargent	10
Sheridan	8
Sioux	3
Stark	13
Steele	4
Towner	9
Trail	9
Walsh	16
Ward	21
Williams	13

## OHIO

Adams	21
Allen	10
Ashland	2
Ashtabula	10
Athens	12
Belmont	7
Brown	14
Butler	9
Carroll	4
Champaign	4
Clark	9
Clermont	23
Clinton	19
Columbiana	10
Coshocton	3
Crawford	5
Cuyahoga	36
Darke	7
Erie	8
Fayette	17
Franklin	22
Fulton	2
Geauga	8
Guernsey	6
Hamilton	21
Hardin	3
Harrison	4
Highland	17
Hocking	8
Holmes	2
Huron	6
Jackson	41
Jefferson	21
Knox	5
Lake	7
Lawrence	26
Licking	10
Logan	5
Lorain	27
Lucas	30
Madison	20
Mahoning	18
Marion	9
Medina	4
Meigs	12
Miami	5
Monroe	9
Montgomery	15
Morgan	9
Morrow	6
Muskingum	14
Ottawa	10
Perry	11
Pickaway	20
Pike	43
Portage	8
Preble	7
Richland	6
Ross	13
Sandusky	6
Scioto	19
Shelby	4
Stark	11
Summit	17
Trumbull	15
Tuscarawas	7
Union	7
Van Wert	4
Vinton	9
Warren	9

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
-----------------	------------------------	------------

## OHIO—Continued

Washington	5
Wayne	4
Wood	8
Wyandot	7
OKLAHOMA	71
Adair	11
Alfalfa	34
Atoka	28
Beckham	20
Blaine	20
Bryan	20
Caddo	37
Canadian	12
Carter	33
Cherokee	37
Choctaw	41
Cimarron	19
Cleveland	20
Coal	43
Comanche	16
Cotton	20
Craig	18
Creek	32
Custer	22
Delaware	45
Dewey	14
Ellis	11
Garfield	17
Grady	30
Grant	9
Greer	26
Harper	16
Haskell	48
Hughes	36
Jackson	30
Jefferson	27
Johnston	43
Kay	24
Kingfisher	13
Kiowa	26
Latimer	52
Le Flore	45
Lincoln	22
Logan	27
Love	33
McClain	20
McCurtain	53
McIntosh	45
Marshall	38
Mayes	30
Murray	30
Muskogee	42
Noble	18
Nowata	32
Okfuskee	40
Oklahoma	37
Omulgee	40
Osage	21
Ottawa	24
Pawnee	23
Pittsburg	26
Pontotoc	25
Pottawatomie	26
Pushmataha	36
Roger Mills	12
Rogers	23
Seminole	40
Sequoyah	65
Stephens	23
Texas	24
Tillman	41
Tulsa	25
Wagoner	36
Washington	19
Washita	11
Woodward	12

## OREGON

Baker	26
Benton	19
Clackamas	38
Clatsop	22
Columbia	47
Coos	57
Crook	40
Curry	56
Dechutes	31
Douglas	48
Gilliam	4
Grant	37
Harney	25
Hood River	50

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
-----------------	------------------------	------------

## OREGON—Continued

Jackson	24
Jefferson	49
Josephine	48
Klamath	27
Lake	37
Lane	56
Lincoln	34
Linn	45
Malheur	32
Marion	39
Morrow	19
Multnomah	15
Polk	36
Sherman	16
Umatilla	30
Union	17
Wallowa	24
Wasco	31
Washington	24
Wheeler	10
Yamhill	28

## PENNSYLVANIA

Allegheny	23
Armstrong	13
Beaver	17
Bedford	16
Berks	8
Blair	9
Bradford	19
Bucks	17
Butler	11
Cambria	13
Cameron	15
Carbon	9
Centre	10
Chester	5
Clarion	22
Clearfield	15
Clinton	10
Columbia	5
Crawford	8
Cumberland	7
Dauphin	9
Delaware	20
Elk	7
Erie	10
Fayette	27
Forest	10
Franklin	13
Fulton	23
Greene	24
Huntingdon	14
Indiana	13
Jefferson	11
Juniata	7
Lackawanna	14
Lancaster	4
Lawrence	25
Lebanon	6
Lehigh	5
Luzerne	9
Lycoming	7
McKean	19
Mercer	9
Mifflin	10
Monroe	11
Montgomery	6
Montour	2
Northampton	11
Northumberland	8
Perry	8
Philadelphia	18
Potter	18
Schuylkill	14
Snyder	9
Somerset	13
Sullivan	9
Susquehanna	9
Tioga	24
Union	16
Venango	16
Warren	11
Washington	16
Wayne	4
Westmoreland	12
Wyoming	6
York	14

## RHODE ISLAND

Bristol:	
Bristol (city)	(1)
Warren (city)	(1)

Footnotes at end of table.

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>RHODE ISLAND—Continued</b>		
Kent:		
Coventry (city)	(1)	
East Greenwich (city)	(1)	
Warwick (city)	10	
West Greenwich (city)	(1)	
West Warwick (city)	(1)	
Newport:		
Jamestown (city)	(1)	
Newport (city)	(1)	1 N/A
Providence:		
Burrillville (city)	(1)	
Central Falls (city)	(1)	1 N/A
Cranston (city)	12	
East Providence (city)	(1)	1 N/A
Foster (city)	(1)	
Glocester (city)	(1)	
Johnston (city)	(1)	
Lincoln (city)	(1)	
North Providence (city)	(1)	
North Smithfield (city)	(1)	
Pawtucket (city)	(1)	
Providence (city)	25	
Smithfield (city)	(1)	
Woonsocket (city)	(1)	
<b>SOUTH CAROLINA</b>		
Abbeville	4	
Aiken	8	
Allendale	24	
Anderson	3	
Bamberg	18	
Barnwell	18	
Beaufort	20	
Berkeley	24	
Calhoun	19	
Charleston	9	
Cherokee	6	
Chester	6	
Chesterfield	13	
Clarendon	31	
Colleton	16	
Darlington	17	
Dillon	40	
Dorchester	19	
Edgefield	13	
Fairfield	8	
Florence	26	
Georgetown	36	
Greenville	7	
Greenwood	3	
Hampton	17	
Horry	16	
Jasper	16	
Kershaw	11	
Lancaster	7	
Laurens	6	
Lee	40	
Lexington	5	
McCormick	31	
Marion	18	
Marlboro	31	
Newberry	5	
Oconee	7	
Orangeburg	18	
Pickens	5	
Richland	4	
Saluda	11	
Spartanburg	5	
Sumter	16	
Union	5	
Williamsburg	40	
York	14	
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA</b>		
Beadle	6	
Bennett	3	
Bon Homme	6	
Brookings	8	
Brown	7	
Brule	13	
Buffalo	10	
Campbell	18	
Charles Mix	21	
Clark	4	
Codington	6	
Corson	4	
Davison	9	
Day	14	
Deuel	11	
Dewey	17	
Douglas	8	

Footnotes at end of table.

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>SOUTH DAKOTA—Continued</b>		
Edmunds		10
Faulk		6
Grant		6
Gregory		11
Hamlin		5
Hand		9
Hanson		3
Hutchison		2
Hyde		9
Jackson		8
Jerauld		5
Kingsbury		12
Lake		6
Lincoln		3
Lyman		7
McCook		9
McPherson		4
Marshall		7
Mellette		8
Miner		4
Moody		16
Pennington		22
Perkins		9
Potter		10
Roberts		8
Sanborn		6
Todd		6
Tripp		16
Turner		3
Union		9
Walworth		23
Ziebach		32
<b>TENNESSEE</b>		
Anderson		25
Bedford		3
Benton		16
Bledsoe		26
Blount		10
Bradley		8
Campbell		27
Cannon		12
Carroll		12
Carter		18
Cheatham		20
Chester		6
Claiborne		18
Clay		16
Cooke		10
Crockett		14
Cumberland		14
Davidson		4
Decatur		13
DeKalb		8
Dickson		6
Dyer		13
Fayette		39
Fentress		20
Franklin		10
Gibson		19
Giles		6
Grainger		14
Greene		5
Grundy		17
Hamblen		12
Hamilton		8
Hancock		23
Hardeman		51
Hardin		15
Hawkins		10
Haywood		41
Henderson		12
Henry		4
Hickman		14
Houston		13
Humphreys		12
Jackson		13
Jefferson		17
Johnson		11
Knox		9
Lake		31
Lauderdale		29
Lawrence		7
Lewis		9
Lincoln		7
Loudon		9
McMinn		7
McNairy		13
Macon		6
Madison		10
Marion		26
Marshall		11
Maury		5

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>TENNESSEE—Continued</b>		
Meigs		12
Monroe		9
Montgomery		6
Moor		6
Morgan		32
Obion		4
Overton		14
Perry		12
Pickett		14
Polk		8
Putnam		9
Rhea		17
Roane		17
Robertson		13
Rutherford		5
Scott		39
Sequatchie		23
Sevier		6
Shelby		8
Smith		7
Stewart		21
Sullivan		11
Sumner		9
Tipton		28
Trousdale		8
Unicoi		17
Union		24
Van Buren		11
Warren		6
Washington		8
Wayne		10
Weakley		5
White		11
Wilkes		6
<b>TEXAS</b>		
Anderson		6
Angelina		42
Atascosa		12
Austin		8
Bastrop		18
Bee		4
Bexar		12
Brewster		12
Brooks		61
Brown		11
Burleson		28
Caldwell		16
Callahan		9
Cameron		14
Camp		24
Carson		3
Cass		18
Cherokee		11
Childress		7
Cochran		18
Coke		8
Comanche		10
Cooke		11
Cottle		24
Crosby		6
Culberson		15
Dallam		6
Dallas		12
Dawson		16
Delta		15
De Witt		16
Dickens		19
Dimmit		30
Duval		51
Eastland		11
El Paso		13
Falls		17
Fannin		21
Fayette		9
Fisher		10
Floyd		10
Foard		12
Franklin		15
Freestone		19
Frio		32
Galveston		10
Goliad		34
Gonzales		20
Grimes		25
Grayson		9
Denison (City)		8
Guadalupe		8
Hale		13
Hamilton		5
Hardeman		13
Hardin		19
Harrison		10
Haskell		14

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>TEXAS—Continued</b>		
Hays.	19	
Hemphill.	7	
Henderson.	8	
Hidalgo.	17	
Hills.	13	
Hockley.	10	
Houston.	20	
Howard.	9	
Hudspeth.		17
Hutchison.	23	
Iron.	22	
Jackson.	8	
Jasper.	20	
Jeff Davis.		16
Jefferson.	11	
Jim Hogg.	58	
Jim Wells.	25	
Jones.	18	
Karnes.	41	
Kent.	18	
Kinney.	55	
Kleberg.	21	
Know.	15	
Lamb.	8	
La Salle.	45	
Lavaca.	11	
Lee.	19	
Leon.	27	
Liberty.	12	
Limestone.	19	
Lipscomb.	3	
Live Oak.	41	
Lubbock.	6	
McLennan.	6	
Madison.	25	
Marion.	33	
Martin.	7	
Matagorda.	17	
Maverick.	44	
Madina.	16	
Milam.	19	
Montague.	13	
Moore.	4	
Morris.	19	
Motley.	22	
Nacogdoches.	14	
Newton.	23	
Nolan.	15	
Nueces.	8	
Orange.	10	
Panola.	18	
Pecos.		12
Polk.	19	
Potter.	7	
Presidio.		36
Rains.	15	
Real.	33	
Robertson.	41	
Sabine.	10	
San Augustine.	18	
San Jacinto.	39	
San Patricio.	27	
Scurry.	16	
Shelby.	8	
Smith.	2	
Starr.	67	
Stonewall.	18	
Swisher.	17	
Tarrant.	6	
Terrell.	6	
Terry.	5	
Titus.	15	
Tom Green.	11	
Travis.	20	
Trinity.	23	
Tyler.	14	
Upshur.	20	
Val Verde Del Rio (city).	23	
Waller.	14	
Walker.	38	
Ward.	27	
Washington.	23	
Webb.	40	
Wilbarger.	13	
Willacy.	39	
Williamson.	10	
Wilson.	15	
Zapata.	57	
Zavala.	28	

## UTAH

Beaver		5
Box Elder.		5
Cache.		3

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>UTAH—Continued</b>		
Carbon.		10
Daggett.		(*)
Davis.		11
Duchesne.		11
Emery.		6
Garfield.		8
Grand.		11
Iron.		6
Juab.		4
Kane.		2
Millard.		2
Morgan.		4
Piute.		8
Rich.		1
Salt Lake.		18
San Juan.		26
Sanpete.		6
Sevier.		5
Summit.		4
Tooele.		4
Uintah.		10
Utah.		6
Wasatch.		4
Washington.		4
Wayne.		1
Weber.		19
<b>VERMONT<sup>4</sup></b>		
Addison.		(1)
Middlebury <sup>4</sup> .		
Bennington.		(1)
Bennington <sup>4</sup> .		
Caledonia.		(1)
Morrisville (WD).		
St. Johnsbury (WD).		
Chittenden.		(1)
St. Albans (WD).		
Burlington (WD).		
Middlebury (WD).		
Morrisville (WD).		
Essex.		(1)
Newport (WD).		
St. Johnsbury (WD).		
Franklin.		(1)
St. Albans (WD).		
Grand Isle.		(1)
St. Albans (WD).		
Lamoille.		(1)
Morrisville (WD).		
Orange.		(1)
Hartford (WD).		
Montpelier (WD).		
St. Johnsbury (WD).		
Windham.		(1)
Brattleboro (WD).		
Springfield (WD).		
Windsor.		(1)
Hartford (WD).		
Springfield (WD).		
<b>VIRGINIA</b>		
Accomack.		7
Amelia.		5
Amherst.		11
Appomattox.		17
Bath.		16
Bland.		11
Brunswick.		15
Buchanan.		21
Buckingham.		15
Caroline.		2
Carroll.		9
Charles City.		5
Charlottesville.		9
Craig.		13
Cumberland.		15
Dickenson.		23
Dinwiddie.		6
Essex.		3
Fairfax.		5
Floyd.		5
Fluvanna.		18
Franklin.		6
Giles.		18
Goochland.		2

Footnotes at end of table.

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Adm. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>VIRGINIA—Continued</b>		
Grayson.		4
Greene.		19
Greenville.		16
Halifax.		18
Highland.		1
Isle of Wight.		27
King and Queen.		14
Lee.		14
Louisa.		11
Lunenburg.		13
Madison.		4
Mecklenburg.		5
Middlesex.		1
Nansemond.		33
Neilson.		12
Northampton.		13
Northumberland.		2
Nottoway.		20
Page.		24
Patrick.		4
Pittsylvania.		22
Powhatan.		14
Prince Edwards.		18
Rappahannock.		17
Richmond.		20
Russell.		20
Scott.		16
Smyth.		4
Southampton.		9
Surry.		15
Sussex.		29
Tazewell.		15
Washington.		6
Westmoreland.		3
Wise.		13
Wythe.		2
<b>INDEPENDENT CITIES</b>		
Bristol.		16
Chesapeake.		13
Danville.		7
Fairfax.		(1)
Falls Church.		(1)
Norfolk.		7
Norton.		(1)
Roanoke.		9
<b>WASHINGTON</b>		
Adams.		35
Asotin.		28
Benton.		37
Chelan.		34
Cowlitz.		31
Douglas.		24
Ferry.		31
Franklin.		21
Garfield.		28
Grant.		19
Grays Harbor.		35
Island.		49
Jefferson.		5
King.		18
Kitsap.		20
Kittitas.		14
Klickitat.		18
Lewis.		28
Lincoln.		21
Mason.		6
Okanogan.		32
Pacific.		21
Pand Oreille.		15
Pierce.		18
San Juan.		22
Skagit.		3
Skamania.		32
Snohomish.		68
Spokane.		23
Stevens.		29
Thurston.		16
Wahkiakum.		20
Walla Walla.		33
Whatcom.		35
Whitman.		20
Yakima.		14
<b>WEST VIRGINIA</b>		
Barbour.		46
Berkeley.		18
Boone.		9
Braxton.		36
Brooke.		23
Braxton.		26

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>WEST VIRGINIA—Continued</b>		
Cabell.	14	Bayfield
Calhoun.	28	Brown
Clay.	46	Buffalo
Doddridge.	11	Burnett
Fayette.	25	Chippewa:
Gilmer.	23	Arthur (city)
Grant.	8	Bloomer (city)
Greenbrier.	14	Birch Creek (city)
Hampshire.	9	Cadott (city)
Hancock.	14	Chippewa Falls (city)
Hardy.	11	Cleveland (city)
Harrison.	9	Cornell (city)
Jackson.	18	Eagle Point (city)
Jefferson.	9	Estella (city)
Kanawha.	20	New Holcombe (city)
Lewis.	14	New Auburn (city)
Lincoln.	41	Ruby (city)
Logan.	37	Sampson (city)
McDowell.	36	Stanley (city)
Marion.	10	Clark
Marshall.	14	Columbia
Mason.	18	Crawford
Mercer.	18	Dane
Mineral.	18	Dodge
Mingo.	52	Door
Monongalia.	8	Douglas
Monroe.	15	Duan
Morgan.	6	Eau Claire
Nicholas.	22	Florence
Ohio.	12	Fond du Lac
Pendleton.	10	Forest
Pleasants.	14	Grant
Pocahontas.	14	Green
Preston.	14	Iowa
Putnam.	17	Iron
Raleigh.	21	Jackson
Randolph.	21	Juneau
Ritchie.	11	Kenosha
Roane.	19	Keweenaw
Summers.	28	LaCrosse
Taylor.	11	Lafayette
Tucker.	15	Langlade
Tyler.	12	Lincoln
Upshur.	19	Manitowoc
Wayne.	40	Marathon
Webster.	38	Marinette
Wetzel.	22	Marquette
Wirt.	8	Menominee
Wood.	10	Milwaukee
Wyoming.	41	Monroe
<b>WISCONSIN</b>		
Adams.	11	Oconto
Ashland.	29	Oneida
Barron.	6	Outagamie
		Ozaukee
		Pepin

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 Census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>WISCONSIN—Continued</b>		
Bayfield	14	10
Brown	14	
Buffalo	11	
Burnett	7	
Chippewa:		
Arthur (city)	(1)	
Bloomer (city)	(1)	
Birch Creek (city)	(1)	
Cadott (city)	(1)	
Chippewa Falls (city)	(1)	
Cleveland (city)	(1)	
Cornell (city)	(1)	
Eagle Point (city)	(1)	
Estella (city)	(1)	
New Holcombe (city)	(1)	
New Auburn (city)	(1)	
Ruby (city)	(1)	
Sampson (city)	(1)	
Stanley (city)	(1)	
Clark	8	
Columbia	4	
Crawford	11	
Dane	16	
Dodge	5	
Door	4	
Douglas	24	
Duan	7	
Eau Claire	10	
Fond du Lac	40	
Forest	13	
Grant	6	
Green	3	
Iowa	3	
Iron	6	
Jackson	16	
Juneau	13	
Kenosha	32	
Keweenaw	3	
LaCrosse	12	
Lafayette	14	
Langlade	7	
Lincoln	13	
Manitowoc	13	
Marathon	10	
Marinette	11	
Marquette	4	
Menominee	85	
Milwaukee	25	
Monroe	7	
Oconto	11	
Oneida	18	
Outagamie	9	
Ozaukee	8	
Pepin	10	

## EXHIBIT 2—Continued

TABLE II.—FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS—NEEDY FAMILY (CD) AND FOOD STAMP PROGRAMS—Continued

Percent of persons participating in county and city administrative units (computation based on: (1) 1960 Census of families with incomes under \$3,000, (2) an average family of 4, and (3) program participation as of February 1969)

[In percent]

State/Admin. unit	Commodity distribution	Food stamp
<b>WISCONSIN—Continued</b>		
Pierce		
Polk	11	
Portage	12	
Price	8	
Racine	30	
Richland	5	
Rock	19	
Rusk	11	
St. Croix	4	
Sauk	7	
Sawyer	27	
Shawano	9	
Sheboygan	7	
Taylor	14	
Trempealeau	4	
Vernon	4	
Washburn	27	
Washington	9	
Waukesha	9	
Waupaca	9	
Waushara	10	
Winnebago	8	
Wood	16	
<b>WYOMING</b>		
Albany	9	
Big Horn	16	
Campbell	6	
Carbon	16	
Converse	6	
Crook	2	
Fremont	4	
Goshen	10	
Hot Springs	3	
Johnson	6	
Laramie	34	
Lincoln	3	
Natrona	16	
Niobrara	4	
Park	9	
Platte	10	
Sheridan	8	
Sublette	4	
Sweetwater	17	
Teton	13	
Uinta	2	
Washakie	10	
Weston	11	
National average	22	16

1 Not available.

2 Included with Billings County.

3 Combined with Uintah.

4 Welfare district.

## EXHIBIT 3

STATE-BY-STATE PROFILE OF THE DROP IN PARTICIPATION IN COUNTIES TRANSFERRING FROM COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM TO FOOD STAMP PROGRAM<sup>1</sup>

State	Commodity participation just after transfer	Food stamp participation just after transfer	Food stamp participation Jan. 1, 1969	Decline in participation Number	Decline in participation Percent	State	Commodity participation just after transfer	Food stamp participation just after transfer	Food stamp participation Jan. 1, 1969	Decline in participation Number	Decline in participation Percent
	just after transfer	just after transfer					just after transfer	just after transfer			
Total <sup>2</sup>	2,783,108	1,478,568	1,698,891	1,084,217	40	Montana	2,768	1,518	1,855	913	33
Alabama	69,562	27,308	28,302	41,260	58	Nebraska	12,872	6,992	8,665	4,207	33
Arkansas	118,777	47,630	64,464	54,313	46	New Jersey	5,138	19,856	31,414	+26,276	—
California	6,196	3,652	8,039	+1,843	(*)	New Mexico	34,637	18,566	36,043	+1,406	—
Colorado	65,425	25,200	45,135	20,290	31	New York	54,569	33,289	36,044	18,525	34
Connecticut	574	21,382	18,104	+17,530	—	North Carolina	19,925	9,909	11,563	8,362	42
Georgia	31,325	7,316	12,086	19,239	67	North Dakota	1,582	1,968	2,127	+545	—
Illinois	112,394	42,191	43,792	68,602	61	Ohio	274,053	169,814	216,704	57,349	21
Indiana	49,846	22,255	35,162	14,684	29	Oregon	31,383	9,841	11,703	19,680	63
Iowa	43,755	16,832	22,660	21,095	48	Pennsylvania	416,685	231,241	223,197	193,488	46
Kansas	1,820	1,034	763	1,057	58	Rhode Island	4,299	4,591	6,282	+1,983	—
Kentucky	196,083	95,071	119,968	76,115	39	South Carolina	13,119	7,264	9,671	3,448	26
Louisiana	113,444	66,336	66,068	47,376	42	Tennessee	98,412	73,066	72,870	25,542	26
Maine	1,070	647	2,738	+1,668	—	Texas	7,844	5,207	7,534	310	4
Maryland	43,447	31,634	32,339	11,108	26	Vermont	9,957	4,852	4,786	5,171	52
Massachusetts	4,133	4,294	4,134	(*)	—	Virginia	13,838	10,019	6,519	7,319	52
Michigan	217,162	113,070	86,925	130,237	60	Washington	76,028	37,362	60,923	15,105	20
Minnesota	47,265	21,700	27,297	19,968	42	West Virginia	198,741	89,851	+121,235	77,506	39
Mississippi	295,500	176,415	178,050	117,450	40	Wisconsin	13,529	5,551	5,958	7,571	56
Missouri	68,106	9,235	21,876	46,230	67	Wyoming	9,681	5,224	5,253	4,428	45

Footnotes on following page.

September 24, 1969

<sup>1</sup> Includes only counties transferring during fiscal years 1961–68. Based on participation in food stamp programs on Jan. 1, 1969, as reported by USDA and on USDA publication "Participation in Needy Family Program in Projects Prior to Transfer to Food Stamp Program and Participation in Food Stamp Program" C. & M. S./CFPSS, Dec. 2, 1968. Participation in food stamp program on Jan. 1, 1969 includes only counties which have transferred from the commodity program, thus, it is not equivalent to total participation in the food stamp program. Prepared by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

<sup>2</sup> These totals vary slightly from totals in USDA table II because cities for which Jan. 1, 1969, participation figures are not available are omitted from this table.

<sup>3</sup> See the following table:

	Commodity participation just before transfer	Food stamp participation just after transfer	Food stamp participation Jan. 1, 1969
California:			
Humboldt	5,032	1,027	3,539
Modoc	282	59	127
Shasta	882	2,556	4,373

<sup>4</sup> This figure is based on the May 1968 participation, not the December 1968 participation as all the others are.

<sup>5</sup> Returned to commodity program.

TABLE II.—PARTICIPATION IN NEEDY FAMILY PROGRAM FOR PROJECTS BEFORE TRANSFERRING TO FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AND IN FOOD STAMP PROGRAM AFTER TRANSFERRING AND PARTICIPATION IN ALL PROJECTS OF FOOD STAMP PROGRAM,<sup>1</sup> BY MONTH

Month entered food stamp program	Transfers from needy family to food stamp			Food stamp, all projects			Month entered food stamp program	Transfers from needy family to food stamp			Food stamp, all projects			
	States <sup>2</sup>	Counties or cities	Persons participating		States <sup>2</sup>	Projects <sup>3</sup>		Counties or cities	Persons participating		States <sup>2</sup>	Projects <sup>3</sup>	Persons participating	
			In needy family prior to transfer	In food stamp after transfer					In needy family prior to transfer	In food stamp after transfer				
Fiscal year 1968:														
July	1	1	517	277	1	1	277							
August	1	1	5,187	2,946	2	2	6,452							
September	1	1	5,940	3,008	3	3	7,749							
October	2	4	41,750	32,025	4	5	35,113							
November	1	3	574	21,382	1	2	37,922							
January					1	1	1,267							
February	2	2	1,069	1,024	3	4	1,631							
March	11	26	42,750	32,620	18	72	72,315							
April	16	56	85,929	54,539	25	103	94,932							
Total	23	94	183,716	147,821	30	193	258,162							
Cumulative to date	42	728	2,956,633	1,524,574	+43	+1,027	2,024,982							
Fiscal year 1969:														
July	6	18	38,505		10	57								
August	8	24	54,806		19	83								
September	1	2	494		4	13								
October					1	1								
November	4	6	3,199		6	7								
Total	14	50	97,004		24	161								
Cumulative to date	42	778	3,053,637		+43	+1,186								
Fiscal year 1961:														
May	1	1	36,673	11,287	1	1	11,287							
June	4	4	52,096	33,715	5	5	38,353							
Total	5	5	88,769	45,002	6	6	49,640							
Fiscal year 1962:														
July	2	2	168,238	91,315	2	2	91,315							
Cumulative total	7	7	257,007	136,317	8	8	140,955							
Fiscal year 1963:														
October	1	1	32,285	11,500	1	1	11,500							
November	3	6	50,106	28,829	4	7	31,372							
December	3	3	62,728	29,321	3	3	29,321							
January	2	2	79,922	20,239	2	2	20,239							
February	1	1	6,536	4,717	1	1	4,717							
March	8	10	214,464	91,214	8	10	91,214							
April	2	2	18,705	5,163	2	2	5,163							
May	2	2	90,544	46,568	2	2	46,568							
June	2	5	18,231	8,894	3	6	9,386							
Total	16	32	573,521	246,445	18	34	249,480							
Cumulative total	19	39	830,528	382,762	21	42	390,435							
Fiscal year 1964:														
September		1												
Cumulative total		20	40	833,951										
Fiscal year 1965:														
February	3	8	45,980											
March	6	12	81,209											
April	10	15	101,569											
May	5	12	63,201											
June	3	3	17,755											
Total	17	50	309,714											
Cumulative total	27	90	1,143,655											
Fiscal year 1966:														
July	5	6	84,444											
September	1	2	6,807											
October	4	8	43,537											
November	12	25	83,854											
December	10	21	95,650											
January	2	2	35,133											
February	1	1	33,926											
March	2	4	22,079											
April	9	15	53,006											
May	14	45	339,356											
June	9	28	87,175											
Total	24	157	884,967											
Cumulative total	33	247	2,028,632											
Fiscal year 1967:														
July	2	2	7,401											
August	1	1	12,984											
September	1	3	4,299											
October														
November	8	38	45,878											
December	14	57	100,829											
January	17	91	157,256											
February	10	47	103,638											
March	10	22	79,402											
April	14	30	51,548											
May	16	49	56,821											
June	9	47	124,229											
Total	30	387	744,285											
Cumulative total	39	634	2,772,917											

<sup>1</sup> Participation in needy family program is the peak of the 3 months prior to entering food stamp program; participation in food stamp program is the peak month nationally in fiscal year.

<sup>2</sup> States are counted only once in arriving at fiscal year total; also, only once since beginning of food stamp program in arriving at cumulative total.

<sup>3</sup> Projects expanding city to county operation or new county joining existing projects are not included as new projects.

<sup>4</sup> Includes District of Columbia.

<sup>5</sup> Rice County, Kans., withdrew Apr. 1, 1965.

<sup>6</sup> Cherokee County, S.C. (reentered July 1, 1968) and Hardeman County, Tenn., withdrew July 1, 1967; Nash County, N.C., withdrew Aug. 1, 1967 (reentered Aug. 1, 1968); Marshall County, Miss., withdrew Dec. 29, 1967.

<sup>7</sup> Includes District of Columbia; Massachusetts discontinued program when Amherst (city) withdrew July 31, 1968.

<sup>8</sup> Amherst (city), Mass., withdrew July 31, 1968; Red River, Tex., withdrew Sept. 30, 1968.

sent that my letter of April 21, 1969, to Governor LeVander be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

APRIL 21, 1969.

HON. HAROLD LEVANDER,  
Governor, State of Minnesota, State Capitol,  
St. Paul, Minn.

DEAR GOVERNOR LEVANDER: During the past several months, the Select Committee on Nu-

have the same problems in Minnesota. In looking at the table, I find that, as of a few months ago, there were 12 counties in my State with no food programs—no direct commodity program, no food-stamp program. I appealed to the Governor of my State to help. I asked him to set up a committee. He did not do so. So that the citizens who need food assistance in those counties are still in need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

trition and Human Needs of the U.S. Senate, assisted by numerous private and public efforts including a survey by the U.S. Department of Public Health, has carefully documented the widespread existence of hunger and malnutrition in this country.

As a Minnesotan who has been privileged to serve on the Committee and participate in this study, I have become increasingly concerned about its implications for our State. While we have not held hearings in Minnesota, authoritative statistical and other printed reports indicate that many of the same patterns of income variation, spotty participation in supplementary food programs, and ineffective delivery of assistance may also be present in Minnesota, where we pride ourselves on the quantity and quality of our food production and our concern for the needy.

#### THE NATIONAL PICTURE

Much work remains to be done in organizing and evaluating the information we are gathering, but I believe the following observations represent a fair appraisal of what we have established to the satisfaction of a responsible bipartisan cross-section of the Committee:

1. Hunger and malnutrition are far more widespread than any of us have thought. While figures are necessarily speculative at this time, most responsible authorities would now agree that approximately 10 million Americans suffer from some degree of malnutrition.

2. Although there may be pockets of more serious and more concentrated nutritional deprivation, hunger and malnutrition do exist in all parts of the United States and in every State.

3. While programs to avert hunger and malnutrition have expanded in recent years they still fail substantially to meet their goals. To summarize some of the inadequacies of major nutrition programs:

#### A. Direct commodity food program (DCF)

DCF programs exist in only 1,342 of the nation's 3,098 counties, or just over 43 percent. A county may not participate in both DCF or Food Stamp programs. Foods distributed under DCF programs are inadequate to carry a needy family through the entire month for which they are provided. Eligible foods often do not meet the special requirements of the ill, the young, and those who have special traditional eating patterns.

Food is often available at only one point in a county, requiring as much as \$7.00 to \$8.00 per month for pick-up costs if transportation can be found at all. Some county administrators carry out the program in such a way that they unintentionally or intentionally discriminate against certain recipients or embarrass and harass the poor to the point that they prefer to remain hungry. Outreach workers are rarely available to find those most in need.

#### B. Food-stamp program (FS)

The FS program is designed to permit a recipient to purchase his own food according to his family's needs, but the bonus value of stamps is usually so meager that a family receiving food stamps, as former Secretary of Agriculture Freeman testified before the committee, may spend more money on food stamps than it previously spent on food and will still spend a greater proportion of its net income for food than will a family of average means.

Since food stamps—except in two counties in South Carolina—are never free, a recipient may find himself unable at a given time to make the full payment for a two-week or one-month supply of food stamps because he simply does not have the cash. Rent, fuel, utilities, costs of going to and from work, and other expenses which require immediate cash payment literally take food from the mouths of his family. Like the DCF program, the FS program will not carry a family

through its food needs for the month even if the initial cash investment can be made. The cash problem may help to explain why, when counties shift from DCF to FS programs, as many as 50 percent of persons who have been receiving commodities do not participate in the Food Stamp program! How do they feed themselves and their families?

Food stamps are available only for foods or food products. While a food stamp purchaser may use his stamps to purchase cake, candy, potato chips, or other "luxury" foods, for example, assistance is not available for the purchase of such basic household needs as soap, detergent, and medicine. The immediate necessity for cash outlay for these items can also cut substantially into funds available for a food stamp payment. In addition, the FS program relies on the family to make purchasing judgments, but nutrition education for the family is usually lacking.

Like the DCF program, the FS program can be and sometimes is administered in a token, conservative or actually insulting and discriminatory way. And outreach workers are rarely available in this program to seek out those most in need.

#### C. The national school lunch and breakfast programs

Although adequate nutrition is vital to the energy and learning capacity of students, not enough schools participate in the programs—a shocking percentage of the very poorest children *cannot* participate because of the charges that may be imposed by the school. Estimates indicate that there are approximately 6.6 million school children in the country whose families can be described as poverty-stricken, but only two million of them can participate in school lunch programs. Others may be left out because there are no programs where they live or because their families cannot provide money for lunches. Often these latter children sit next to friends and higher-income families who enjoy hot, nutritious, government-subsidized lunches while poor children have little for lunch except humiliation.

The School Breakfast Program suffers the same inadequacies, besides being so new that it can be found only in a small number of schools. I have been appalled to find how many children come to school without breakfast, jeopardizing both their health and their ability to learn. In Florida alone, it is reliably estimated that 85 thousand school children arrive at school each morning without breakfast.

Like other programs for the poor, the National School Lunch and Breakfast programs are often least available to those who need them most. The poorest school districts have the least financial resources for school cafeteria facilities and operational costs, and they are also the least able to provide reduced-price or free meals for those who must go hungry without that help.

4. Inadequate as these programs are, they do exist; but there is no program to deal even remotely with the critical nutrition needs of infants from the period before birth until they reach school age. Pediatricians have pleaded eloquently before the Committee for national recognition of the disaster—mental as well as physical—which befalls undernourished infants. Besides the dangers of permanent physical impairment and increased susceptibility to illness which malnutrition brings during the pre-school period, a child's capacity to learn may be seriously and permanently damaged by undernourishment. Most of a human being's mental capacity develops in the pre-school years. A mind crippled by malnutrition *cannot* later be restored to full capacity. In fact, malnutrition may be one of the key reasons that infant mortality, premature birth, and physical and mental subnormality are found in such shocking percentages among the

very poor. We now know that kwashiorkor, pellagra, marasmus, and rickets, all diseases of malnutrition, are serious problems in this country. Dr. Charles Lowe, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics, was asked before our Committee whether his testimony meant that he thought the problem of hunger and malnutrition was the first factor that must be solved if we are to break the cycle of poverty in America.

"That would be my opinion," Dr. Lowe replied, "not only the first but the most readily approachable."

But we do not have systematic, nationwide programs to attack this basic, approachable problem in the early years of childhood where they are most critical.

5. Those most needing help to obtain good nutrition—infants and children, mothers, the illiterate, the aging, the physically and mentally disabled, the mentally ill, the totally impoverished—are at the same time the most difficult to reach. They suffer, and die, in baffled and heartbreaking silence. They are usually neither seen nor heard. Many live a "shadow life"—not even knowing or understanding their problems, let alone what they might do to solve them. Others, I am convinced—thousands and perhaps millions of them—prefer hunger to the degrading treatment they receive when they seek help. So present programs almost invariably stop at the shoreline of greatest need, by default depriving unreach Americans of their health, their physical and mental abilities, sometimes their chance for pride—even, perhaps, their capacity to care for themselves. And what is worse is that this nation is therefore denied the productivity of thousands or millions of Americans crippled to the point of uselessness as producers. We are a nation whose capacity to produce nutritious foods is world-renowned; pervasive hunger and malnutrition is our national shame.

#### MINNESOTA

Hunger in Minnesota is as difficult to measure precisely as hunger in the nation as a whole, but some of the same general measures make it possible to judge that a problem does exist in our State.

A new Bureau of Labor Statistics study concludes that an urban family of four must receive a gross income of \$6,000 a year to feed its members properly and still meet other minimum expenses. A comparable rural family, the Bureau estimates, must receive a gross income of \$5,000 to \$5,500 per year. Even then, according to the study, only one-fourth of persons living on those incomes actually obtain adequate diets.

Assuming the Bureau's estimates are reasonable, surely families of four anywhere in Minnesota who receive \$3,000 or less in gross income per year must suffer some degree of nutritional deprivation. In Minnesota an estimated 600,000 persons live in such families, while only about 73,000 Minnesotans are currently participating in either the Direct Commodity Food Program or the Food Stamp program, according to current Department of Agriculture figures.

For some of the more than 500,000 Minnesotans whose family income is below \$3,000 but who are not receiving food supplements through either program, the National School Lunch program may be providing some help for the children. But 170,000 elementary and secondary school children in Minnesota attend the 1,454 schools of the 3,299 schools in our state where the program is not available, and the children from poor families among them obviously have no opportunity to receive these benefits. Furthermore, of the 507,000 children who do participate in the National School Lunch Program in Minnesota, the percentage receiving free meals was only 2.7 per cent during the past fiscal year. This compares with a national average of 12 per cent of children in the

September 24, 1969

program who received free meals during the same period. It is impossible to know how many undernourished children remain hungry in Minnesota despite the National School Lunch Program, but it is fair to speculate on the basis of the available information that many Minnesota children from needy families, like similar children throughout the nation, are being missed by this program.

School Breakfast Programs in Minnesota, as elsewhere in the Nation, are pitifully inadequate. During fiscal 1968 only 18 schools served 3,426 Minnesota children. If Florida estimates 85,000 breakfast-less children, how many do we have in Minnesota?

The general nutritional situation can be looked at in another way. Every person receiving welfare assistance is eligible automatically for food assistance. But even if all of the persons presently receiving help from either the Direct Commodity Food program or the Food Stamp program in Minnesota were assumed to be welfare recipients (and they almost certainly are not all welfare recipients) these programs would be reaching only slightly more than half of the 144,000 persons receiving welfare assistance in Minnesota in November 1968.

Furthermore, some of the same administrative problems evident in these food programs nationally are probably present in Minnesota as well. I should expect that there would be less tokenism and harassment in Minnesota than in most states, but it is true that some Minnesota counties distribute as few as 15 of the 22 Commodity Food items available and that none of the Minnesota counties have more than one distribution point for commodities. As we would expect in Minnesota, there are some impressive volunteer efforts to make up for this deficiency, most notably in Pope, Douglas, and Lyon counties, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

These are the basic questions:

How many of the 170,000 Minnesota school children in schools which do not have School Lunch Programs are undernourished?

How many of the 507,000 school children participating in the School Lunch Program should be receiving free lunches but are not? How many of the 360,000 children who are not receiving lunches in schools which have the program should be participating, probably through free lunches?

How many eligible welfare recipients are not receiving food supplements of any kind?

How many eligible families do not participate in food supplement programs because of administrative or information problems, or because the counties in which they live do not have any program at all?

Tragically, we do not know the answers to these questions. But we should know them, so that we can deal with the problems they reflect, and I hope we will find them out.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD AND EMERGENCY SERVICES PROGRAMS

In addition, other special federal nutritional programs could be more widely used in Minnesota.

One such program is USDA's new Supplemental Food program under which doctors are permitted to prescribe food for mothers and young children whom they diagnose as suffering from malnutrition. This program is aimed directly at those most susceptible to the crippling effects of malnutrition, and it should be adopted as widely as possible in Minnesota.

Another program which might be expanded in Minnesota is the Emergency Food and Medical Services program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Under this program outreach workers tour areas with substantial poverty-stricken populations, informing eligible residents of the help available to them, offering information on proper nutritional practices, and providing direct aid in cases of severe need. Recently I was able to help

establish one such program on the Leech Lake Indian Reservation, and we certainly should have others.

#### A NUTRITION SURVEY FOR MINNESOTA

I have gone on at some length to sketch the character of nutritional problems and program deficiencies at the state and national levels. Regrettably, we must speculate on the basis of general income figures about the extent and location of the hungry in Minnesota.

To improve the basis of our information, I would be happy to join with you in asking the U.S. Public Health Service to expand its National Nutrition Survey to include Minnesota. As an alternative, Minnesota, like New York, might enlist the expert nutritionists available within the State in a comprehensive nutrition survey of its own. If we are to deal with malnutrition effectively in Minnesota, we will need expert assistance to identify its specific locations, its magnitude, and the measures which might be taken to alleviate it.

Since it is unlikely, however, that such a survey would come quickly enough or be state-wide in its application, I urge you to establish quickly a State Commission on Human Nutrition to examine all aspects of the problem of malnutrition in Minnesota. This Committee might be composed of federal, state, and local representatives of such programs as the Direct Commodity Food program, the Food Stamp Program, the School Lunch and Breakfast programs, the OEO's Emergency Food and Medical Services Program, and USDA's new Supplemental Food Program. It could also usefully draw on the expect knowledge available at our universities and the practical knowledge possessed by the food industry in Minnesota. It should include welfare officers, Public Health specialists, and a wide range of interested and knowledgeable citizens.

I would hope that the Commission could begin work immediately so that, if possible, it could present this session of the legislature with proposals to make our State government a full participant in the growing effort to eradicate hunger. The Committee might then continue the preparation of a comprehensive report that details the location and extent of hunger in Minnesota, outlines existing programs for its alleviation, and presents a comprehensive plan to commit all available State resources to a coordinated federal-state-local-private campaign against hunger.

Several states have committed themselves to such efforts. In North Carolina, for example, Governor Moore has made the eradication of hunger the keystone of his administration. Toward this end North Carolina has sponsored a careful study of the nutritional requirements of its citizens; examined the failures of Federal Food programs; called on every State agency with responsibility in the area of nutrition to report on its present efforts and lay plans for expanding these efforts; urged county officials to adopt and encourage participation in existing food programs; convened a state-wide "opportunity group" to coordinate state efforts and to enlist the help of private industry and charitable groups; assisted new nutrition education programs in many counties; and, most important, appropriated state funds to help needy persons, poor counties, and weak school districts to participate in useful, but often too costly, Federal programs.

I note also, in today's newspapers, that Governor Rockefeller has asked the New York State legislature to require that every county participate in the Food Stamp program as soon as adequate Federal funds are available, and to require that counties participate in the Direct Commodity Food program until Food Stamp participation is possible.

We need not imitate the North Carolina or New York efforts, but we should emulate their resolution to act quickly and effectively

at the State level to eradicate hunger. I sincerely hope that you will act now by establishing a Commission on Human Nutrition.

I will enthusiastically support any significant new efforts at the State level and continue my own efforts to improve food assistance programs at the Federal level.

As public officials, we share responsibility for the pitifully inadequate public efforts to meet the needs of the poor and the hungry in America. But assessing blame will not feed anyone. What we must share in the future instead is a firm resolve to move together in a non-partisan attack which will draw all of our resources—local, state, federal, and private—into a united drive against hunger.

I look forward to working with you in this effort.

Sincerely,

WALTER F. MONDALE.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, looking at the Minnesota counties which do participate, one of them delivers food stamps to only 8 percent of those needing them; another to 5 percent; another to 3 percent; many others to 3 percent and 5 percent and other kinds of token percentages.

I am glad to see that there are a few counties doing better, but the same pattern exists in Minnesota as in other States. It shows that we have only a token food stamp program in this country. We talk about ending hunger but we are not acting to alleviate it.

Mr. President, as we meet here today, there are millions of Americans, of all ages, all races, all beliefs, who are hungry and suffer from malnutrition. We are robbing many of our children of the promise of a decent life because Congresses have not fully met this problem.

Mr. President, now is the time for this Congress to act.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, 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. PELL. 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. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the substitute food-stamp bill introduced today by Senator McGovern, myself, and other colleagues.

I would like to say at the outset of my comments that the Committee on Agriculture and especially my distinguished colleague from Louisiana, Senator ELLENDER, should be commended for the excellent efforts which they have made, first earlier in this session to increase the 1970 authorization for food stamps to \$750 million and for the many improvements which they have made in the bill recently reported to the floor.

However, in view of the massive national concern for the problem of malnutrition at this time, I think it is extremely important that we do not miss the opportunity to pass a food-stamp bill which would encompass all the improvements needed in the food-stamp program to eliminate malnutrition in this country.

As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I have become extremely sensi-

tive to the suffering and hardship felt by those many Americans who lack an adequate diet.

I believe it would be extremely unfortunate if the Senate would pass a food-stamp bill which would only provide a limited amount of progress toward the elimination of malnutrition in this country; a goal which I believe is shared by all Americans. It is for this reason that I have joined with Senator McGOVERN and other members of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs in the introduction of a substitute bill which would go that extra mile needed to reach our goal of an adequate diet for all Americans regardless of income.

If we are to span the nutrition gap, then we must build a bridge based on the food stamp program which does not fall short of reaching the goal supported by all Americans—an adequate diet for all.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending McGovern substitute, and all amendments thereto, occur not later than 3:45 p.m.; in the meantime, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, at this time I would like to make a minor modification of the pending substitute. I send it to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to modify his amendment?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is modified as the Senator requests.

The modification is on page 7 line 2 of the substitute strike "two-thirds" and insert in lieu thereof "one-half."

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, if I may just have the attention of the Senate, the modification relates to the matter of free food stamps. Instead of making families eligible for free food stamps when they have an income of \$80 a month or less, this is a somewhat more conservative amendment. It would set that figure at approximately \$60. The formula would be one-half the current amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet prescribed by the Secretary under section 7(a).

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would have no objection.

Mr. McGOVERN. The purpose of that modification is to comply with the request made by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), one of the cosponsors of the substitute bill, that would take a somewhat more conservative approach on the matter of free food stamps. Otherwise the substitute bill stands as originally offered.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, is that time to be taken out of the time of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes, to be taken out of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be taken out of the time of the Senator from South Dakota.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Who yields time?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield such time as required to the Senator from Massachusetts.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last February 18, I joined with several of my colleagues to support the fight for full funding of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. At that time, we were concerned with the need to extend, full blown, the life of that committee, in order to continue to investigate the problems of hunger and malnutrition in our society. Authorization for full funding was approved by this Senate, and the committee has been conducting its very thorough investigation.

Under the leadership of Senator McGovern, that investigation has produced indisputable evidence of the tragic consequences of hunger and deprivation. The information about poor nutrition and inadequate food, gathered and presented to the American public, leaves no question that this problem is one of the most serious in our society.

Today, we are concerned not with continuing the committee's investigation, although that remains as a yet unfinished task; instead, we are concerned with a proposal to help meet the needs that have already been explicitly documented.

The current Federal food stamp program serves only 3.2 million of the currently estimated 25 million poor and 13 million near poor. Combined in these groups, are those people whose incomes place them in substantial danger of being malnourished.

Suppose the disbursement to farmers eligible to receive Federal payments for holding the ceiling on their production of food was limited to just a few of the eligible farmers. If that payment were made to farmers on the same limited basis that food stamps are issued to the hungry poor, then 193,000 farmers would have received subsidy payments instead of the 2.3 million farmers who got Government subsidy checks last year.

Eligible people who might be able to eat better with Federal food stamps live in every county in the United States. Yet, the stamp program is currently serving only 16 percent of all hungry Americans in the Nation's counties.

Imagine, if you will, what it would mean if the Department of Defense provided adequate diets for just 16 percent of the men in every military unit. That could never happen because the DOD does not let itself become embroiled in

debates about the relationship between good nutrition and desired productivity. They know a hungry soldier is not an effective soldier. Only when we are asked to consider food assistance for the poor do we make probing inquiries about the value of an adequate diet. Only then do we make microscopic investigations into the proposed cost of putting enough food into the mouths of the hungry.

Public debates about the country's ability to feed the poor pointlessly end in a wrangle about money, loss of personal incentives and concern over proving the relationship between good nutrition and desired productivity. But in the largest Federal food assistance program administered by the Department of Defense, these irrelevant concerns are never debated. In fiscal year 1970, DOD plans to expend nearly \$4 billion to feed 3.5 million servicemen at an annual rate of considerably over \$1,100 per person. This compares with the administration budget for food assistance for the poor which would allegedly service 8 million poor people at a cost of \$1,226 billion, or an annual rate of \$145 per person. That ratio of nearly 8 to 1 in favor of the armed services can only make the poor firmly convinced that their Government is not fighting the real enemy.

For a family that is poor, the enemy that gnaws away throughout each day of their dreary, hollow existence is their constantly undernourished, anemic diets. Even for those participating in the food stamp program, there is no provision to insure that recipients will enjoy an adequate, healthy diet. They get, instead, the crumbs of a cruelly administered fraud. Our Government has estimated that more than \$3 billion is needed to provide an economy, low-cost diet for all poor families—a diet, that was admittedly designed for emergency situations to meet food needs for a very few days. Yet, the total food benefits planned by the administration for fiscal 1970 fall \$2 billion short of that amount. It falls nearly \$4 billion short of the amount needed to provide a more nutritious low-budget diet which has been prescribed as the absolute minimum a family needs to achieve nutritional adequacy over a period of time.

In other words, we are being woefully unfair and dishonest with the poor, when an admittedly weak program is approved to meet the serious nutritional needs of millions of Americans. We know that the current food stamp program cannot buy enough nutritious food to feed a poor family. Yet, it is the cost of this soup line program which is used to measure the total cost for feeding the hungry. It is astounding that over the years we can continue these pitiful illusions.

If the needs of the war in Vietnam were met in the same way, American life might be considerably different. What would be happening in Vietnam if, when the Pentagon asks for 500 jet fighters, funds are made available to procure only 100?

Dr. Charles Upton Lowe, chairman of the Committee on Nutrition of the American Academy of Pediatrics notes:

We have a reasonable set of figures upon which to estimate the dollar cost of relieving

malnutrition. Food to meet the needs of an adult costs approximately one dollar a day; infants, during the period they are bottle fed, need 36 cents a day for milk. Extrapolating these figures to national need, one can estimate that in addition to the present food programs, we must spend another 3 billion dollars if we are to provide adequate food for all those in America who are now suffering some degree of malnutrition. The cost, although great in dollars, is a small fraction of the gross national product; less than one third of one percent and minuscule compared to the social cost of failure to feed hungry people.

Senator Robert Kennedy's 1967 observations of the seriousness of hunger and malnutrition in Mississippi focused national attention on this problem. His concerns have hastened our consideration of ways to improve the program so that more of the poor, including those with no income at all, can maintain an adequate diet.

Later, that year, Senator Kennedy joined with our very able colleague from New York (Senator JAVITS) to submit the Partnership for Health Amendments of 1967. That provision called for a comprehensive national survey of the incidence and location of serious hunger and malnutrition and related health problems. Since then, the Public Health Service initiated and is conducting the national nutrition survey. Under Dr. Arnold Schaefer's direction, this survey has already verified instances of starvation and neglect.

Because of Robert Kennedy's insistence to highlight the national hunger problem, the celebrated CBS report "Hunger in America" developed a sympathetic stirring for American TV viewers. Perhaps, that documentary has done more than any other single event to awaken the public to this national shame.

Senator McGOVERN's bill is designed to realistically meet the food needs of the poor. By citing only selected features of Senator McGOVERN's proposal, we see that his bill will authorize free food stamps for 5 million poor Americans. They represent the 20 percent of all the poor, whose total income is less than \$1,000 per year. Over 1 million of these very poor have no cash income at all. This is a provision that was offered more than 2 years ago.

In June 1967, Robert Kennedy asked Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, to issue free food stamps. Senator Kennedy asserted that the minimum payment must be reduced permanently to zero for people who have no income. Today's bill offered by Senator McGOVERN will also provide for an allotment of food stamps that is large enough to buy a nutritious diet. It is not a continuation of the present watered down program that weakly attempts to buy a poor family the skimpy diet designed for emergency use.

And finally, this bill requires the Secretary of Agriculture to operate a food stamp program whenever local officials refuse to recognize and meet the needs of the hungry poor. I am pleased to give my full support to Senator McGOVERN. He has compiled in this bill the provisions that are necessary to begin a sincere attack on hunger induced by poverty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute to thank the Senator from Massachusetts for the excellent statement he has made today, for the leadership he has provided the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and for the excellent work he has done as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian Education which has been looking into the problems of that neglected group of citizens. I appreciate very much the contribution the Senator has made.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I do not think we ought to adopt the proposed amendment as a substitute bill. There are many things that do not fit the situation at all. These are some points which we should consider:

First, rather than allow the elderly to give stamps to nonprofit organizations and commissaries of the Department of Defense, it would be simpler to meet their needs through other programs.

Second, under the substitute simultaneous operation of commodity distribution and food stamp programs must continue until participation of the food stamp program equals the previous participation in the commodity program. Thus, simultaneous operation, with its duplication of effort, could go on for a long time.

Third, the substitute amendment, offered by the Senator from South Dakota and others requires distribution of stamps and collection of charges by the Post Office. Too many persons have had trouble getting mail lately with an over-worked Post Office Department, and it does not seem that we should put this additional burden on the Post Office until they are able to handle the excessive work which is already loaded on them.

Fourth, the amendment offered requires establishment of the program in every area after January 1, 1971. Yet, the appropriation authorization for fiscal 1972 is only \$2.5 billion, and heaven knows what little distance that would go if we complied with the rest of the amendment.

Fifth, the amendment authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to administer the program nationally or in any area through a nonprofit organization. We can see the difficulties which would be encountered in that situation, with the nonprofit organizations all vying with each other to see who would run the food stamp program.

Sixth, the amendment relieves the States of the cost of issuing coupons and collecting charges for food stamps, and this further lessens the State's responsibility in a cooperative program.

I cannot think of any reason in the world why we should vote for the amendment offered by several of our very well-meaning colleagues.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GURNEY in the chair). Who yields time?

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 10 minutes to the senior Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has only 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. McGOVERN. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that the argument just made by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) is a very important one. I think the answer to it is that this is an alternate plan for the plan proposed by the Agriculture Committee, dealing with certain fundamental changes which overshadow the particular matters to which my beloved colleague, Senator AIKEN, has called attention—that is, they deal with the question of free food stamps.

The level is now down to \$60 a month. It deals with the adequacy of the stamp allotment which requires \$125 a month for a low-cost food plan, and it makes national eligibility standards and therefore insures that we will not have the situation in which 10 percent of the counties in the country have no plan of any kind. These are critically important things, and I consider also very important the bypassing provision.

I am the ranking minority member of the committee which Senator McGOVERN has so very ably and brilliantly led; and we found county after county in which, no matter what you do whether people are starving or not the county just will not take corrective action. If we are going to be stymied by that, then the United States is not performing its obligation.

Therefore, Mr. President, as the ranking Republican member of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I proudly join in sponsoring the substitute food stamp bill—an urgently needed reform measure to eliminate the intolerable conditions of hunger and malnutrition from our Nation.

I think it significant that nine members of the select committee—on a bipartisan basis—joined in sponsoring the substitute food stamp bill. As members of the select committee, we have—in the course of our 9-month investigation of the extent of hunger in this Nation—witnessed firsthand the evils of malnutrition and the inadequacy of the present food stamp program.

I would like to express pride in the fact that this administration has overcome some of the redtape and bureaucracy which has entangled its predecessors and has brought us from discovery of a national problem to a commitment to take action to deal with malnutrition and hunger.

I also wish to commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and particularly its chairman, Senator ELLENDER, for acknowledging the need for an expanded stamp program as evidenced by his leadership in the Senate's passage of the \$750,000,000 emergency food stamp authorization several weeks ago.

However, I do not feel that the committee bill goes far enough in providing the expansion and reform in the food stamp program which is so desperately needed. If we are to really get the job done and effect meaningful food stamp reform, then I believe that we must adopt the substitute bill and reject that reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The substitute bill as I have indicated, would provide the needed reforms in the stamp program including free stamps for

families of four whose income is less than \$60 per month; a stamp coupon allotment for families of four at an amount not less than the USDA low-cost food plan of approximately \$125 per month, and national eligibility standards which would allow families of four with income less than \$4,000 per year to participate in the stamp program.

Mr. President, these provisions in the substitute bill are similar to provisions in the food stamp section of my omnibus hunger bill, which I introduced several weeks ago. They were needed then and they are needed now. If we can give away free commodity foods, then we can and should do no less for the neediest recipients of food stamps. I think that free food stamps would go a long way in meeting the food needs of such recipients, whose incomes are less than \$60 a month for a family of four.

Regarding the coupon allotment of approximately \$1,500 per year, we should certainly provide this much food to the very needy in our country. The Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated that in 1967, the average low-level standard food-at-home budget for a family of four ranged from \$1,433 to \$2,120 in metropolitan-urban areas of the United States and from \$1,369 to \$2,059 in nonmetropolitan areas—population from 2,500 to 50,000 In the Northeastern region of the United States, which includes New York, the range was from \$1,503 to \$2,237.

We should not hesitate to provide eligibility to those households where annual income is under \$4,000—especially since the average low-level standard of total budget expenses for a family of four is \$5,473 in the South alone—if we hope to someday see such families no longer in need for such aid.

The committee has taken a step forward in food stamp reform, but with all due respect to its members who worked so long and hard on writing the bill, we can no longer take steps when we need to take giant strides. The substitute represents the strides that must be taken if we are to help those to whom the doors of economic independence and adequate nutrition have been closed for too long. Let us open those doors, Mr. President. Let us open those doors so that mothers will no longer have to stare at the bloated bellies of their malnourished children and so that empty stomachs will no longer exist as a bar to gaining a full mind for many millions of school children who live in poverty.

Regarding appropriations, Mr. President, the substitute bill would provide \$1.25 billion for fiscal 1970, \$2 billion for 1971 and \$2.5 billion for 1972. Without these funds, we cannot have an expanded and meaningful food stamp program. The very least we can do is to fund the program at a level to solve the problem.

Finally, Mr. President, I view this substitute bill as an important interim measure at least until a comprehensive and adequate welfare reform program is enacted to provide monetary payments at a high enough level to permit food stamps to be discontinued without hardship to recipients. It would be unjust and unfair to phase out food stamps before

adequate welfare reform is enacted. We must meet the need right now, and I believe that the substitute stamp bill will provide the program and funds necessary to accomplish that goal.

In the final analysis, Mr. President, we will be judged morally as a great Nation, not only by our general well-being, but also by how well we provide for those who have too little.

Therefore, we are not doing anything overgenerous in this substitute bill. We are simply recognizing the reality that this country regurgitates when it thinks about the fact that there are many people in this country who are so malnourished that they are on the verge of starvation. Yet, that is the finding of fact that affects 5 million American families.

If our country cannot morally gird itself up to do something remotely adequate about it, it is a pretty sad day. In other words, instead of looking at this through the wrong end of the telescope, at subsidies and particular regulations, remember, the House has not acted, and they can tie up any particular minor detail that we do not cover in this substitute.

We have to look at the fundamental thrust of what has aroused the conscience of this country to an extent greater than did the war on poverty or anything in the welfare field. This is the fact that medical testimony has proven and demonstrated that many Americans—an estimate of 5 million families—are affected by hunger and malnutrition.

The substitute makes minimal provision and it differs from the basic measure before the Senate in the fundamental point—that we will not allow a family to starve because it does not have the money to pay for food stamps, and that we will not allow any political entity, a county or otherwise, to frustrate the conscience of the United States in providing for people who can find no income for food—not to mention other basic necessities of life.

For those reasons, Mr. President, because it settles the basic question of principle in a reasonable and modest way, I hope very much that the Senate will adopt the substitute and do its part to deal with what is a blot on the national escutcheon and an affront to the national conscience that demonstrably, hundreds of thousands of Americans go to bed hungry every night is something which I do not think any American wants to tolerate, however we may differ on any other question.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the substitute means a rewriting of the whole bill. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry spent 4 days in hearings and 2 or 3 days in marking up the bill. The only opposition was from the Senator from South Dakota. There was some opposition to a provision in the bill relating to granting free stamps to people receiving incomes of less than \$40 or \$60.

But this is a very liberal bill. It is not the same as the law we now have on the statute books, by any means. In this bill, I read from section 3 (a) :

The face value of the coupon allotment which State agencies shall be authorized to

issue to any households certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be in such amount as the Secretary determines to be the cost of a nutritionally adequate diet.

Mr. President, the bill provides \$750 million for fiscal year 1970. The testimony was that the administration could use only \$610 million. Therefore, under the bill we are now considering we are providing \$140 million more than the administration said it could use.

For the second year the administrator would have \$1.5 billion and a carryover of whatever is left from fiscal year 1970. For the third year \$1.5 billion plus whatever is carried over from the two preceding years would be available.

Mr. President, the bill we are now considering is a vast improvement over the law that is now on the statute books. The present law provides that the recipient of stamps shall pay as much cash for stamps as he did pay in the past and, depending on his income, he would receive a small bonus of stamps for that much cash.

Under the old rules and regulations that were made by the Secretary of Agriculture, a person paying as low as \$2 could get stamps in the amount of \$30, \$40, up to \$50; and under this new bill the Secretary could even go further than that.

Under the new bill as well as the present law administration is provided at the local level. In other words, it involves participation by the State, by the county, and the people.

Under the substitute bill, if a county does not join in and ask for the program, the Federal Government could go in and establish a program not administered directly by the Secretary but by some association which he chooses to do the job.

Mr. President, I do not know the implications involved in the substitute we are now considering. We have not had time to consider all of the provisions of the substitute bill. The committee spent much time in producing the bill which was reported. In my humble judgment the substitute would not give to the people the diet that is prescribed in the bill that we have presented to the Senate for the reason that, as the Senator from South Dakota admitted today, the money could be used for other purposes than to buy stamps.

Our bill specifies that the stamps are to be used to provide a diet which the Secretary determines to be a nutritionally adequate diet. That is prescribed in the bill itself.

The substitute provides that the stamps could be used to buy soap—I will refer to the bill for the other language that is contained in the provision.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. The substitute bill provides:

The term "food" also means such products as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation.

Mr. AIKEN. That could mean clothing.

Mr. ELLENDER. It could mean clothing. It could mean housing.

Mr. AIKEN. It could mean almost anything pertaining to living quarters.

Mr. ELLENDER. There is no doubt about it.

As I said, Mr. President, the proposals of the Senator would change the bill altogether. On local administration I dare say that this bill would not give to the recipients the stamps necessary to give them an adequate diet. The local administration should be retained, but under the substitute bill it is intended that every county and every parish in the United States shall have a program of food stamps; and, if the locality does not do so, if it does not follow the law in applying for it, then, as I said a while ago the Secretary could employ an association—the Salvation Army or the Black Panthers, or what-have-you—to operate the program in the counties where the local authorities refuse or have reason not to desire to have a program.

One of the most seriously defective sections in the bill is the provision for concurrent operation of the food distribution program, which does not provide an adequate diet, along with the food stamp program, permitting participants to purchase less than that which is allotted as necessary to an adequate diet, and permitting food stamps to be used for a wide variety of nonfood products instead of being used for food.

Now, in order to carry out the program as envisioned by the distinguished Senator from South Dakota it would not require \$2.5 billion but probably \$5 billion per year to operate, and particularly when the bill provides that the moneys can be used for purposes other than food.

The committee felt that the program for food stamps should be relegated to food needs, for the purpose of purchasing food and nothing else.

Mr. President, I am very hopeful that the Senate will not make a snap judgment and vote for this substitute in lieu of the bill reported by the committee with little or no opposition from anyone except, as I said, a few who desire to have free stamps ranging from \$40 to \$60 to low income families.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I wish to say that we are charged with proceeding at a snail's pace. Now we are raising the appropriation authorization from \$340 million to \$1.5 billion in 2 years and that is a pretty good pace for a snail. It is more than a 400-percent increase.

Mr. ELLENDER. I agree with the Senator.

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

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have not seen a more serious effort to come up with good legislation than that which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry used in the several days of hearings and the several days of markup which we employed. We came out with a bill which is really revolutionary in the amount of the increase to meet the problems of hunger in this Nation.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) both have stated accurately what happened in committee.

With only the reservation on the part of the Senator from South Dakota that he expected to offer a substitute bill, and the reservations of about four Senators that they wanted to vote for free food stamps for the least able families, there was no division in that committee of 13 Senators on the bill when it was reported.

Mr. President, the first point I want to mention, which has already been mentioned, is the fact that the substitute bill as proposed by the Senator from South Dakota would change the nature of the bill. This is a food stamp bill. I read only these words from the substitute bill:

The term "food" also means such products as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation.

That means soap, toothpaste, toothbrushes, Lysol, toilet tissue, and any number of other things which we could mention that would be added to the articles which would come within the purview of the bill; that would make it not at all a food stamp bill exclusively.

I hardly need mention the fact that a drive would be made by many industries to get in under the purchases which could be made by food stamps, if this kind of provision were put in the bill.

The second thing I want to mention is the power of the Secretary of Agriculture to override the Governor and the State welfare department that would be given by the substitute bill. It is provided in the bill that, in the event the State welfare department has not managed the program well or does not ask for a program, and the Governor does not ask for a program, the Secretary of Agriculture can, on his own motion, bring food stamps into any county and have the program administered by a nonprofit association or organization of his choice, or by a public organization, if he so chooses.

Mr. President, if that is consonant with our form of government, then I fail to recognize it. It seems to me it seeks to put in the hands of a Federal agency, and in an important officer of the Federal Government, the power to override entirely the will of the local community, and the will of the State, that is directly opposed to the use of this kind of program.

Incidentally, there may be units that want to continue the commodity distribution program, which can be done, even under the committee bill.

The third point I want to mention is the excessive amounts that would be authorized in the bill. The present program for 1969 is \$315 million. The amount authorized for 1970 is \$340 million. The committee bill raises that to \$750 million—that is more than double—and raises that by doubling it to \$1.5 billion for 1971; and for the same amount, \$1.5 billion for 1972. It also provides for a cumulative use of the authorizations and appropriations. So that, as a matter of fact, what is provided is a total authorization of \$3.75 billion for the 3 years covered by the committee bill.

Mr. President, the substitute bill provides, instead, \$5.75 billion, or exactly \$2 billion more for the program in those 3 years, meaning that the judgment of the committee, after hearing all the testimony, is considered to be that far off in its effort to meet the practical problems of expansion of the present existing problems within those 3 years.

I want to give full credit to the Secretary of Agriculture. I think he is quite an humanitarian. He appeared before the committee more than once. We asked him to give us the figures as to what he thought could be spent in the first year, the second year, and the third year. He did so, and Senators will find the figures on page 411 of the printed record of the hearings.

The figures are as follows: That in the 1970 year, \$610,000,000 could be spent; that in the 1971 year, \$1,517,000,000 could be spent; that in the 1972 year, \$1,742,000,000 could be spent—meaning that he found, during the 3 years, that \$3,870,000,000, or a little less than that, could be spent by expanding, in every practical way known to him and his staff, this very important program.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the fact that there is only a slender difference between the total for 3 years as stated by the Secretary of Agriculture and what is in the committee bill. It is \$3,750,000,000 in the committee bill. It is \$3,870,000,000 under the testimony of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I say again that I think the Secretary of Agriculture is an humanitarian. He is as good an humanitarian as anyone in this Chamber, including those who press for adoption of the substitute bill. I think he knows a good deal more about administration than they do and can do, when he tells the committee what he told it. I believe that we should listen to him in that regard.

Mr. President, in these days of fiscal difficulty, shall we come in here and say that we want to authorize nearly \$2 billion more than he says can possibly be properly spent in the three years covered by the bill?

The next point I want to make—I am on limited time—is the practical point that I think we will make immensely harder the passage of any appropriate legislation if we adopt the substitute bill.

I remind Senators that several months ago we passed a provision, by special resolution, which we called an emergency resolution, raising the authorization to \$750,000,000 for 1970. We had hoped that it would be promptly handled in the House. It has not been so handled. It is still hanging fire over there.

For us to come up now with this figure, which would jump this year's authorization by half a billion dollars, and the years into the future even more, Mr. President, is just like putting a live match in grass which has been saturated with gasoline. We have no chance to hope for a real peaceful working out of this important program. We have got a limited time to do it in. We are already 3 months up into fiscal 1970, and we just cannot hope for a practical working out of that problem with the other House. They have just as much to say and just as much influence and just as much ob-

ligation in the passage of this measure as have we. I think it would be extremely unwise from the practical standpoint. I am sorry that I cannot feel there is any practicality at all in the substitute provision that is brought here, because I think it offers what amounts to almost a declaration of war with the other committees at the other end of the Capitol that are handling this type of legislation.

It is my very strong hope that the committee bill will prevail. I do not agree with every part of it, but we came out with the best judgment that we could agree on which represented the vast majority feeling of that committee, and when the final vote came, it was a unanimous vote except for the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota reserved the right to offer the substitute bill here on the floor, which this committee had had before it and which the committee had declined to adopt for reasons that we thought were overwhelmingly powerful. We still feel that way. We feel the committee bill is a good job. We hope it will be enacted as reported by the committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, shortly after I came to the U.S. Senate nearly 25 years ago, I became a cosponsor of food stamp legislation with the senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN). I have been a cosponsor with him all these years since. I look upon Senator AIKEN as a real authority in this field. He favored this program long before most Members here even thought about it or it became law.

The chairman of the committee, Senator ELLENDER, has given great study to this very worthwhile program.

I think our committee was very liberal in authorizing a vast amount of additional money, probably far more than we should at this time. I do not think doubling the program in 1 year does the program or the recipients of it any good. I think a more moderate expansion would have been far more advisable.

I support the action of the committee and hope the substitute bill does not prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. President, I would like to ask one question on a point on which the Senator from California is not clear. I was present at the hearings, 2 years ago in Massachusetts which I think possibly began to focus attention generally on this situation. We found a circumstance in one of the Southern States brought on by new legislation, the minimum wage law, as applied to farm labor in which we found there were a number of people in the area who had no work whatsoever, no wages whatsoever, and therefore a very definite and special situation was created where they had absolutely no money to buy stamps.

Under the committee bill, is there a provision, which would make it possible

for the Secretary of Agriculture to approach such a situation as an emergency and, under these provisions, provide food or food stamps free under circumstances in which people need it free, having no money with which to buy the stamps?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may I state to my good friend that the law today has a provision which reads as follows:

In areas where a food stamp program is in effect there shall be no distribution of federally owned food to households under the authority of any other law except during emergency situations caused by natural or other disaster as determined by the Secretary.

That still remains the law.

Mr. MURPHY. In other words, the Secretary of Agriculture, the administrator of this particular bill, could declare that there was an emergency, and therefore he would have the power under the bill to provide food or food stamps free?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the present law.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished colleague very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not know that anything more can be said than what has already been stated.

There is one point I would like to elaborate a little more than I did a while ago, and it relates to the direct distribution program. The substitute makes it possible for this food program to continue indefinitely if the State pays the cost of administration even though a food stamp program becomes effective.

In my opinion, and as I think all of us know, the direct distribution program has been a failure because there are only 22 different commodities that are now distributed under that program. It is a very limited program.

If that program of free distribution of food is permitted to go on, it will mean the Secretary will be unable to provide for an adequate diet for people. I am sure that, because of the fact that the food is free under the program, many will be tempted to accept the free food rather than obtain stamps with which they can buy any food of their choosing.

That is one point I would like to emphasize.

We do not provide that alternative in the bill. The committee bill provides that in the course of time the Secretary can gradually work the program from a food distributing program to a food stamp program.

Mr. President, I must oppose this substitute amendment. It is not the proper way to legislate. The committee has worked diligently on the committee bill. It analyzed all the proposals that were made on this subject, heard all witnesses that wished to be heard, had the counsel of the Senator from South Dakota, who is a member of the committee, had the technical assistance of experts on this program, and brought out a bill that the Senator from South Dakota recognizes as a major step to meet the problem.

On Monday the Senator had 17 amendments printed. Some are alternative provisions. Probably none of them

are identical to anything in the Senator's bill, S. 2014. Many of them are far reaching and the committee has had little opportunity to look into them from the standpoint of policy. Today we have a complete substitute, which we have had no opportunity to examine. We do not know its full implications.

If it is a compilation of the amendments which were printed and available yesterday, it does some things which I do not believe its author intended. For instance, it would make a millionaire eligible for the program if all his resources were in cash or non-income-producing property. It would repeal the Secretary's authority to limit the issuance of stamps to the amount of funds available for their redemption. It would make certification more cumbersome by requiring an affidavit, and subject the applicant to State criminal laws for any false statements in his affidavit.

The proposals of the Senator from South Dakota would, first, defeat the purpose of the act and perpetuate hunger and malnutrition by offering the commodity distribution program, which does not provide an adequate diet, as an alternative to the food stamp program; permitting participants to purchase less than the allotment necessary to an adequate diet; and permitting food stamps to be used for a wide variety of nonfood products instead of being used for food.

Second, increase Federal expenditures by providing for payment by the Federal, rather than the State government of the cost of stamps for those who cannot afford to pay; providing free stamps for those who can afford to pay—and who are now paying; extending the program to a wide variety of nonfood products; locking into the law a minimum national eligibility standard—\$4,000—which is almost \$700 in excess of what Senator McGOVERN terms at page 26 of the committee report "the minimum national standard that should be set"—\$3,335; inviting fraud by prohibiting the Secretary from looking behind an applicant's affidavit; providing for Federal payment of administrative costs now borne by local governments; providing for complete assumption of local administration by the Federal Government in certain situations; extending the act to foreign and other areas not subject to U.S. tax laws; authorizing expenditures in excess of appropriations; and repealing the Secretary's authority to limit the number of stamps issued to the amount of funds available to redeem them.

Third, make the certification process more cumbersome by requiring an affidavit, in lieu of the present unsworn statement.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question or two?

Mr. ELLENDER. Surely.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first I would like to reemphasize the cooperation of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). He is on the same committee with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), and I would not want anything I say to reflect on his approach to the problem and his desire to do everything he can, as a human being, to im-

prove the situation. We may differ as to what ought to be done, its magnitude, and so forth, but as to the question of heart, there is no doubt about the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). I wanted to reiterate that statement, as has the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN).

I want to ask a question with relation to the question asked by the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) about free food distribution. We had a very heated debate with Secretary Freeman because he did not interpret the law to permit distribution of free food stamps. It was only when Secretary Hardin came to office that the law was interpreted to permit distribution of free stamps, and then in a really extreme situation. It remains a rather vexing question. There is no channel in the existing law with respect to the distribution of free food stamps in the manner with which we are concerned in this debate.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is the law, as I just read it. That law has been used, as the Senator has said. It is true there may have been a misinterpretation by Secretary Freeman.

I think the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) has something to say about that and has had some experience with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I would like to say this for the record in this matter. Secretary Freeman initiated the program, to assist people in the lower income classes, to help in advising on good quality food that could be bought with food stamps.

When Secretary Hardin came into office, he wanted to try free distribution of food stamps in two counties in South Carolina. He came to me, simply because I am chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture, as the Senator knows. I told him I thought it should stand on the question of the legal interpretation of his rights under the section 32 law.

The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture rendered him an opinion stating that in case of an emergency, he could use section 32 funds, if available, for that purpose; and the funds used in the two South Carolina counties where free distribution of food stamps took place on that limited scale came from section 32.

That opinion, I think, still stands, and I am sure that in the event of any grave emergency it would again be invoked. Certainly, as chairman of the subcommittee which I head, I would agree to its being invoked; and I wish to say that both Secretary Freeman, in the instance I mentioned, and Secretary Hardin, in the instance I mentioned—and he also carried on the food stamp assistance program that Secretary Freeman had begun—showed themselves to be real humanitarians; and I have no doubt whatever that any Secretary of Agriculture, in the event of real emergency, would make available funds under section 32 for distribution of free food stamps.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is aware, is he not, of the fact that we did have a very heated discussion with Secretary Free-

man about the fact that he did not interpret the law that way? It was not until Secretary Hardin came along that the section was so interpreted by the Department.

The Senator speaks of grave emergencies. Will he not agree that this does not apply, in any national way, to families of extremely limited income, like the \$60 standard contained in the substitute?

Mr. HOLLAND. My feeling is that it would pertain only in case of emergency and the Secretary found, and thought he was justified in finding, that in those two counties in South Carolina, there was an emergency gravely affecting the lives and welfare of human beings.

What later interpretations might be I do not know; but I think it would have to be some sort of emergency. It could be much less than a hurricane-destroyed area, because it was less than that in the areas in question.

The Secretary found that, under section 32, there was authority to dip into section 32 funds in an emergency, even for the payment of that part of the food stamps for each family that otherwise would have to be paid for by them or someone locally.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the opportunity to speak on this measure.

This has been a notable year for our country. We have sent three men to the moon, taken a critical look at our tax structure, authorized already nearly \$20 billion for military procurement and will probably have a gross national product in excess of \$295 billion. But in this notable year, we will also have hundreds of thousands of men, women and children who will wake up hungry, remain hungry throughout the day, and lie down at night with their hunger still unrelieved.

As a member of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition, I have seen the hungry and how they live. I have heard startling testimony about the extent of malnutrition in this country. And I am horrified.

But I have also learned that there is something we in Congress can do to change what I have seen and heard. I am convinced that we can alleviate hunger and its debilitating effects which all too often force people to live in poverty as unproductive members of our society.

We have, in fact, already begun to act through the food stamp and commodity distribution programs which reach approximately 6 million people.

Today we again have the opportunity to attack the problem of hunger by amending the Food Stamp Act. Senator ELLENDER and the members of the Agriculture Committee have provided us with this opportunity by reporting out the food stamp amendments now before us. They are to be commended for grappling with the food stamp program and attempting to correct its deficiencies.

The administration too should be commended for supporting this program and recommending some vital changes in it.

Despite these efforts, however, I feel that additional changes must be made to ensure the efficacy of our food assistance

programs. It is for this reason that I am cosponsoring the substitute food stamp amendment before us today.

This legislation will expand the food stamp program into the 469 counties which currently fail to provide food assistance to some 2 million people. It will, in addition, begin to set national standards of eligibility for participation in the food stamp program. This is the direction in which the President is moving for his family assistance proposal. It is the direction in which we must move if the food stamp program is to reach those most in need of assistance.

Not only will this bill increase eligibility under the Food Stamp Act, it will also increase participation in the program. One of the major reasons the food stamp program in Chicago and elsewhere across the Nation does not reach more people is because the poor cannot afford to participate in it. They simply cannot gather together once a month all the money they need to buy food stamps. Thus, they go hungry.

The variable purchase sections of this legislation will correct this problem. It will permit families to buy a portion of their food stamp allotment at least once a week.

Yet, the acquisition of stamps alone will not necessarily mean that a recipient will have a nutritionally adequate diet. Many of the poor do not know what such a diet entails.

Under the substitute education programs for recipients will be initiated. The administration of a food stamp program will include a nutrition education program to teach families what types of food to buy to insure that they have a balanced diet.

The importance of such a program cannot be overstated. A family that does not know what is nutritional can remain malnourished despite the availability of food stamps.

Finally, this legislation provides for the concurrent distribution of food stamps and commodities during emergencies, during the transition to a food stamp program, and when requested and financed by the State.

Mr. President, the appropriation requested to enact the provisions I have outlined is \$1.25 billion for fiscal 1970. This is far less than the \$2.93 billion the Bureau of the Budget indicated would be needed to eliminate hunger in the Nation this year.

We have a responsibility to make this investment, an obligation to the hungry and to our society to see that all our citizens are fed. I hope that we will accept this responsibility today as we consider amending the Food Stamp Act.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in addition to the nine of the 13 members of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs who cosponsored this amendment in the nature of a substitute, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD),

the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) be added as co-sponsors.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

**MR. McGOVERN.** Mr. President, the bipartisan amendment that is before the Senate is designed to carry out the call that President Nixon and others have made to put an end to hunger in this country once and for all. It is my best judgment that the committee bill, while it is a big improvement over the existing program, will still leave about half of the 15 million hungry people in this country malnourished. It will not reach, in my judgment, more than seven or eight million of those people who can be classified as malnourished.

The substitute provision will reach all 15 million of those people.

**THE PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time has expired.

**MR. SCOTT.** Mr. President, I am pleased that the substitute food stamp bill, now before us, includes language similar to my amendment to extend the benefits of the food stamp program to elderly persons now denied eligibility because they lack kitchen facilities, or because they are physically unable to cook for themselves. My amendment proposed that private, nonprofit organizations be authorized to accept food stamps in exchange for cooked meals prepared either for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls.

Thirty-three Senators joined me as a cosponsor of S. 2470, the bill which I introduced earlier this year, and on which my amendment is based. These distinguished Senators are: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DODD, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. FONG, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HART, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. HOLDINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. PELL, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPONG, Mr. SAXBE, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH.

Legislation identical to S. 2470 has been introduced also in the House of Representatives by two of Pennsylvania's able Congressmen, Mr. EDWARD G. BIESTER, JR., and Mr. JOSEPH M. McDADE.

Congress, in approving the Food Stamp Act of 1964, the act which we are today amending, intended to help older citizens with meager incomes to buy more and better food. Under the present law, however, persons who otherwise meet age, residency and income requirements are still not eligible for food stamps if they do not have cooking facilities in their households. If a physical incapacity or chronic illness makes it impossible for persons to shop or prepare food, and if they have no one to do these things for them, these persons, too, are in effect denied the use of food stamps. I see no reason why these citizens, who are often among the most isolated and needy in the community, should be denied the benefits which the Food Stamp Act was enacted to provide.

My proposal would amend the Food Stamp Act to meet this problem. It would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture, under regulations carefully prescribed and administered by him, to designate specific church and other non-profit organizations of a bona fide charitable nature to accept food stamps in exchange for prepared meals. Although the redemption of these stamps would assist eligible groups in the purchase of food, the stamps themselves would be issued only to individuals, who would be the direct beneficiaries of this amendment. This, I believe, is fully in keeping with the congressional intent behind the Food Stamp Act. Moreover, by engaging the cooperation of nonprofit, charitable organizations, my proposal would be in keeping also with the current focus of relying more heavily on private initiative for solutions to pressing national problems, of which one, certainly, is hunger.

Today, in 27 States across America, more than 75 charitable organizations are taking one approach to the alleviation of hunger through programs which offer prepared meals to "shut-ins" and other elderly persons who are unable to cook for themselves and who, in the absence of this assistance, might otherwise face the dismal prospect of institutionalization. These programs, relying heavily on voluntary effort, are aimed at an element of the hunger problem which, though less noticed, is nevertheless significant and fully worthy of attention and corrective action.

It was through one such effort in my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that I first learned of the need for the amendment which I am proposing today. The meals on wheels program, operated by the Lutheran Service Society of western Pennsylvania, currently provides such service to Pittsburgh's Northside, a section in which an unusually large number of persons live in rooming houses. A well-balanced nutritious diet is offered through two meals a day served five times weekly. Despite the extensive use of volunteers, however, food and other costs have limited the number of elderly who can be reached by this program so far to only about 50. Estimates indicate that in this one area alone, several thousand needy persons might potentially be served. My amendment is designed to encourage and make possible the expansion of just such efforts, not only for Pittsburgh, but for the many communities and cities throughout the Nation where a similar situation and need exist.

It is an irony, in these times of unprecedented economic achievement, that the basic goal of enough to eat still remains, for too many Americans, a promise rather than reality. As a nation, we have become increasingly aware of the need to strengthen our food assistance programs to assure access to a proper diet for persons living on poverty level incomes and below. This administration has announced its intention to make the food stamp program a more effective vehicle for this purpose. Yet, without the changes proposed in my amendment, some of our most needy older citizens will remain disenfranchised from food stamp benefits.

**MR. PRESIDENT,** the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee held extensive hearings before reporting its bill. This legislation, while extending and expanding the food stamp program, still failed to deal with the problem which my amendment is intended to resolve. The committee's bill still failed to provide a change of eligibility needed to enable the poor, who otherwise qualify, but who cannot cook for themselves because of physical disability or a lack of kitchen facilities, to purchase, and to effectively utilize, food stamps. This is the purpose of my amendment.

Some may question the effects of the administration's sweeping welfare proposals on the need for my amendment. The President intends his welfare program, and the food stamp program, to complement each other—at least for the time being. The administration's welfare proposals deal in no way, however, with a change in food stamp eligibility. Moreover, the \$65 minimum Federal monthly payment envisioned by the administration's welfare plan, with State supplement, will presumably be used by recipients to pay their total living costs. It will provide that much more security for those individuals who can reduce the portion of this payment allocated for food costs through the purchase of food stamps. Finally, the administration's welfare package is complex, making final congressional action this year doubtful. My amendment, by contrast, provides a simple approach, immediately, to the problem of hunger among the special group of elderly citizens which this proposal is designed to reach.

I recognize, too, that my amendment may be questioned in the light of the Older Americans Act. Title IV of this act authorizes Federal grants to State or State-approved agencies which may be used for demonstration or pilot food service programs to provide meals either for home delivery or for consumption in community dining halls. The use of title IV grants for this purpose, however, is limited generally to the payment of administrative and research costs in connection with these programs. This means that those persons, to whom these meals are offered, are still expected to pay for the cost of the food which goes into the meals which they consume. Even if title IV funding were to be increased dramatically, this would only enhance the ability of organizations to provide food services, without in any way increasing the ability of individual recipients to pay for their meals. I stress, Mr. President, that title IV of the Older Americans Act deals in this area primarily with administrative and research costs. In this, it differs markedly from my amendment, which addresses itself to the problem older citizens face as individuals in attempting to pay for the cost of meals obtained from nonprofit sources.

Many elderly persons, who are physically fit but who do not have kitchen facilities, would find their lives more rewarding if the use of food stamps were to make it possible for them to join others in community dining halls. This is true also for those elderly, physically handicapped and chronically ill persons

September 24, 1969

who otherwise could not afford them, but who could obtain home-delivered meals from religious and other nonprofit voluntary sources if authorized to use food stamps for this purpose. Too often the alternative, documented in hearings this year before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, is hunger and malnutrition.

Mr. President, I remain convinced that my amendment is needed as an addition to the food stamp program in order to bring the Federal Government and many communities together in a further common effort to erase the problem of hunger among the elderly. I urge its favorable consideration.

SUPPORT FOR AN ADEQUATE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise to support the McGovern substitute to S. 2547. The Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, of which I am a member, has uncovered many inadequacies in the food stamp program, inadequacies which I feel these amendments remedy.

First, income eligibility standards would be no lower than three times the cost of the Department of Agriculture's low-cost food plan. This standard would have to be revised annually to reflect increases in food prices.

Second, the total coupon allotment would equal the USDA low-cost food plan in value. These provisions would guarantee an adequate diet for food stamp recipients—a goal not being achieved under the present program.

Third, the amendment provides for free food stamps for families of four, earning less than \$1,000 annually. This provision would make food stamps available to those who cannot now afford to purchase them. Furthermore, the amendment would require families to spend more than 25 percent of their total income on food stamps.

But the most vital provision in this bill is the one which authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to operate a food stamp program directly or through any public or private agency when no food stamp program exists where one is needed, where no program exists at all by January 1, 1971, or where fewer than half of the poor in an area participate in a food stamp program. One of the most shocking inadequacies in the present program is the inability of the Federal Government to make food stamps available anywhere a clear need for them exists. It is simply inconceivable not to provide food stamps for all Americans that need them.

Mr. President, as a member of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs and as chairman of the Health Subcommittee of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have seen the horrible damage which hunger and malnutrition can do. In adults, hunger and malnutrition sap the body and breaks the spirit. They rob men of energy and of initiative. They reduce the ability of the body to resist disease.

But the most sickening effect of an inadequate diet are found in children. Hungry and undernourished children suffer from all of the ill effects found in

hungry or undernourished adults. But hungry children are doubly afflicted, for hungry children cannot learn. Thus, when we condemn a child to hunger because we fail to assure that he has an adequate diet, we also condemn him to lag behind the other children because he cannot learn as well as they can.

The hearings held before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs have shown that 90 percent of the potential intellectual development of a person is fixed and determined by the time he reaches 4 years of age, and that malnutrition during the first 4 years of life of a child means that the child will be mentally retarded or a slow learner. A child malnourished during the first 4 years is mentally malnourished all the rest of his life, regardless of the diet he receives during later years.

I submit, Mr. President, that we, in this Senate, in this Nation, cannot go on record as being willing to do anything less than provide food for every American who needs it. Will we have it said of us that we were the generation that placed an American on the moon, we were the generation which achieved an undreamed-of level of technology here on earth and that we failed to feed its own fellow citizens? I think not, Mr. President. I urge adoption of this substitute.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, of the Senator from South Dakota.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG. On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) would each vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 40, as follows:

[No. 98 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Anderson	Church	Goodell
Baker	Cook	Gravel
Bayh	Cooper	Harris
Brooke	Cranston	Hart
Burdick	Dodd	Hartke
Byrd, W. V. a.	Eagleton	Hatfield
Case	Fulbright	Hollings

Inouye	Montoya	Saxbe
Jackson	Moss	Schweiker
Javits	Muskie	Scott
Kennedy	Nelson	Smith, Ill.
Mansfield	Packwood	Spong
Mathias	Pastore	Stevens
McCarthy	Pell	Symington
McGovern	Percy	Tydings
McIntyre	Proxmire	Williams, N.J.
Metcalf	Randolph	Yarborough
Mondale	Ribicoff	Young, Ohio

NAYS—40

Aiken	Ervin	Murphy
Allen	Fannin	Pearson
Allott	Fong	Prouty
Bellmon	Goldwater	Russell
Bennett	Griffin	Smith, Maine
Bible	Gurney	Sparkman
Boggs	Hansen	Stennis
Byrd, Va.	Holland	Talmadge
Cannon	Hruska	Thurmond
Cotton	Jordan, N.C.	Tower
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Dole	McClellan	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Miler	
Ellender	Mundt	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Long, against.

NOT VOTING—5

Eastland	Hughes	McGee
Gore	Magnuson	

So Mr. McGOVERN's amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the substitute amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McGOVERN. I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF ELECTION OF MINORITY LEADER AND MINORITY WHIP

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, as chairman of the Republican Senatorial Conference, I wish to announce to the Senate that today the Republican Senatorial Conference elected the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator HUGH SCOTT, as floor leader, and the junior Senator from Michigan, Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN, as whip.

I make this announcement so that there may be official record of the action of the Republican Senatorial Conference.

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

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. I yield.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it is not in bad grace for this expression to come from this side of the aisle. I rise to congratulate my colleague from Michigan, BOB GRIFFIN. Now that his votes are counted, it will do him no damage to say that if I were a Republican and a participant in that caucus, I most certainly would have voted for Bob. [Laughter.]

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2547) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964.

Mr. JAVITS. Third reading, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, since I shall vote against the passage of this bill, I want the record to show, rather briefly, some of the reasons why I was opposed to it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is not order in the Senate. I ask that all persons not immediately needed on the floor of the Senate be asked to leave the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senate is not in order. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the Chamber of all unnecessary personnel at this time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the Senate is not in order. I ask that all attachés be compelled to leave the Chamber immediately. They are overpaid for the work they are supposed to do in their offices, and they are here out of curiosity. I ask that the Sergeant at Arms perform his duties immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms has been so instructed, and the unauthorized personnel are leaving the Chamber.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if any of my distinguished colleagues do not wish to hear my brief remarks, they of course have the privilege of withdrawing from the Chamber; but I hope they will do me the courtesy to listen if they are in the Chamber.

Mr. President, I want to briefly state why I shall vote against this bill, and against what I regard as a very bad bill. The first thing I want to mention is that it raises by \$2 billion over the period of 3 years the expenditures that are allowed in the committee bill, which itself is a very, very liberal bill. In the second place I want the record to show it raises by nearly \$2 billion the amount that the Secretary of Agriculture—whom I regard as not only a fine man but also a great humanitarian—says he can spend, by expanding to the greatest effective limit that he can expand during these 3 years the food stamp program.

This bill would say that the Secretary of Agriculture is wrong, that he can spend much more than he says is the maximum limit, and that he does not know what he is talking about or is not a humanitarian. I think he both knows what he is talking about and that he is a humanitarian. I agree with him implicitly.

The third thing I object to about this bill is the power it would give the Secretary of Agriculture to completely override the preference of the State and the Governor of that State, openly expressed, to continue that State under another program, the commodity food program. This bill would give the Secretary the power to overrule the Governor, to say that the Governor and the other authorities in the State, including the welfare board, do not know anything about the problems of their State, that the Secretary knows more and better, and that he can manditorily impose food stamp programs in each unit of that State, and can even, as the substitute bill provides, use a nonprofit corporation or association to administer the program within the

State or any unit of the State, thus completely bypassing the legal structure of the State. I do not think that is good government, and I particularly do not think it is good American government.

Mr. President, the next point I wish to make is purely a practical point. More than 2 months ago we passed, as an emergency measure, a resolution raising the authorization for this program for fiscal year 1970 from \$340 million to \$750 million. We a good deal more than doubled it. We put that amount of \$750 million in our appropriation bill because we passed that resolution. That emergency resolution still languishes at the other end of the Capitol in the hands of a committee which has convictions just as we have them here, and which thinks we are going overboard in this matter.

I hope they will overcome their present feelings and will approve that bill. But now to send over to them a bill which raises the authorization for this year from \$340 to \$1,250 million and raises the authorization from the committee bill for the years that are to follow in each case by a large amount, or from \$1.5 billion in 1971 to \$2 billion, and from \$1.5 billion in 1972 to \$2.5 billion, I think brings about an almost intolerable situation for us to work out with the other body.

I am interested in this legislation. I supported it in committee. I thought we were being highly liberal. I approved that liberality when we voted in committee on this bill increasing the appropriation of \$315 million last year, and the authorization for this year of \$340 million to \$750 million, and increasing the authorizations for 1971 and 1972 to \$1.5 billion each year.

I know of no orderly program in the more than 23 years I have been in the Senate which has been able to step up effectively at any such rate as this. I do not believe this program can be stepped up effectively in this period of time at any such rate as that proposed by the substitute. I think the Secretary of Agriculture, who will have the administration of this bill if it is passed, should be listened to by the Senate when he tells us he cannot spend by all means within his control, with good effective management, more than \$610 million this year and more than the other amounts stated by him in the 2 years to follow, bringing the total to a little bit more than the committee bill.

Mr. President, believing this substitute to be a very bad bill; believing also that it brings about a very grave impasse between this body and the other body; recognizing the fact that as wise as the Senate is, it is not the only body to pass on legislation, and that the other body is going to have a say on this matter; and recognizing further that the administration certainly will have a say, when we are going far over the administration request and far over the administrator's limit as to what he says he can spend, I think we are acting unwisely.

Mr. President, therefore, I shall oppose the bill.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Florida for what he has said.

No man in the country is more dedi-

cated to the task of ending malnutrition in America than the Secretary of Agriculture. No man in America is more qualified to speak on the situation.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry held 4 days of hearings on this matter. We were in executive session for a while. The distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) gave consideration and permitted members to present all the problems that have been raised about this program. If there was a point to be decided, it was decided in favor of generosity and in favor of feeding the hungry.

Here in this one step the authorization for the current fiscal year is raised from \$315 million to \$750 million; and it will go, in the years that follow, to \$1.5 billion.

This is not a miserly approach. The Secretary of Agriculture in addition to being very knowledgeable about this matter, has approached it in a humanitarian way as well as in a sensible way. He is mobilizing the forces of the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service, and individuals who are well qualified to deal with all aspects of malnutrition.

It is not always a shortage of food; it is a matter of training. All of these aspects are given attention. The committee reported not only a sound bill but also a generous bill.

I call attention to the 12 points enumerated in the committee report. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that those 12 points, which appear on pages 1 and 2 of the report, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### SHORT EXPLANATION

This bill would amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 to expand the program, simplify participation procedures, correct grievances, assure participants of an adequate diet, reduce coupon costs for the neediest households, and assure all eligible households of the opportunity to participate. It would—

(1) Increase the appropriation authorization from \$315 million in fiscal 1969 to \$750 million in fiscal 1970 and \$1.5 billion in each of the fiscal years 1971 and 1972;

(2) Assure program participants of a nutritionally adequate diet;

(3) Assure all eligible households of the opportunity to participate in the program by requiring the State agency to arrange for payment of the minimum charge, and limiting the maximum charge to 30 percent of household income;

(4) Permit direct administration by the Secretary in local areas where such action is necessary;

(5) Provide for State eligibility standards which take local factors into account, but meet national standards prescribed by the Secretary;

(6) Provide for program information activities to insure participation of eligible households;

(7) Provide a hearing procedure for aggrieved participants;

(8) Permit direct commodity distribution during the transition to a food stamp program;

(9) Simplify certification for certain assistance households;

(10) Provide for issuance of stamps at least twice monthly;

- (11) Permit recipients to have the cost of coupons deducted from welfare checks; and
- (12) Provide for an interdepartmental committee to advise the Secretary on food assistance programs.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I call attention not only to the great increase that we are making in this program but also to other points of explanation. This is to assure a program in which participants will receive a nutritionally adequate diet. It will permit direct administration by the Secretary in local areas where such action is necessary. It meets all the problems. On the problem of having a local governing body which is out of step with what is being done, in certain situations the Secretary can move in. It provides a hearing for an aggrieved party. It simplifies it. Many of these poor people have to buy their stamps once a month. That was difficult to do. It provides that they must be issued at least twice monthly.

Testimony presented before the committee pointed out many things. For instance, welfare recipients sometimes have no means of transportation. It is difficult for them to get to the location where food stamps can be purchased. This is simplifying it so that it can be taken out of their welfare check so they can get all the food money immediately, which is probably the most important.

My point is that this is not only a good bill, it is also a generous bill. To go beyond it, in my opinion, is reckless. It cannot be well administered. It would be better if we returned to the committee bill and operated under that, at least during those months that we know it will be impossible to administer to as many people as are provided for in the bill.

I commend those who supported the committee bill. In doing so, they have done the right thing for all the parties concerned. To go beyond that is to raise false hopes, and deal with the impossible.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I introduced a food stamp bill which was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Many of the provisions offered in that bill were approved by the committee. I thought the committee was quite generous in increasing the funds authorized from \$315 million last year, to \$750 million this year, and \$1.5 billion next year.

That sum of money, in fact, was more than the Secretary of Agriculture stated he could administer. I thought the bill that the committee brought forth was quite generous. It had the support of every member of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee, except one. That was the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN).

I want to compliment and commend the Senator from South Dakota for the fine work he has done in this field. His Select Committee on Nutrition, in my judgment, has awakened the conscience of the country to the fact that we do have the problem of malnutrition in this country, and that a good deal of it is attributable to poverty.

The McGovern committee, in my judgment, served its purpose in awakening the legislative committee that had juris-

diction to act. It took action, and the action that it took was adequate.

I regret very much that I am unable to support the substitute bill that the Senate has agreed to.

Mr. President, let me tell you some of the reasons why I cannot vote for the bill the Senate has just agreed to.

First. Any applicant can be certified for food stamps merely by going in and signing an affidavit. That is all that is required to enable an applicant to receive food stamps.

Second. Any family of four that earns \$4,000 a year would be eligible for food stamps under the McGovern substitute. This is not the maximum, but the minimum level of eligibility.

Mr. President, let me show what they can buy with some of the food stamps they will receive: Any item that relates to personal cleanliness, hygiene, or home sanitation.

What does that include? That would include such items as brooms, mops, hair shampoos, deodorants, laundry aids, water softeners, and things of that kind.

In my judgment, the Senate has gone much too far. It is my considered opinion that the House committee will not adopt the provisions which we have just agreed to. I think that we would have had some difficulty in getting the House committee to agree to the language of the Senate committee bill, but at least I think we would have gone forward in that direction.

I deeply regret that in pursuing what I think is a worthwhile endeavor, that is, to aid the poor, those who live in poverty, and those who suffer from malnutrition, today, the Senate has established a monster which will attempt to give food to everyone in the country on their word alone—on their affidavit—regardless of their financial circumstances.

I believe that is going too far.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I should like to point out, in reference to some of the nonfood items, that there may be situations where poor families should have those purchases, but that would come under the welfare department.

This is a nutrition bill. We should not establish two national welfare departments. This matter should be confined to food because, basically, this is a nutrition bill.

Whatever the needs might be for non-food items, they should be met in some other manner than through food stamps.

I thank the Senator from Georgia very much for yielding to me.

Mr. TALMADGE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska for his comments.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am very happy to yield to the Senator from Vermont, the ranking minority member on the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am really shocked at the vote of the Senate on the McGovern substitute bill. What the Senate has done is to sign a death warrant for the food stamp program, unless it is

reversed in some manner. I do not know that we can do that now, except by returning it to the committee.

I hope that most of those who voted for the substitute bill did not understand the import of what they were doing. I presume that they did not, because they were not in the Chamber when it was being discussed. Let me say this: Thank God I do not want to be President of the United States. That is one thing I want to say. I think I can be rational in talking about this program.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I want all Members of the Senate to know that the distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) offered the first food stamp bill in the Senate prior to World War II. That is the genesis of the program we are talking about right now.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I have worked for this program for the past 30 years. It is a good program. Its purpose is good. The purpose of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in reporting the bill they did, which provided for a 400-percent increase in the food stamp program, was to report a good bill. That was not a small increase. It was an increase as large as the administrative officers could handle over the next 3 years.

I do not say it is the ultimate, but when they talk about turning the program over to private institutions, turning it over to the Post Office Department, as is provided for in the substitute bill, when they provide for the use of food stamps for purchase of household commodities as well as food, then it can only mean that they merely wish to kill the bill or, perhaps, they want to force the President to veto it. I do not know what was on their minds, but I think we should make a last effort to save the bill.

Therefore, Mr. President, I move to recommit it at this time to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because I am so ashamed of some of it.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to vote on final passage of the bill; and if there is a motion to recommit, I urge Senators to defeat such a motion.

I feel this is not a generous bill, as has been stated by the Senator from Nebraska. The Bureau of the Budget has made an analysis of what it would cost America to fill the food gap, the hunger gap. As is pointed out in the interim report of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, in a footnote on page 23, the Bureau of the Budget has estimated the cost of closing the hunger gap to be \$2.930 billion for fiscal year 1970 based on the economy food plan.

In other words, the \$1.250 billion authorized in the substitute bill is \$1.680 billion short of what the Bureau of the Budget said is needed to feed hungry Americans this year.

When we deal in percentages of increase, that numbers game is a defeating game if we recognize that we started with literally no recognition of what this problem of hunger was.

In my previous comments, I commend the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry for stepping up and facing this

problem, for recommending programs that, a few years ago, would have been utterly impossible. But, even more, I commend my distinguished colleague from South Carolina, who is known as a fiscal conservative but a humanitarian, who went out to the rural areas of his own State and saw with his own eyes the hunger that existed in his State, as exists in other States.

I attended the hearings of the Select Committee on Hunger and Human Needs in the State of Illinois. I am conscious of the fact that we have schoolchildren in Chicago who go to school in the morning so hungry that they cannot think of filling their minds—all they can think about is filling their empty stomachs. But we also have a voluntary program to feed those children. For the first time the city of Chicago and the State legislature have faced up to the fact that we have a disgrace—hunger—amidst the affluence in Illinois.

Why did the committee go to Illinois? We did it because the U.S. Senate had the wisdom to look ahead, to set up a committee, under the chairmanship of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), with the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) as the ranking minority member, to determine the need for food that exists in America.

The Senate committee went into several States. We investigated right here in Washington, D.C. Two miles from the Capitol we found hunger.

Mr. President, hunger is the kind of problem that cannot be corrected easily. It is a problem that we cannot correct in the next fiscal budget. We know, from expert testimony, that a malnourished body means an undernourished mind and brain. We know that we cannot ever make up for the damage done to children who are malnourished.

If children are not equipped educationally or mentally to go into labor or work, we can make up for it later by putting them on welfare. We determined, from a careful study, however, that the results of malnutrition cannot be as easily compensated for. Therefore, the investment now of a few hundred dollars in food for a pregnant mother, for infant children, would mean a saving of thousands of dollars later as an investment in human beings.

In this year, when in the Senate we have already authorized \$20 billion for defense, when we have authorized \$3.750 billion for a space program aimed 10 and 20 years into the future, when the Bureau of the Budget says we need \$2.930 billion to feed hungry Americans, can we say that the program we passed is an overly generous program? I am sorry we felt we could afford only \$1.250 billion this year, but it is a start.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PERCY. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Bureau of the Budget made a study of the number of hungry people in the country, and the extent of hunger?

Mr. PERCY. We have only footnoted a section from the report it made, but it has made such an estimate, and the best

estimate it made was that \$2.930 billion is necessary to fill that food gap.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Bureau used somebody else's figures as to the number of people involved and the amount of the need and merely made a mathematical computation, or has the Bureau of the Budget made a survey of hunger and malnutrition in the country?

Mr. PERCY. I do not think it has made—

Mr. CURTIS. I do not think it has.

Mr. PERCY. It has not made as exhaustive a study as our own Senate committee has made. BOB has been simply able to estimate what the incomes of people are. It can estimate what it costs to live. It can then see the tremendous gap that exists.

The Senate did not establish merely a hunger committee; it set up a Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. Its members stood in shopping centers and watched people use food stamps. Senator McGOVERN and I went to East St. Louis and talked to store owners and asked how the stamps are being used. A store owner said he watched people who are hungry and who need food take money for those stamps and use them for soap, because the people have to have some sense of cleanliness. We know what happens if teeth are not kept clean and if people are not kept clean. We know what happens if people do not try to keep a decent house, if floors and windows are dirty, if they live in pig sties. How can they raise children that way? For that reason members of the cosponsors of the substitute committee insisted that we get into this bill a provision for the purchase of soap, and sanitary products. It was for that reason that we felt strongly about the fact that the Department of Agriculture, which is in charge of helping produce food, should not be the sole decision maker about what the needs of people are.

As a matter of fact, the Department of Agriculture has not been able to look beyond many of the problems it has. When the Nutrition Committee was in Illinois we went into storage houses at the railroad stations to which the Department of Agriculture had delivered commodity food parcels. Once the food reaches these storehouses it becomes the responsibility of the community to deliver. Yet no one seems to care. We have gone into storehouses where the boxes are labeled, "Store only in temperatures 30 to 70 degrees," and stood in temperatures of 105 degrees. I then began to worry about the kind of food the Department of Agriculture was delivering to people.

For those reasons, I commend the administration for concluding that the food stamp program should be shifted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, from the Department of Agriculture.

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

Mr. PERCY. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not what we are witnessing precisely the situation in the country? Yes, this program was started 30 years ago, and I bless the Senator

from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) for starting it. But is it not a fact that we have just discovered in the last year or year and a half a massive problem, and before that time we had a question as to whether, even in a hunger emergency, the Secretary could allow free food or free food stamps? Therefore, as this question has exploded upon us in all its magnitude, we are trying to meet, to some extent, the problem on the order of magnitude required.

One further question. Is it not a fact that even the order of magnitude that we have adopted in our substitute is not very much different from that which the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry itself has done? It says \$750 million this year; we say \$1.25 billion. Then it goes on with a billion and a half next year and the year after that, and we say \$2 billion and \$2.5 billion.

We are not trying to upset the whole world with revolutionary doctrine. They themselves said that the order of magnitude has to be manifold increased—10 times—and we say the same thing. We may differ with them in degree, but the fundamental principle is that there has been in this country a sudden revulsion against a dreadful situation which assails our sense of morality, and that is what we are trying to respond to with this amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, if I may reply to the Senator by using my personal experience as an example. When my late distinguished senior colleague, Senator Dirksen, asked me to go on the Nutrition Committee, I really questioned the need for even establishing it. In fact, many Senators raised this question, because we were given a very small budget to start with, and had to fight for a budget sufficient to at least do a study in four or five States.

If one had asked, 2 years ago, "In the United States of America, are there hungry and malnourished Americans?" 99 percent of the people throughout this country would have said no.

For a very modest sum, a quarter of a million dollars, this committee of the Senate has informed the United States of America about the perilous nature of the problem of hunger we do have. One of the great dissatisfactions that exists in this affluent country is the disparity between the haves and the have-nots; and we are trying, by helping provide the basic needs of life, to close that gap with a humanitarian—but, I think, a sensible and hardheaded—approach.

I simply say this is not overly generous. It is not anything that anyone could feel is a giveaway program. The need must be demonstrated.

Again I commend the administration for looking ahead and saying that ultimately cash is better than stamps. I tend to think so, too. I think the reformed welfare program will be a far better program in the future. But we have not even started to debate that.

The hungry Americans exist today, and we have to take care of them until we can find a better solution than stamps or welfare. I happen to think stamps are degrading. I think one of the reasons people who need and should have

September 24, 1969

them do not want to apply for them is that they have to stand in line at a grocery store and suffer the shame of paying the bill with stamps. They then also suffer shame of being distinguished from other Americans. I know the shame people felt during the depression when they were on relief, and that food truck would pull up to their front door. Every neighbor then knew about their poverty.

Mr. President, I feel deeply about the necessity for this bill. I think the committee has done an outstanding job, and I agree with the Senator from New York. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has solved the principle. They have recognized the need. We are not talking about the principle now; we are meeting this need.

The cosponsors and supporters of this substitute bill are saying "Now is really the time to step up and meet the problem of hunger." Providing \$1.25 billion for this effort is one of the best investments the Senate of the United States could make in the future citizens of this country. If we can feed millions of Indians—as we have done, generously, year after year after year—how can any of us say to our own taxpayers, our own citizens, "We do not have the money to feed you. We know the need is there. The Bureau of the Budget has certified that the need is there, but we do not have the money to feed you now. Wait until fiscal 1971, fiscal 1972, or fiscal 1973. Tell your children to wait, and then finally we will find the money for food for hungry Americans."

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague for his remarks. I rise in support of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) as a cosponsor of his amendment.

I congratulate the committee on its excellent and very deliberate approach to the problem of hunger in America. But it is strikingly strange, and absolutely unacceptable, Mr. President, to have watched the Senate, over the past 2 months, argue at length and finally approve a mistake of \$2 billion on one defense item, a mistake of \$750 million on another defense item, and, by a majority vote, continued to underwrite these same mistakes—and I voted with the majority—and then, all of a sudden, when we come to a difference—and this is a question of the difference between \$750 million and \$1.25 billion, or \$500 million, for the next fiscal year; that is what we are arguing about—a difference for 1971 between \$1.5 billion and \$2 billion and for 1972, a difference between \$1.5 billion and \$2.5 billion, we find, all of a sudden, complete chaos; we have ruined the food stamp program, it ought to be recommitted, the Secretary could not possibly administer a billion dollars.

Yesterday we passed by unanimous consent a bill to provide \$8 billion for a far less serious problem—though it is an important one—housing. We passed an \$8 billion bill without a dissenting vote, in this same Chamber. But here,

when it comes to a difference of \$500 million, there is chaos. It is fearfully stated that even private concerns might get into the program.

Let me tell you about what is going on. Let me tell you about the success of the program. It so happens that the only free food stamp program in America today is in my backyard. We went there in January of this year and there was complete hostility, a complete rebuff, complete lack of local cooperation, and an actual voting down unanimously by the Bar Association of the OEO programs, and by the medical society of the health programs. The OEO program itself was defunct. The local officials were not talking to each other, and things had ground to a halt. Even Joe Fraser, the heavyweight boxing champion, had come down there trying to build day care centers. He put on exhibition boxing matches, and got up enough to start seven. The churches completed two, but five were standing as stark monuments to Federal bureaucracy. Why? Because the Government here in Washington, with everybody talking about ruining the Government, ruining the budget, and ruining the program, said, "Yes, you need \$40,000 to complete five of these day care centers. Senator, we can give you two consultants to study the program for \$20,000 a year, but we cannot give you the \$40,000 to complete the centers."

That was a typical example. Warsaw Island desperately needs fresh water. Some of us are always talking about purchasing soap and detergents with food stamps. They ought to go down and look in our backyards, and they would know what we are talking about. On Warsaw Island, for 7 years they have been trying to get water. They keep putting a request in, and the Federal Government insists on a comprehensive water plan. Well, it is easier to build an ABM or put a man on the moon than to get a comprehensive water plan for a 31-island area with nowhere to look except here in Washington.

That land was distributed to emancipated Negro families in 10-acre plots—10 acres and a mule—and they left it to their descendants, and they left it to theirs. It was their property. But when they applied—those people, living in those shacks—for housing loans, the FHA said they had to get a fee simple title.

It was their property but fee simple title was impossible.

The OEO said, "We will send two lawyers there and let them take on the project and clear up the title as far as they can go, so that it will be acceptable for HEW."

The Bar Association said no. However, the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and I went over to see the Secretary of Agriculture. I want to tell how generous he is. He is far more generous than anyone would say about here.

We have to talk about what the alternative is if we do not have an effective food stamp program.

We met that evening for a couple of hours. One of the Assistant Secretaries said:

Well, Senator HOLLINGS, you have proved your point. You have had the psychologists,

You have had the doctors, you have had the professors from Vanderbilt University and South Carolina, and they have all recommended a nutrition program. Senator McGOVERN and Bill Smith and the local authorities have testified for it. The local black leaders have testified in support of it. That proves that 31 islands need assistance. You need a superintendent, an assistant superintendent, and one truck for each of 5 islands.

That is putting bureaucracy upon bureaucracy.

I told Secretary Hardin:

If you start with that kind of bureaucracy, you will ruin it. It will go into billions of dollars. You need private and local participation, control, and supervision.

I do not care if we put \$10 billion worth of food on Ladies Island in Beaufort County. Once that food is consumed or spoiled, they will still be living in hunger and in filth. They still will not have a house. They still will not have water. And we will still have a problem.

Everyone knows of the great leadership we have given them for 30 years. We have not faced up to the problem. We do not even know what the problem is.

I said:

All I want is free food stamps. Give me the salary of one truck driver and let me do the rest.

The Secretary of Agriculture agreed. He is generous. He was willing to give more. However, this committee asked for less.

Opponents say it sounds like a racket—\$500 million. That is what they say. They say it will ruin the hunger program.

I say that if we do not get the \$500 million, that will ruin it. That is my position. It will ruin it.

The distinguished Senators from South Dakota, Illinois, New York, and other States used our program. It has not been extravagant. It has not been run by wild liberals or harebrains who would put everyone on the food stamp program.

On the contrary, they said, "Let us start it. Let us try it."

I could belabor the Senate with the matter. However, it would take too long. Someday we will detail how the medical society has completely flip-flopped and endorsed the health program.

We are clearing up the title problem. We have got things rolling so that the poor people would not be cheated. And you cannot put that into the law. How would we write it? It has to be done locally.

We had one private merchant in the Beaufort area who volunteered the rolling stock to take food to the outside areas. He actually took orders and delivered it to the people at his own expense, for the information of those who are worried about private participation. That is how the people are getting the food now.

One of the great things we have found is that we need a tremendously vast and enlarged program to get the food stamps to the people. In Beaufort County there were 700 families consisting of 2,700 persons who in January were participating in the program. By May, they had 896 families involving 3,176 people. The food itself in May cost \$43,718. And someone wonders why it has to be half a billion dollars. They think that a mistake can

be made and that we can have inflation as a result. They think that we can do all kinds of terrible things.

They think that all of a sudden it is a harebrained, ill-conceived, wild idea to provide for the hungry; but it can be done.

We started it with the nutritional program. The Senator from South Dakota was instrumental in the matter of feeding the children under 6 years of age and pregnant mothers.

At the present time we are feeding 2,127 in Beaufort County under that program. And the State health officer, who is the most conservative of conservatives, a graduate of the Medical College of South Carolina and past county health officer, went to all his health officers in the other 48 counties in South Carolina with regard to the matter. Next year in South Carolina if we continue extending the program, which this measure would do, we will feed many thousands.

They say it will involve so much money that the Secretary cannot handle it.

I point out that he can handle \$4 billion for subsidy programs. However, somehow, the provision of a half billion dollars just completely wrecks the program, and he could not accept it if it were extended.

What is the alternative?

As one of my distinguished colleagues was saying the other day, "It is bad to grow old." The other fellow said, "Yes, it is until you think of the alternative."

What is the alternative? Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina and some of our liberal friends will part ways on this one.

Here is the Secretary of Agriculture talking about a new program. He has recommended \$1,600 a year in cash. We would say, "Just sign your name. Don't even sign your name. Get the money."

I hear a lot of objections on the food stamp program. I get letter after letter reading:

**DEAR SENATOR:** I saw them standing in line getting cigarettes and beer and maraschino cherries for their martinis.

I never heard of such a thing. However, I continue to ask the people in the grocery stores. We have audited the figures. It is on my shoulders and these are the objections we hear. And the grocers say that under the law they cannot get whisky and cigarettes.

The question was and is, "Are we going to get a decent response with respect to the food program, or are we going to get a half-way response?" It was said that it would not solve the problem, and we should give them the cash.

Secretary Hardin and Secretary Finch came to the committee and testified to that effect.

It was said that would not solve the problem, that we should give them the cash.

I do not think we can solve it with cash. That is why I feel so strongly about the food stamp program. It does bring into play local participation. If it were not for the private suppliers, we could not be feeding 2,100 young kids and pregnant mothers in Beaufort County.

I have friends who volunteered to

trigger the matter in the private sector and participate in it. That is what we are doing. That is why I am so strong for going at the matter in this particular fashion.

It has been tried in my backyard. It has been proved, and there is no reason whatsoever to say whether it is generous or not generous.

The August figures for participation tapered off. In the summer the number of jobs pick up. People on the food stamp program find jobs. But the Secretary would not have to spend the money.

When the rural people do not have the money to spend to buy food and everything else, the program would then cost more. That is the answer.

The opponents come back and say that the House will not like it. I do not know what they are doing over there. But they had better study the matter.

The opponents say the measure ought to be recommitted.

I feel that we have been diddling and playing with this thing over many years and had never faced up to the problem until Robert Kennedy went into the boondocks and until the Senator from South Dakota took the matter over.

The leadership has come from his committee. This is no time to holler "chaos" and "the end of the world is coming" over the expenditure of \$500 million in the next fiscal year. That is what we were talking about when yesterday we passed \$8 billion unanimously. I was part of that, because I thought the judgment was sound.

You are bound to make mistakes. If this is a half-million-dollar mistake, come back and tell me next year, "Just like you did on military, HOLLINGS, you did it on hunger. We overspent \$5 million." Come back and tell me, and that will be fine; but do not kill a good program.

When the Secretary of Agriculture testified, I am fully of the opinion that he intended his \$1,600 a year to replace the food stamp program completely; and when he and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare testified before this committee, he was actually above \$1,600. He is already up to \$2,300 some odd right now in his approach to the program. And this bill we are debating is far under what the Republican Secretary of Agriculture recommends as of this minute.

**MR. ELLENDER.** Mr. President, I regret the action taken by the Senate this afternoon on the pending measure.

I was very much interested in the statement made by my good friend, the Senator from South Carolina. He told us of the fine progress made in two counties. Well, it happened that that fine progress was made under the law that is now on the statute books. And it was a success because of the cooperation at the local level. The people got into the act with the Federal Government.

It has been shown that many States refused to participate in the program. Some said it was not needed, and others based it on the fact that they did not have the funds to carry on the program.

Under the substitute amendment, if a county, a parish, or a neighborhood refuses to have a food stamp program,

some association can carry it on in behalf of the Secretary of Agriculture. That will mean this, in my opinion: If States can obtain this program without putting any money into it, that is the way it is going to be handled; because many States today are hard pressed for funds. If they know that there is a law under which this program can be carried out entirely by the Federal Government, they are simply going to get out of the program.

Mr. President, I have been dealing with programs of this kind for quite some time. The distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL) and I, back in 1946, fathered the school lunch program, and that program was a great success. And why? Simply because we got the complete cooperation of the people at the local level to carry on such a program. That program involves the expenditure of over \$2.5 billion a year, and the Federal Government puts up approximately 26 percent of it.

Under the substitute that is now before the Senate, if adopted, I would venture to say that if the House goes along, this fine food stamp program will be a welfare program and will be handled entirely by the Federal Government, at the Federal level. That is what is going to happen.

Mr. President, my good friend the Senator from Vermont made the motion to recommit the bill. I would have done it had he not done so. So I want to give notice that, so far as I am concerned, I will vote to recommit this bill, in the hope that we can present the Senate a bill that will be acceptable to the House.

As the Senator from Florida stated earlier, we tried to get the House to go along with an additional authorization of \$750 million instead of the \$340 million. I have tried zealously in the past 4 or 5 weeks to get the House to act on that, and I could not budge them.

My fear is that if this bill goes to the House in its present form, we will have no action on the food stamp bill. I regret that that condition faces us, and it seems to me that we should try to get our heads together.

I presented my side of the argument yesterday for over an hour on the floor, and again today, and I was really surprised—in fact, I was much upset—on this, my 79th birthday, to notice the package I have been given as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

**MR. HARRIS.** Mr. President, I have spoken on this matter in some detail earlier on the Senate floor. I do not want to burden the RECORD at this time or unduly delay the Senate.

My wife, Mrs. Harris, testified before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry as a representative of the National Urban Coalition's board and chairman of its committee on health.

That testimony is contained in the hearings now before us.

Suffice it to say at this point, Mr. President, that I feel that the Senate in adoption of the substitute bill earlier this afternoon, took a monumental step forward for the people of this country and particularly for the poor people of this

September 24, 1969

country. I think that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and others have performed a service in bringing out the facts about hunger and malnutrition in this country in such a way as to make it impossible for us not to act—a service which will be of tremendous credit to their names and their lives for many, many years to come. I am hopeful that before long the country will adopt a much more realistic and humane income maintenance system and a much more realistic and humane system to guarantee jobs to those who are willing and able to work. In the meantime, the very least we can do is to recognize that the right to be free of hunger and malnutrition, the right to enough to eat, is exactly that—a right of every American citizen; that providing every American with enough to eat is not a matter of charity, the Senate has done a great thing today in the adoption of this substitute. I just hope that the Senate will now reject the motion to recommit the bill. The bill has had sufficient study and sufficient debate. It has had sufficient explanation. Now is the time to reject the motion to recommit, to pass the bill, and to send it on its way to the other body.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, yesterday I submitted an amendment designed to alleviate malnutrition in the rural areas of my State. I find today that the parliamentary situation now is that a motion has been made to recommit the bill and that I am unable to have my amendment considered.

I thought that the manner in which the amendment in the nature of a substitute was offered would have allowed the consideration of other amendments that might have been offered. I discussed my amendment with the chairman on the floor of the Senate yesterday. I testified in support of the bill before the committee.

I cannot understand why the amendment in the nature of a substitute should have been acted on before the other amendments were considered. Therefore, I shall vote to recommit the bill.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield.

Mr. McGOVERN. The parliamentary situation did not foreclose the offering of amendments to the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. STEVENS. It was my understanding that it did.

Mr. McGOVERN. I think the Senator from Alaska has been misinformed, although I bow to the judgment of persons more familiar with the rules than I am. My understanding is that an amendment in the nature of a substitute can itself be amended.

Mr. STEVENS. It is my understanding that amendments could not be offered after the amendment in the nature of a substitute had been agreed to.

As a matter of fact, I voted in favor of the substitute amendment because of the situation that existed. I did agree with a portion of the substitute amendment. But I was late in arriving in the Chamber, and at the time the vote was finished, the Senate went immediately to the third reading, and there was no op-

portunity to offer my amendment. The Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) was in the same situation I was in.

I think the bill should be recommitted. I think we should deal with the chairman of the committee. I think the bill and the substitute should go back to the committee for further review.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) a question with reference to the situation. I point out, as the Senator from Alaska has, that we realized the parliamentary situation. I could have offered my amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute, but I was delayed at an election. I lost there, and I suppose I will lose here.

With reference to the use of food stamps for items other than food, does the Senator from South Dakota interpret that to mean the buying of mops, brooms, and the like?

Mr. McGOVERN. That would be in the discretion of the Secretary. But I presume that he would authorize the recipients of food stamps to purchase soap with which to wash their hands, so that they would not become infested with parasites, worms, and bacteria; soap with which to wash the dishes, so that the food that is served on them would be clean.

One of the shocking things that came out before the select committee was the testimony of witnesses in South Carolina, who suggested to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hollings) the problem of worm infestation. We found in a good many cases that persons who were suffering from inadequate diet were sharing that inadequate diet with worms. The reason for this amendment is to introduce, at what I would assume would be a very modest cost, the right of food stamp recipients to use a small portion of that to purchase soap and other things that would give them the sanitation they require.

Mr. DOLE. Would it include such items of hardware as mops and brooms?

Mr. McGOVERN. I would not anticipate that it would, but it would be entirely up to the Secretary of Agriculture. However, I cannot see him authorizing items which he did not feel were necessary.

Mr. DOLE. With respect to the inclusion of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, I am wondering about the cost of this addition. What would be the additional cost because of those additions?

Mr. McGOVERN. I would say it could actually result in a reduction in the cost because those areas now have the commodity distribution program. It seems to me more economical and practical to give them food stamps to permit them to make purchases through normal retail channels rather than shipping in commodities, which we are now doing.

Mr. DOLE. Third, do I understand that one of the provisions does provide for current operation of the food stamp program and the commodity program? I have specific reference to this situation. As I understand it, it is practical on Indian reservations because food stamps

take longer than 90 days at times. Does the Senator have a provision to take care of this situation?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is one of the advantages of the substitute bill. It has a provision to permit the Secretary to operate both until such time as the participation in the food stamp program equals what it had heretofore had under the commodity distribution program.

Mr. DOLE. If the State or local community requested a continuation of, let us say, the commodity distribution program while undertaking to implement the food stamp program, would the State or local community pay the cost or the Federal Government?

Mr. McGOVERN. The State and the community would pay the cost if they requested a program under clause 3 of section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act as it would be amended by my substitute.

Mr. DOLE. I agree with that amendment. As the Senator knows, this was a provision I hoped to offer for the administration. That is contained in the substitute.

Mr. McGOVERN. While I am engaged in colloquy with the Senator I would like to point out to him one of the things that he wanted to accomplish was partially accomplished in that we reduced the level at which families would qualify for free food stamps from approximately \$80 to \$60. We went about halfway in the direction the Senator wanted to go. I believe the substitute bill is now in a form which should be more acceptable to him than when we introduced it.

Mr. DOLE. As the Senator knows, in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, there was an effort by some of us to establish the principle of free food stamps.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct. I think the Senator from Kansas initiated that effort.

Mr. DOLE. I have never been able to follow the hangup that some have on offering free food stamps. I think the only difference was the change in the Senator's substitute as to where we should draw the line, whether it should be at \$80, \$60, \$50, or the \$40 suggested by the Secretary. I understand the substitute has a cutoff at \$60.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is approximately correct.

Mr. DOLE. Finally, and I think this is contained in the substitute, Is there a provision which provides that the recipient has the right to purchase less than the full amount of the stamps?

Mr. McGOVERN. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. There is a range in the substitute?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes.

Mr. DOLE. The need for such a provision has been outlined in the field hearings. Sometimes they do not want to spend all their money at one time for food and it offers them more opportunity.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator will recall that a week ago Monday Mr. Hardin, the Secretary of Agriculture, and Mr. Lyng, the Assistant Secretary, testified and recommended the so-called variable purchase principle, and this concept is incorporated in the substitute bill.

Mr. DOLE. By reducing the limitation from \$80 to \$60 what does that do to the overall cost? Would this reduce the initial cost?

Mr. McGOVERN. Yes, it would. It would reduce that cost by approximately one-fourth; the cost of operating that portion of the bill that provides for free food stamps would be reduced by approximately one-fourth.

Mr. DOLE. In other words, for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 we are talking about, instead of an additional \$2 billion, an additional \$1.5 billion.

Mr. McGOVERN. It would not be that much because it is difficult to forecast how many people would be participating under any provision of the bill.

What I am suggesting is that that cost factor in the bill covers grants in free food stamps to those families on an income of \$80 a month, and when we reduce that figure to \$60 a month obviously cuts are being made in the cost of the program.

Mr. DOLE. With respect to nutritional education in retail stores, I am not sure I understand the full meaning of that provision.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is permissive language, I wish to say to the Senator. It does not require retail stores to carry out nutritional education. If, for example, pamphlet material were available on how to shop wisely, or plan, and diet, and stores that are handling food stamps were willing to do it, this would all be managed under the provisions of the bill when they distribute such information to food stamp recipients.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from South Dakota. Generally, let me say, most of the amendments in the substitute bill are acceptable. I do not know of any great discussion about them. I think, perhaps, when we come to the limitation, we should know more about the free food stamps, and perhaps about one or two other areas. Perhaps the Senator from Alaska was precluded from offering his amendment, but generally I support the objectives of the substitute bill, particularly the principle with reference to free food stamps, if I could have some assurance that the cost has been reduced by as much as 25 percent.

Mr. McGOVERN. It is in the nature of an estimate. I cannot foretell exactly how many people will sign up for the program, but certainly it will be in that direction.

Mr. DOLE. The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) pointed out that certainly the Secretary could spend another half a billion dollars or \$1 billion, whatever the case may be. I was under the impression, from the testimony given in the hearings held before the committee, that perhaps all we can spend in this fiscal year is around \$640 million—between \$500 and \$600 million—because it takes some time to implement the program. I am wondering whether, by authorizing a certain amount, this does not mean we can possibly spend that much money. We are already into the fiscal year. Is there a necessity for going as far as we go in the substitute?

Mr. McGOVERN. I would say to the

Senator that I think there is, for the reasons that were outlined by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY). He cited the Budget Bureau estimate of around \$2.9 billion that would be needed in fiscal 1970 to take care of all the problems of malnutrition and hunger.

I think the figure of \$1 1/4 billion is prudent and conservative. As soon as we adopt the formula which provides \$125 a month in food stamps to a family of four, and permits those families with incomes of \$60 a month or less to draw free food stamps, and then incorporate the outreach section that requires the Secretary to get this information out to the country, I think we will find that that \$1 1/4 billion will be taken up and expended in the food stamp program without any great difficulty. As a matter of fact, I think it is on the conservative side.

Mr. DOLE. I believe that the administration, in all fairness to the Senator's position, did indicate a request for 1971 and 1972 for open ended authorizations. It did not ask for any limit to be placed on either fiscal year.

Mr. McGOVERN. That is, frankly, my preference. I wish we had an open ended authorization. I do not think that anyone can really forecast exactly the level of participation we will get. Of course, if the administration finds, for some reason or other, that it cannot use the funds, there is nothing in the bill which requires it to spend it.

Mr. DOLE. I have been concerned about the possibility or the feasibility of operating a food stamp program in small and sparsely settled counties in Kansas. A great number of the 105 counties in Kansas do not participate in a food stamp program. I have determined and have learned from the Department of Agriculture that they do authorize the counties to be combined for this purpose. Some of the smaller Kansas counties are made up of 2,000 or fewer people—maybe as many as half a dozen families qualify for welfare assistance. So that the only practical way to meet the problem is to consolidate the counties for food stamps or direct commodity programs. It is not practical to begin a food stamp program for five, six, or eight persons. Thus, I have learned that they do have, in some parts of the country, multiple-county food assistance programs. I certainly hope that the Department will continue to urge this in States such as Kansas, the Dakotas, and perhaps other States, where we have as few as 2,000 or 3,000 persons living in one county.

On the basis of the comments of the Senator from South Dakota, it would appear that the objections that some of us had have been met by the substitute bill and, therefore, I shall vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, let me say that my only reason for moving to recommit the substitute bill was to find out if Members of the Senate really meant what they appeared to mean when they voted for the substitute offered by the Senator from South Dakota.

In my opinion, it will be an emasculation of the food stamp program. As the substitute bill now reads, it is just a

plain welfare program, with very little resemblance to the food stamp program we intended it to be.

That is the reason, Mr. President, I moved to recommit the bill, to find out if Senators really mean to emasculate the food stamp program.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one brief comment before this comes to a vote. I do not wish to delay the Senate. I believe that all the arguments which can be made have already been made.

The Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) raised the question about whether the Senate knew what it was doing when it voted 54 to 40 to approve the substitute provision.

Let me say that what we voted for substantially was a bill which was introduced in the Senate several months ago, was printed at that time in the RECORD with full and complete explanations; there was then introduced a series of amendments on Monday which were printed in the RECORD with a full explanation of every amendment.

The substitute bill had the cosponsorship of nine of the 13 members of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. They have been sitting on the subject and holding hearings in all parts of the country for the past 10 months. It had the cosponsorship of two Senators who, I think, have made the most extended tours of their districts; namely, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), both of whom took the time to make personal tours of their own districts and go out and look at the problems firsthand.

Let me say to the Senators who are raising questions about whether we knew what we were doing, that most Senators believe that what we are doing is a conservative step. It is not a wild, irresponsible effort.

As has been pointed out by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), the Bureau of the Budget has concluded that the cost to this country is 3 1/2 times as much to permit malnutrition to continue as it would cost to end it.

Therefore, I think the time has come to stop the delay and put an end to hunger. We have a bill before us now which has been approved, in the nature of a substitute, and I earnestly hope that the Senate will not knock out that bill and further delay our answer to this all-important problem of hunger.

I urge that the motion to recommit be rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, is it not a fact that after the Senator did his bill, and after I did mine, the Senator made no compromise in order to win myself, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) to be sponsors—as we are on the committee—but there were further compromises to win the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) and others over to reducing the \$80 to \$60, and to reduce the appropriations, and otherwise refine the individual elements of the bill.

Mr. McGOVERN. The Senator is absolutely correct. Without that kind of strong bipartisan cooperation, we would not have had the vote we had awhile ago. I hope that at least as decisive a mar-

gin, the Senate will reject the motion to recommit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) to recommit the bill to committee.

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 56, as follows:

[No. 99 Leg.]

YEAS—39

Aiken	Ellender	McClellan
Allen	Ervin	Miller
Allott	Fannin	Mundt
Bellmon	Fong	Murphy
Bennett	Goldwater	Prouty
Bible	Griffin	Russell
Boggs	Gurney	Sparkman
Byrd, Va.	Hansen	Stennis
Cannon	Holland	Stevens
Cotton	Humka	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan, N.C.	Thurmond
Dominick	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Eastland	Long	Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—56

Anderson	Hartke	Pastore
Baker	Hatfield	Pearson
Bayh	Hollings	Pell
Brooke	Inouye	Percy
Burdick	Jackson	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Javits	Randolph
Case	Kennedy	Ribicoff
Church	Mathias	Saxbe
Cook	McCarthy	Schweiker
Cooper	McGee	Scott
Cranston	McGovern	Smith, Maine
Dodd	McIntyre	Smith, Ill.
Dole	Metcalfe	Spong
Eagleton	Mondale	Symington
Fulbright	Montoya	Tydings
Goodell	Moss	Williams, N.J.
Gravel	Muskie	Yarborough
Harris	Nelson	Young, Ohio
Hart	Packwood	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mr. Mansfield, against.

NOT VOTING—4

Gore	Magnuson
Hughes	Tower

So Mr. AIKEN's motion to recommit was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have already been ordered.

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 proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. SPARKMAN (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) is absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) is necessarily absent and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is detained on official business.

The result was announced—yeas 78, nays 14, as follows:

[No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—78

Aiken	Gravel	Mundt
Allott	Griffin	Murphy
Anderson	Hansen	Muskie
Baker	Harris	Nelson
Bayh	Hart	Packwood
Bible	Hartke	Pastore
Boggs	Hatfield	Pearson
Brooke	Hollings	Pell
Burdick	Hruska	Percy
Byrd, W. Va.	Inouye	Prouty
Case	Jackson	Proxmire
Church	Javits	Randolph
Cook	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Cooper	Kennedy	Saxbe
Cranston	Mathias	Schweiker
Dodd	McCarthy	Scott
Dole	McCormick	Smith, Maine
Eagleton	McCloskey	Smith, Ill.
Fulbright	McGovern	Spong
Goodell	McIntyre	Stevens
Gravel	McNally	Symington
Harris	Metcalf	Tydings
Hart	Miller	Williams, N.J.
	Mondale	Yarborough
	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
	Goodell	Young, Ohio

NAYS—14

Allen	Ervin	Stennis
Bellmon	Gurney	Talmadge
Bennett	Holland	Thurmond
Eastland	Jordan, N.C.	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Russell	

PRESENT AND ANNOUNCING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Cooper, for.

Sparkman, against.

NOT VOTING—6

Goldwater	Hughes	McClellan
Gore	Magnuson	Tower

So the bill (S. 2547) was passed, as follows:

S. 2547

An Act to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964

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

SECTION 1. The Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress in order to promote the general welfare, that the Nation's abundance of food should be utilized cooperatively by the States, the Federal Government, local governmental units, and other agencies to the maximum extent to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's population and provide adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition among low-income households. The Congress hereby finds that increased utilization of foods in establishing and maintaining adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition will tend to cause the distribution in a beneficial manner of our agricultural abundances and will strengthen our agricultural economy, as well as result in more orderly marketing and distribution of food. To effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act, a food stamp program, which will permit those households with low incomes to receive a share of the Nation's food abundance sufficient to provide them with adequate levels of food consumption and nutrition, is herein authorized."

(2) Subsection (b) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "The term 'food' also means such products as the Secretary may determine to be necessary for personal cleanliness, hygiene, and home sanitation."

(3) The second sentence of subsection (e) of section 3 is amended to read as follows: "The term 'household' shall also mean (1) a single individual living alone who has cooking facilities and who purchases and prepares food for home consumption, or (2) an elderly person who meets the requirements of section 10(h) of this Act."

(4) Subsection (f) of section 3 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence to read as follows: "Such term also means a private nonprofit institution, boarding house (other than a fraternity, sorority, or other social club) or school which provides meals to persons of sixty-five years or over who are not residing in an institution or boarding house; a private nonprofit organization that prepares and delivers meals to persons of sixty-five years or over in their homes; and commissaries operated by the Department of Defense which shall accept coupons in exchange for food for any participating household which otherwise is eligible under regulations of the Department of Defense to utilize the services of such commissaries."

(5) Subsection (j) of section 3 is amended to read as follows:

"(j) The term 'State' means the fifty States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(6) Subsection (a) of section 4 is amended by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The Secretary is authorized to formulate and administer a food stamp program under which eligible households within a State will be provided with coupon allotments of sufficient monetary value to enable them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet. Such program shall be carried out in any State at the request of the appropriate State agency of such State or pursuant to section 10(f) of this Act."

(7) Subsection (b) of section 4 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) In areas where the food stamp program is in operation, there shall be no distribution of federally donated foods to households under the authority of any other law except that distribution thereunder shall be made: (1) during temporary emergency situations when the Secretary determines that commercial channels of food distribution have been disrupted because of a disaster; (2) in any county where a food stamp program is being initiated and where federally owned foods have been distributed to households during any one of the three months immediately prior to initiation of a food stamp program, until such time as the number of persons participating in a food stamp program exceeds the monthly average number of persons who received federally owned foods during the three month period immediately prior to the initiation of a food stamp program; or (3) on request of the State agency if the State agrees to finance, from funds available to the State or political subdivisions thereof, all of the costs, subsequent to the delivery of such foods within the State, of handling, storing and issuing federally donated food to eligible households in the area."

(8) Section 5 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) Households whose income is determined, as provided in this section, to be insufficient to permit them to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet shall be eligible to participate in the food stamp program. The Secretary shall prescribe, not less often than once a year, the minimum level of income a household must have in order to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for the members of such household and be financially able to meet the other normal living expenses of a household. He shall prescribe such level of income for households composed of varying numbers of individuals, but in no case shall the minimum income level prescribed by the Secretary be less for any household than the equivalent of \$4,000 per year for a household composed of four persons. In prescribing minimum income levels for households under this section the Secretary may take into consideration such relevant factors as the regional variations in the cost of food described in the low-cost food plan published by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture or such other relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. The Secretary shall also prescribe the maximum level of income for households composed of varying numbers of individuals above which households shall be ineligible to participate in the food stamp program. Income limitations prescribed under this subsection shall be revised annually to reflect any increase in the cost of living, as determined on the basis of the Consumer Price Index (all items, United States city average) published monthly by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor.

"(b) In complying with the limitations on participation set forth in subsection (a) above, each State agency shall establish standards to determine the eligibility of applicant households. Such eligibility standards shall comply with the maximum and minimum income levels prescribed by the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section and shall also place a limitation on the resources to be allowed eligible households, but such limitation shall apply to the income, if any, realized from such resources and not to any income which might be realized through liquidation of such resources. The standards of eligibility to be used by each State for the food stamp program shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary."

"(9) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 7 are amended to read as follows:

"(a) Except as hereinafter provided in this

subsection, the face value of the coupon allotment which is issued to any household certified as eligible to participate in the food stamp program shall be not less than the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for the members of such household. The amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for households composed of varying numbers of individuals shall be determined by the Secretary and shall be revised annually by the Secretary. In determining the amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household the Secretary shall take into consideration such relevant factors as he deems appropriate but may not consider the availability or expected availability of appropriations to carry out this Act. In no event shall the amount determined by the Secretary to be necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet for any household be less than the amount which the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture determines to be necessary to permit a household of comparable size to purchase the kinds and amounts of food contained in the low-cost food plan established by the Agricultural Research Service of the United States Department of Agriculture and published in the 'Family Economics Review'. The Agricultural Research Service shall revise and publish the amount which it determines to be necessary to purchase such food at least annually to reflect changes in the prices of food published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in the Department of Labor.

"(b) Households shall be charged such portion of the face value of the coupon allotment issued to them as is determined not to exceed a reasonable investment on the part of the household: *Provided*, That (1) any eligible household whose income is less than one-half the current amount necessary to purchase a nutritionally adequate diet prescribed by the Secretary under section 7(a) of this Act shall not be charged any amount for such coupon allotment; and (2) in no case shall any eligible household be charged an amount greater than an amount equal to 25 per centum of the income of such household for such coupon allotment."

(10) Subsection (a) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. (a) The food stamp program shall be administered to insure that participants are afforded the opportunity to receive at schools, at approved retail food stores, in their homes, or at other appropriate places convenient to participants such instruction and counseling as will best assure that they are able to use their increased purchasing power to obtain those nutritious foods most likely to insure that they receive a nutritionally adequate diet. The food stamp program shall also be administered to insure that all households eligible to participate in the program are informed of its existence and given such assistance as may be required to enable them to make application for the benefits of this Act. In addition to such steps as may be taken administratively, the voluntary cooperation of existing Federal, State, local, or private agencies which carry out informational and educational programs for consumers shall be enlisted for the purpose of providing nutrition counseling and home economics services for eligible households using such authorities as may be available to the Secretary, or in cooperation with other agencies of the Federal Government or private agencies. The Secretary is authorized to use the educational potential of the national school lunch program and its extension to introduce better eating patterns and better nutrition to eligible households under this Act."

(11) Subsection (b) of section 10 is amended by striking everything following the colon and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided*, That the State agency shall comply with the requirements of clauses (2) and (3) of section 10(e) of this Act. The

operating agency may delegate its responsibility for the issuance of coupon and the collection of the amounts charged from eligible households to the United States Post Offices, banks, credit unions, or any other public agency or private nonprofit agency. There shall be kept such records as may be necessary to ascertain whether the program is being conducted in compliance with the provisions of this Act and the regulations issued pursuant to this Act. Such records shall be available for inspection and audit at any reasonable time and shall be preserved for such period of time, not in excess of three years, as may be specified in the regulations."

(12) Subsection (c) of section 10 is amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence the following: "Any household making application for the benefits of this Act shall be certified for eligibility solely by execution of an affidavit, in such form as the Secretary may prescribe, by the member of such household making application. Certification of a household as eligible in any political subdivision shall, in the event of removal of such household to another political subdivision in which the food stamp program is operating, remain valid for participation in the food stamp program for a period of sixty days from the date of such removal."

(13) Subsection (d) of section 10 is amended by inserting immediately preceding the first sentence the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, a household may, if it so elects, purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment it is entitled to purchase. The amount charged any household for any portion of a coupon allotment less than the full coupon allotment shall be an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount which would have been charged such household for the full coupon allotment as such portion of the full coupon allotment bears to the full coupon allotment such household was entitled to purchase. The Secretary shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. Such general guidelines and minimum requirements shall include at least the following provisions: (1) that the issuance of coupons shall take place no less often than once per week and (2) that at each issuance of coupons any household may purchase the entire monthly coupon allotment to which it is entitled or any portion of that coupon which it has not previously purchased. The State agency shall, notwithstanding any other provisions of law, institute procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program shall be entitled, if it so elects, to have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under any federally aided public assistance program and have its coupon allotment distributed to it with such grant or payment."

(14) Subsection (e) of section 10 is amended by striking "(3)" and "(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof "(4)" and "(5)", respectively, and by striking clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) that the State agency shall make every possible effort to insure that all households who meet the eligibility requirements set forth in this Act are certified to participate in the food stamp program;

"(3) that the State agency shall arrange for the issuance of coupons to eligible households and for the collection of sums required from eligible households as payment therefor through the facilities of United States Post Offices directly or by mail, through the fa-

September 24, 1969

cilities of participating retail food stores or in such other manner convenient to participating households as shall best insure their participation."

(15) Subsection (f) of section 10 is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary shall administer a food stamp program through any private nonprofit organization or through any Federal, State or county agency he deems appropriate in any political subdivision of a State if—

"(1) he determines that in the administration of the program in such political subdivision there is a failure by the State agency to comply with the provisions of this Act, or with the regulations issued thereunder, or with the State plan of operation approved by the Secretary and he has informed such State agency of such failure and such failure has not been corrected after a reasonable period of time; or

"(2) he determines that a food stamp program is needed in such political subdivision and the appropriate officials of such political subdivision or the State have not requested a food stamp program for such political subdivision after the Secretary has made an offer of Federal payments as authorized by this section; or

"(3) a food stamp program is not being operated, or is not being operated in accordance with the provisions of this Act, in such political subdivision on January 1, 1971, or thereafter; or

"(4) he determines that the ratio of the number of persons participating in the food stamp program in such political subdivision to the number of persons classified by the Office of Economic Opportunity as low income in such political subdivision is not adequate to effectuate the policy of Congress and the purposes of this Act.

When the Secretary administers a food-stamp program under the provisions of this subsection, he shall observe, or require the administering organization or agency to observe, all of the appropriate provisions of this Act and regulations issued pursuant thereto."

(16) Section 10 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) Subject to such terms and conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary, food stamps issued under this Act to any elderly person may be exchanged by such person for meals prepared and served by any group authorized to prepare and serve meals under subsection (f) of section 3 of this Act if:

"(i) such person does not have facilities for the preparation of food in his living quarters, or does not have reasonable access to such facilities, and the meals served by such organization are served in a common dining room and are prepared and served primarily for the benefit of elderly persons; or

"(ii) such person is housebound, feeble, physically handicapped, or otherwise disabled to the extent that he is unable to prepare nutritious meals for himself, and such organization prepares and delivers meals to such person."

(17) Section 14 is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(e) No person shall be charged with a violation of this or any other Act, or of any regulation issued under this or any other Act, or of any State plan of operation on the basis of any statements or information contained in an affidavit filed pursuant to section 6(d) of this Act, except for fraud."

(18) Section 15 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary shall pay to the State agency of a State the costs of issuing coupons to eligible households and of collecting the sums required

from eligible households as payment therefor."

(19) Section 16 is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To carry out the provisions of this Act there is hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of \$1,250,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$2,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and not in excess of \$2,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Such portion of any such appropriation as may be required to pay for the value of the coupon allotments issued to eligible households which is in excess of the charges paid by such households for such allotments shall be transferred to and made a part of the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act. Sums appropriated under this section shall, notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, continue to remain available for purposes of this Act until expended.

"(b) Upon written notification to the Congress of his intent to do so, the Secretary is authorized in any fiscal year to obligate sums in excess of the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, if such excess obligations are necessary to meet unanticipated increases in participation. In no event shall the amount of excess obligations in any fiscal year exceed an amount equal to 15 per centum of the sums appropriated for such fiscal year pursuant to subsection (a) of this section. The amount of any excess obligation incurred in any fiscal year shall be paid for out of funds appropriated to carry out this Act in the succeeding fiscal year.

"(c) If the Secretary determines that any portion of the funds in the separate account created under section 7(d) of this Act are no longer required to carry out the provisions of this Act, such portion of such funds shall be paid into the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury."

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SCOTT. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate is deeply grateful to the Senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) for his outstanding effort in presenting the food stamp measure to the Senate. Characteristically, Senator ELLENDER applied the greatest devotion and most careful diligence to this proposal. As the chairman of the Agriculture Committee, may I say, there is no Senator who understands better the matter of food and hunger. He has long been a supporter of the Food Stamp program and the fact that he could not in good conscience support the substitute measure which was finally adopted by the Senate does not change that fact. He is to be commended and deserves our warmest thanks.

The same may be said for the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) who has himself been a prime sponsor of the food stamp approach to resolving the problem of malnutrition since the inception of the program following the war. Senator Aiken, of course, serves as the ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture. He has consistently been identified with all efforts to resolve hunger and malnutrition. His assistance on this measure was outstanding and he too deserves the deepest gratitude of the Senate.

I must say that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) is to be

singled out for the fine advocacy he displayed in presenting his substitute measure to the Senate. Its acceptance speaks abundantly for the legislative talents and ability of Senator McGOVERN. His work as chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has placed him in the forefront of this critically important area.

Other Senators contributed most effectively to the debate. Noteworthy were the contributions of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND). Their own strong views were urged sincerely and with the greatest skill and ability. The Senate may be proud of another splendid achievement obtained with magnificent cooperation and the full appreciation of the views of every Member.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 152) to provide for the temporary extension of rural housing programs and Federal Housing Administration insurance authority, and to extend the period during which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may establish maximum interest rates on insured loans.

#### APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In behalf of the Vice President and pursuant to title 16, United States Code, section 715A, the Chair appoints the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, in lieu of the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), who resigned.

#### U.S. RECOGNITION OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 331, Senate Resolution 205, and that it be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EAGLETON in the chair). The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 205) to set forth as an expression of the sense of the Senate a basic principle regarding the recognition by the United States of foreign governments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments on page 2, at the beginning of line 4, insert "of itself"; and in the same line, after the word "States", strike out

"necessarily"; so as to make the resolution read:

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that when the United States recognizes a foreign government and exchanges diplomatic representatives with it, this does not of itself imply that the United States approves of the form, ideology, or policy of that foreign government.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he can advise us of the business next to come up and as far into the week as he can tell us now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on Senate Resolution 205 tonight. There will be no further roll-call votes tonight.

When the Senate completes action on the resolution, hopefully sometime tomorrow, it is the anticipation of the leadership to call up the Mine Safety bill, the debate on which may well go into Friday, if not beyond.

Following the conclusion of action on the Mine Safety bill, the water pollution control bill, Calendar 346, S. 7, will be taken up. However, there is at present a jurisdictional dispute concerning that particular proposal. It is hoped that the dispute will be settled by the time we are ready to take up the bill; but as of now, the hopes are somewhat dim.

Following that, we will take up Calendar No. 316, H.R. 11249, a bill to amend the John F. Kennedy Center Act to authorize additional funds for such center; and then various other items as they appear on the calendar from time to time.

Some time around the middle of next week, we will consider the civil service retirement bills. I had mentioned those bills earlier.

That is the best I can say to my friend, the distinguished minority leader, at this time. I would hope that, as always, he would allow a little flexibility so that we will not be held too closely to the particular day or time.

Mr. SCOTT. That is well understood. I thank the distinguished Senator from Montana.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be laid aside temporarily.

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

#### THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Order Nos. 336, 337, 338, and 340 separately, but in sequence.

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

#### EMOGENE TILMON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 65) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain

lands to Emogene Tilmon of Logan County, Ark.

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 as follows:

On page 2, line 2, insert the following before the period: "and, *Provided*, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the committee report accompanying the bill states that the prospective buyers of the lands concerned contend that the reservations preclude excavations for building foundations and use of the excavated material for fill elsewhere on the land.

The amendment is designed to limit the bill to meet this specific need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 65) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 65

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to Enoch A. Lowder, the sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials reserved to the United States in a certain tract of forty acres of land, more or less, conveyed to her by deed dated February 5, 1963, recorded in Logan County, Arkansas, on February 23, 1963, in Book 55 of Deeds, page 141: *Provided*, That the conveyance authorized by this Act shall change none of the other provisions or conditions of the above cited February 5, 1963, deed from the United States: And provided further, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract.*

#### ENOCH A. LOWDER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 80) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to Enoch A. Lowder of Logan County, Ark.

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 read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, insert the following before the period: "and, *Provided*, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the committee report accompanying the bill states:

The prospective buyers of the lands concerned contend that the reservations preclude excavation for building foundations and use of the excavated material for fill elsewhere on the land.

The amendment is designed to limit the bill to meet this specific need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 80) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time and passed, as follows:

S. 80

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to Enoch A. Lowder, the sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials reserved to the United States in a certain tract of forty acres of land, more or less, conveyed to her by deed dated February 5, 1963, recorded in Logan County, Arkansas, on February 23, 1963, in Book 55 of Deeds, page 141: *Provided*, That the conveyance authorized by this Act shall change none of the other provisions or conditions of the above cited February 5, 1963, deed from the United States: And provided further, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract.*

#### WAYNE TILMON AND EMOGENE TILMON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 82) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to Wayne Tilmon and Emogene Tilmon of Logan County, Ark.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, insert the following before the period: "and, *Provided*, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the committee report accompanying the bill states:

The prospective buyers of the lands concerned contend that the reservations preclude excavation for building foundations and use of the excavated material for fill elsewhere on the land.

The amendment is designed to limit the bill to meet this specific need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 82) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 82

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to Wayne Tilmon and Emogene Tilmon, his wife, the sand, gravel, stone, clay and similar ma-*

terials reserved to the United States in a certain tract of 70.36 acres of land, more or less, conveyed to them by deed dated November 27, 1959, recorded in Logan County, Arkansas, on March 8, 1960, in Book 52 of Deeds, page 556: *Provided*, That the conveyance authorized by this Act shall change none of the other provisions or conditions of the above cited November 27, 1959, deed from the United States: *And provided further*, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract.

#### J. B. SMITH AND SULA E. SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 81) to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials in certain lands to J. B. Smith and Sula E. Smith, of Magazine, Ark., which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after the word "dated" strike out "September 12, 1962, recorded in Logan County, Arkansas, on September 13, 1962, in Book 62 of Deeds, page 129" and insert "November 26, 1962, recorded January 12, 1963, in deed book 55, page 110, Southern District Court House of Logan County, at Booneville, Arkansas"; and on page 2, line 4, after the word "cited" strike out "September 12" and insert "November 26"; so as to make the bill read:

S. 81

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to J. B. Smith and Sula E. Smith, his wife, the sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials reserved to the United States in a certain tract of 52.13 acres of land, more or less, conveyed to them by deed dated November 26, 1962, recorded January 12, 1963, in deed book 55, page 110, Southern District Court House of Logan County, at Booneville, Arkansas: Provided, That the conveyance authorized by this Act shall change none of the other provisions or conditions of the above cited November 26, 1962, deed from the United States: And provided further, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract.*

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 5, insert the following before the period: "; and, *Provided*, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract".

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the committee report accompanying the bill states:

The prospective buyers of the lands concerned contend that the reservations preclude excavation for building foundations and use of the excavated material for fill elsewhere on the land.

The amendment is designed to limit the bill to meet this specific need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 81) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 81

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey by quitclaim deed, without consideration, to J. B. Smith and Sula E. Smith, his wife, the sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials reserved to the United States in a certain tract of 52.13 acres of land, more or less, conveyed to them by deed dated November 26, 1962, recorded January 12, 1963, in deed book 55, page 110, Southern District Court House of Logan County, at Booneville, Arkansas: Provided, That the conveyance authorized by this Act shall change none of the other provisions or conditions of the above cited November 26, 1962, deed from the United States: And provided further, That such sand, gravel, stone, clay, and similar materials shall only be used on said tract.*

#### THE WILLIAM HOWARD TAFT NATIONAL HISTORICAL SITE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 400, H.R. 7066.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 7066) to provide for the establishment of the William Howard Taft National Historical Site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the text of S. 560, Calendar 390, companion Senate bill, as reported.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time and was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 560 be indefinitely postponed.

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

#### CERTAIN KAW INDIANS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 171, Senate Resolution 162.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 162) for the relief of certain Kaw Indians.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) I offer an amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Senator ERVIN to the Calendar Committee of the minority be printed in the RECORD, as well as a memorandum raising certain questions which precipitated the amendment. Both of these insertions are offered at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the material will be printed in the RECORD.

(See exhibit 1.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On the first page, line 11, beginning with the word "of" where it first appears, strike out all through "claimant" on line 3 page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: as to whether there was a constructive taking by the United States of the lands referred to in the first section of the Act of August 8, 1968 (Private Law 90-318), and, if so, whether interest on the amounts authorized pursuant to such Act is legally or equitably due from the United States to the recipients of such amounts from January 1862, until paid.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution, as amended.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

S. Res. 162

*Resolved*, That the bill (S. 1391) entitled "A bill for the relief of certain Kaw Indians", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress as to whether there was a constructive taking by the United States of the lands referred to in the first section of the Act of August 8, 1968 (Private Law 90-318), and, if so, whether interest on the amounts authorized pursuant to such Act is legally or equitably due from the United States to the recipients of such amounts from January 1, 1862, until paid.

#### EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS,  
Washington, D.C., June 26, 1969.

Hon. PAUL J. FANNIN,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PAUL: I was rather disturbed a couple of days ago upon reading a memorandum opposing S. Res. 162, which would refer S. 1391 to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims for a report and recommendation.

The memorandum expresses the view that the referral of S. 1391, which would grant interest on the overdue payment of a claim

to certain Kaw Indians, to the Court of Claims would represent an unfortunate precedent which might open the floodgate for hundreds of Indians to appeal to the Congress for private relief.

First of all, there is no question that the ancestors of the Kaw Indians mentioned in S. 1391 were the victims of the brutality, selfishness and greed of white settlers in taking the land reserved to these Indians under the Kaw Treaty of 1825. The settlers acted with the concurrence and participation of the U.S. Government Indian agent. In fact, it could be argued that there was a constructive taking on the part of the government.

Last year Congress, by enacting Private Law 90-318, determined that the original 23 half-blood Kaw Indians had been wronged by the taking of allotments under Article 6 of the treaty of June 3, 1825 (7 Stat. 244), and that recompense was due them from the government. I introduced the original bill in the realization that the descendants of these 23 half-breed Kaws had few friends in Congress. Under Private Law 90-318, \$3,200 was authorized to be paid to the heirs of each of the 23 original Kaws. This \$3,200 figure was based upon a valuation of \$5.00 per acre, which appraisal was made in 1862, and which by today's standards would be hopelessly inadequate.

After Private Law 90-318 was enacted, it occurred to me that it was a great injustice to the descendants of the original half-breed Kaws to authorize such a paltry amount based upon a valuation nearly century old. Today there are many heirs of each of the ancestor Kaws, and based upon today's prices some of them would hardly receive enough to warrant writing the checks. Therefore, I introduced S. 1391 to amend Private Law 90-318 to provide the payment of interest from January 1, 1862 until paid.

The memorandum referred to above states that the referral of S. 1391 to the Court of Claims "might well establish a costly precedent." As you well know, I am a firm believer in precedent, but if maintaining a precedent merely perpetuates an injustice, the precedent should fall. Moreover, and as far as precedent is concerned in this case, I feel and certainly hope that it is highly unlikely that such a set of circumstances as those involved in the Kaw matter would ever arise again.

S. Res. 162 simply refers the bill and all related materials to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims for a report and recommendation thereon to the Senate. The Commissioner is directed to inform Congress whether the demand is a "legal or equitable claim or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant."

The author of the memorandum strongly implies that Congress accepts without question the recommendations of the Commissioner in all cases. However, I shall not concede that the Congress is so ill-advised that it will rubberstamp any suggestion made by the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims or any other individual. In the overwhelming majority of cases in which Congress has followed the Commissioner's recommendations, I would like to think that Congress examined the matter and decided that the recommendation was just and would serve the interests of equity and fairness. If this resolution passes the Senate, I for one intend to scrutinize closely any recommendation that may be forthcoming from the Commissioner, and I assure you that I would be more than happy to cooperate with you in your examination and assessment of the recommendation.

The group of half-breed Kaws have no other recourse for relief in this matter. The Indian Claims Commission was not set up to hear individual Indian land allotment cases, and therefore I view the procedure contained in S. Res. 162 as essential to the

fair settlement of the Kaw claims. Congress is by no means abrogating its legislative function in this matter, but is only asking for a recommendation and report on a very complex issue.

I know of your deep concern for and your many arduous efforts on behalf of our first Americans, and I hope you will join with me in seeing that the courthouse door is not barred to these half-breed Kaws, who have no special friends nor lobbyists with vast sums of money to forward their cause.

With all kind wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

SAM J. ERVIN, JR.,  
Chairman.

#### MEMORANDUM

Memorandum with respect to S. Res. 162, referring the bill, S. 1391, to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims for a report and recommendation thereon to the Senate. The sponsor of both the bill and the resolution is Senator Ervin.

The bill, S. 1391, would amend Private Law 90-318, approved August 8, 1968, to provide for the payment of interest "at the rate of 6 per centum per annum from January 1, 1862, until paid."

Private Law 90-318, provided for payment of \$3,200 to the heirs of each of twenty-three half-breed Kaw Indians. One-square-mile tracts were reserved to each ancestor under article 6 of the treaty of June 3, 1825, in which the Kaw or Kansas Indians had ceded certain lands to the United States. The total amount of the authorized statutory payment was \$73,600, and was to be in full and final satisfaction of all claims of the named individuals or their heirs against the United States "based upon the loss of Indian lands included in the twenty-three half-breed Kaw allotments granted" in said treaty and "in full satisfaction of any claims of the original allottees or his heirs for the consequent loss of use of the land."

In recommending referral of S. 1391 to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, the report accompanying S. Res. 162 states: "It appears to the committee that there are legal and equitable questions raised in S. 1391 which should be submitted to an appropriate judicial forum for its determination and a report back to the Congress. It also includes consideration of the policy of the Government relating to the payment of interest on claims which should be resolved."

The following is quoted from the House report justifying relief for the heirs of the individuals named in Private Law 90-318: "In the years prior to 1860, the Indian agent charged with responsibility for protecting the interests of the Indians indicated that intruders had settled on the lands and driven the allottees away. As a result of these reports, on May 26, 1860, the Congress passed a law to remedy the situation. Section 1 of that act vested in each of the allottees then living all of the title, interest, and (e)state of the United States in his allotment. In the event that the original allottee was dead, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to determine the heirs and the title of the United States was vested and confirmed by the act in such heirs. Section 1 also provided that nothing in the act would give any binding effect to any prior sale of the land by an allottee or heir.

"Section 2 of the act of May 26, 1860, authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell an allotment on request of the allottee or heir and to sell the allotment of deceased allottees who left no heirs. Section 3 of the act authorized the Secretary to apply the proceeds of the sale in the manner that would be most advantageous to the person entitled thereto.

"As is outlined in the Department of the Interior report, to facilitate the carrying out of the 1860 act, the Secretary of the Interior appointed W. H. Walsh and William H.

Coombs to prepare reports in accordance with the purposes of the act. Those reports were prepared in 1861-62. In transmitting the Walsh-Coombs reports to the Senate in June 1862, the Secretary noted that the reports disclosed that many settlers were on the land (some of whom had made improvements), and that the settlers claimed they had a right to purchase the lands. The reports also set forth the difficulties encountered in properly determining the descendants of the deceased reserve(e)s.

"The whole process was changed by Congress in the act of July 17, 1862 (12 Stat. 628). This act repealed section 2 and 3 of the 1860 act and that part of section 1 which authorized the Secretary to determine the heirs of the allottees. The Department of the Interior states that the effect of the 1862 act was to remove any Federal interest in the lands and to terminate any trust responsibilities the Government may have had on the basis of earlier legislation. The departmental report goes on to state in connection with this termination that 'In retrospect, the wisdom of termination of the Federal interest in 1862 in view of the known situation which existed at that time may be questioned. Nevertheless, that question represented a deliberate policy decision by the Congress.' The committee feels that the foregoing statement does not foreclose a present-day attempt to remedy this longstanding inequity.\*\*\*

"In recommending this legislation, the committee had fixed the land value of the allotment on the basis of a valuation of \$5 an acre. The valuation of this land is based upon the fact that an appraisal was made of the property in 1862, and that each allotment was given a valuation on the basis of its value per acre. Averaging the values made at that time approximates \$5 an acre, so that this is the value adopted by the committee in fixing the amounts set forth in the amended bill."

Comment: This resolution involves subject matter which might well establish a costly precedent.

The award of compensation to these Indians in Private Law 90-318 was based on a value of \$5 per acre. This valuation, in turn, was based upon an 1862 appraisal, which is understood to be a standard practice in determining value in Indian land claims.

There was vigorous agency opposition (Budget Bureau and Interior) to granting relief of any kind in this situation. Such agency opposition doubtless would be much stronger on the question of adding interest on top of the award itself.

The general rule is that no interest is paid on a claim against the Government prior to the date of a judgment in favor of a claimant.

There are two exceptions: (1) where there is a "taking" by the Government (as by eminent domain); and (2) where there is a specific obligation to pay interest, such as in a treaty, statute (as in tax cases), contract, or other specific commitment.

Indian claims are subject to these general rules. The Indian Claims Commission has never allowed interest, but in line with the above stated exceptions, the Supreme Court ordered the Indian Claims Commission to determine the interest to be paid in the case of *Pearl Tribe v. United States*, 390 U.S. 468 (1967).

It has long been and is the general policy of Congress not to pay interest in private relief bills based on the negligence of the Government.

As the facts appear in the report accompanying the resolution of referral to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims, there seems to be nothing to justify the payment of interest in the present situation, on the basis of the precedents which have been established. Thus, article 6 of the 1825 treaty with the Kansas Nation of Indians provided simply and only for reservations from the lands ceded to the United States under that

September 24, 1969

treaty of 1 square mile for each of twenty-three named half-breeds. The treaty contained no other undertaking on the part of the United States respecting these half-breed Indians. The act of May 26, 1860 (12 Stat. 21) provided, in section 1, for vesting in each of the allottees then living all of the title, interest, and estate of the United States in his allotment. In the case of deceased allottees, the Secretary of the Interior was directed to determine the heirs, and the title of the United States was vested and confirmed by the act in such heirs. Section 1 also provided that nothing therein would give any binding effect to any prior sale of the land by an allottee or heir. Section 2 of that act authorized the Secretary of the Interior to sell an allotment on request of the allottee or heir, and to sell the allotments of deceased allottees who left no heirs. Section 3 of that act authorized the Secretary to apply the proceeds of sale in a manner that would be most advantageous to the persons entitled thereto.

The act of July 17, 1862 (12 Stat. 628), repealed sections 2 and 3 of the 1860 act and the part of section 1 which authorized the Secretary to determine the heirs of the allottees.

Whether or not the relief provided in Private Law 90-318 should have been provided at all is irrelevant at this point. However, nothing appears in the facts of the present situation to come within the exceptions outlined above where interest might properly be added as a factor in an award.

If this referral should result adversely to the Government and interest is ultimately awarded in addition to the amounts provided in Private Law 90-318, the effect of that result on Indian claims generally cannot be ignored. It should be borne in mind that these claimants are descendants of nontribal Indians. Indeed, according to the Bureau of the Budget—"If they had been acting as an Indian tribe, band, or other identifiable Indian group, it would have been appropriate to present their case to the Indian Claims Commission while that avenue was still open." (See Senate Report No. 91-183, p. 8).

*An objective of the Indian Claims Commission is finality in its work. However, if the precedent is established here of awarding interest to nontribal Indians, it could open Pandora's box with respect to various claims of tribal Indians against the Government going back over the years which, in one way or another, have been finally adjudicated or settled but without interest.*

The tribal Indians might well ask: "Why pay interest to nontribal Indians but exclude us from having the advantage of the same standard of payment on the same kind of claim?" What would or should prevent them from coming to Congress to seek the reopening of a legion of claims hitherto believed by all the parties to be settled, for the purpose of adding interest as part of the claim?

The factor of interest as a multiple of the original award should also be considered here. If interest should ultimately be allowed, and assuming it to be for 100 years at 4 percent, the increase in the amount of the award would be 4 times that of the award itself. The end result would be the award multiplied by 5.

The pending resolution would refer this matter to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims for his report, without fixing standards or guidelines on the interest question for him to use in preparing his report to the Senate.

In such a congressional reference, the Commissioner "shall append to his findings of fact conclusions sufficient to inform Congress whether the demand is a legal or equitable claim or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant." (28 U.S. Code § 2509). Under such a broad mandate, the Commissioner would in no sense be bound by precedent. In such referral cases "equity" has been construed to mean what Webster says it is, not what the law dictionaries de-

fine it to be. It may be argued that Congress need not accept the recommendations of the Commissioner, but all known precedent is to the contrary. Once a favorable report and recommendation is filed Congress has invariably followed such a report by appropriating whatever amount is recommended in the report. In only one known case has there been a presidential veto of such congressional action.

In view of the foregoing, it would seem much more appropriate for Congress itself to decide the policy question, either on the basis of existing Government policy or by carving out a further exception, grounded on the facts as they appear.

#### PRESIDENT NIXON'S DECISION TO FUND THE SST IS A SAD MISTAKE

MR. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, the Nixon administration's decision to go ahead with the SST is a sad mistake. The administration insists on putting the taxpayer's golden eggs in all the wrong baskets.

The administration has recognized the need for cutbacks in Federal expenditures. The President has ordered a drastic cut in Federal construction programs. He has reduced the funds for health programs. But in the places where really substantial savings could be made, such as in the military budget and the SST, it is "go for broke."

It is going to cost the taxpayers over \$1.2 billion just to build and test two SST prototypes. And that is not likely to be the end of the Government's involvement. Some Government financing is likely to be required to see the SST through the tooling up, certification, and production stages.

Estimates of what that total might be range all the way up to \$4 billion. And that I think is a conservative figure. The C-5A disaster shows what can happen to initial cost estimates. And the C-5A although enormous in size, is a conventional aircraft.

The SST is anything but conventional. There are almost no guidelines based on past engineering experience to assist us with a supersonic plane of this size. The snafus that have plagued the design stage of the SST are simply a prologue to the problems ahead.

We will be building what will amount to a second-generation SST. Titanium is to be used to sheath the fuselage—something that has never been done before. The Russian and Anglo-French SST's use aluminum. We are sailing into uncharted waters. A good rule of thumb is that the more unknowns you have, the more money it is going to cost. We may end up spending \$6 or \$8 billion on this plane—or more.

And yet this plane is the last thing we need. There are too many other demands on the taxpayer's money of far greater urgency.

The arguments in favor of going ahead with this plane are fallacious. Taxpayer support for this plane is not needed to protect our aviation industry from foreign competition. Our aviation industry is thriving now as it never has before. It is working overtime on the jumbo jets and on defense orders.

Private financing for an American SST will be forthcoming when and if investors perceive that an SST would be a profitmaker. The fact that Russia and

an Anglo-French consortium are ahead of us in building SST's does not change the picture in the long run. Our aircraft industry is far and away the most efficient in the world and it is not going to be hurt by waiting for a decision on the SST to be made in the marketplace instead of in the councils of government.

Neither is the SST going to correct our balance-of-payments problems as its advocates insist it will. There are many able economists who argue that the SST would hurt our balance-of-payments position by increasing the flow of American tourist dollars abroad.

The main point, however, is that the benefits of the SST will be tragically minuscule compared to the social costs it could impose if not strictly limited to transoceanic flights—a limitation I think is not likely because it would destroy any hope of real profits for the plane.

Each SST would lay down a carpet of sonic booms 60 to 70 miles wide. Fleets of SST's crisscrossing the country would create unprecedented pandemonium. We would be callously swapping the serenity of virtually the entire population of the country in return for a fleet of planes that would carry only 1 to 5 percent of all Americans. This is sound pollution with a vengeance.

Ironically, even the one undeniable benefit of the plane—increased speed—would be all but erased by the traffic jams over major airports and—on the ground—between airports and the central city. What do we really gain?

In addition, Mr. President, I would like to call the Senate's attention to another aspect of the SST development. Pan American, Trans World, American, United, and a number of other airlines are chipping in to Boeing for part of Boeing's cost of developing this mammoth plane. The total amount that is contributed to Boeing under this arrangement is \$52 million.

Last week the Internal Revenue Service ruled that the airlines could consider these payments to be ordinary and necessary business expenses and deduct them on their tax returns. This ruling—which was reported in this morning's Wall Street Journal—permits these payments to be written off against ordinary income as research or experimental expenses under section 174 of the Internal Revenue Code.

The result of this ruling is that the Federal Government will forgo some \$27 million in Federal income taxes from the airlines—a cost which should be added to the already gigantic cost to the Federal Government for developing the SST. How does the IRS justify such a ruling?

Section 174 of the code reads as follows:

A taxpayer may treat research or experimental expenditures which are paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business . . . as a deduction. (Emphasis supplied).

To this Senator, this language is perfectly clear. If American Airlines, say, were developing the SST for itself, it could deduct the research and developmental costs against ordinary income. Similarly, any airline which was engaged

in the actual development could deduct these costs.

But these airlines are not developing the SST. Who is? The Federal Government, in conjunction with Boeing Aircraft. Section 174 clearly applies only to research and experimental expenditures paid or incurred by the developer. And these payments, according to section 174, must be "in connection with his trade or business." It requires quite a stretch of the imagination to say that payments to Boeing by American, Pan Am, United, TWA, and the others are payments that paid or incurred by the developer.

Of course, no one is arguing that these payments should not figure in the airlines' tax returns. They should. But as capital costs—not ordinary and necessary business expenses. These payments should be regarded legally as exactly what they are intended for in reality—namely, as part of the cost of purchasing these planes from Boeing. Then, when the planes are delivered to the airlines, the carriers' basis in the planes should be increased by the amount paid to Boeing in the course of development, and this higher basis should then be amortized over the life of the plane as a capital cost.

That these payments are in connection with the purchase of the planes can be seen clearly from the arrangement between Boeing and the airlines. One million dollars is being given to Boeing by each carrier for each of their 52 "positions," or options, to buy the SST, when available. In other words, the \$52 million

represents a downpayment on the purchase of 52 planes, at the rate of \$1 million a plane.

Mr. President, these payments are unquestionably capital outlays, and should be regarded as such. Treating them as ordinary and necessary business expenses of the airlines, as IRS has done, twists the clear and unambiguous language of the Internal Revenue Code to benefit the airlines at the expense of the Federal Government.

This tax ruling constitutes another SST subsidy in this case, a tax expenditure subsidy with millions to be added to the hundreds of millions already spent on this boondoggle for international jet setters.

#### ADJOURNMENT

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 25, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, September 24, 1969:

##### OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Frank Charles Carlucci III, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, vice Theodore M. Berry.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COUNCIL

Harry S. Robinson, Jr., of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the District of Columbia Council for the remainder of the term expiring February 1, 1970, vice William S. Thompson, resigned.

#### ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The Army National Guard of the United States named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Gen. Sylvester T. DelCorso, [REDACTED] xxx-xx-xxxx  
Adjutant General's Corps.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate September 24, 1969:

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

William B. Macomber, Jr., of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.

Francis G. Meyer, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

John P. Humes, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Austria.

Graham A. Martin, of North Carolina, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Italy.

#### REPRESENTATIVE TO THE EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Idar Rimestad, of North Dakota, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the European office of the United Nations, with the rank of Ambassador.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, September 24, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*With Thee is the fountain of life; in Thy light shall we see light.—Psalm 36: 9.*

O Thou Eternal Spirit whose will for us is peace and whose purposes never fail, we come to Thee seeking to know Thy will and praying for strength to do it as we enter this new day fresh from Thy hand.

Amid the demanding duties of these disturbing days may we discover adequate resources in Thee and find our souls restored and renewed as we walk in right paths.

We pray for our country—that all malice and misery, all narrow exclusiveness may be swept away by Thy spirit and that honor, justice, and good will may be established among us. Thus may every person be given the opportunity to live a full, a free, and a fruitful life to the glory of Thy name and for the good of all mankind. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communica-

cated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 55. An act for the relief of Leonard N. Rogers, John P. Corcoran, Mrs. Charles W. (Ethel J.) Pensinger, Marion M. Lee, and Arthur N. Lee;

S. 858. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to wheat;

S. 2864. An act to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 152. Joint resolution to provide for the temporary extension of rural housing programs and Federal Housing Administration insurance authority, and to extend the period during which the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development may establish maximum interest rates on insured loans.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY AND TOMORROW

MR. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judi-

cary may sit during general debate today and tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### ANNUAL REPORT OF ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR 1968—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 91-162)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

#### To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with Section 10(a) of Public Law 358, 83rd Congress, as amended, I am transmitting the Annual Report of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation for the year ending December 31, 1968.

RICHARD NIXON.  
THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1969.

#### NEW PEACE CORPS POLICY DISREGARDS CONGRESSIONAL HISTORY

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1