SENATE—*Tuesday, December 2, 1969*

The Senate met at 10 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Eternal Father, keep us this day inwardly in our souls and outwardly in our actions, in tune with infinite and eternal values. Make us to be of good courage, to hold fast that which is good, to render no man evil for evil, to strengthen the faint hearted, support the weak, help the afflicted, honor all men, and ever to love and serve Thee. Lead us by Thy wisdom and when the evening comes and our work is done, grant us the rest of the just. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, December 1, 1969, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on yesterday, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for some very brief unanimous-consent requests, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Senator.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes, and that the morning business not exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Colorado is recognized for 20 minutes.

THE SONGMY INCIDENT—TRIAL BY PRESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am taking the floor today—and I appreciate the courtesy of the leadership in giving me this time—to raise once again the issue of fair trial versus trial by press.

The first amendment to the Constitution does not allow trial by press. The denial of the basic right of any person, whether in or out of uniform, to a fair trial is a right guaranteed under our Constitution.

I spoke last week of the possibility of prejudice or bias which could result from publication of interviews of prospective witnesses in the so-called Songmy massacre. I am speaking now of evidence presented in the form of statements of alleged witnesses or participants and photographs and judgments by the press. I am speaking of trial by press in a most explosive, emotional, alleged atrocity in Vietnam.

Mr. President, only a handful of events in our Nation's history, because of their national significance or sensational aspects, have received such extensive coverage. Only a few of these cases have subjected our legal system to the strain present in the Mylai case. The shock of the alleged atrocities struck at me and at the very conscience, I am sure, of every American, and another tragedy may be at hand.

Life magazine published yesterday a story, complete with alleged eyewitnesses, headlines, full-page color photographs, and a judgment. Newsweek and Time followed suit, and ended a weekend in which this country was deluged, through the major newspapers and TV broadcasts, by recaps, repeats, and republication of every statement made to date by almost everyone.

The Life magazine article—through pictures and selective statements from almost every witness—presents a case and decides. It renders a judgment of what happened and who was involved. It should be clearly pointed out at this point that none of these statements was made under oath, no cross-examination took place, and there has been no legal identification of the photographs, either as to location or as to the actual people who were supposed to have committed the crimes which were evident in the photographs. The pictures, in fact, not only may be inflammatory, but also, they otherwise may be inadmissible at the trial. So there is no due process in this article, but there certainly is judgment.

Other pictures were published and other interviews reported. The Cleveland Plain Dealer was credited along with others in the Life article, for one; but the Life article was the most sensational and renders a specific judgment on what happened. Life conducted a trial by press within its own covers. The net effect of other publications approaches this ultimate prejudice, but none was quite so blatant.

Mr. President, coming so late, this article serves no purpose, so far as I can see, of furthering justice or fixing legal responsibility for the alleged atrocities. It serves no public need to know nor any watchdog philosophy of the press. Its only apparent value is to retrieve a return of Life's investment of some $40,000 paid or to be paid to a former Army photographer who put the pictures up to the highest bidder.

I might add, Mr. President, that this photographer, so far as I can understand, was an official photographer, was on duty, turned over black and white photographs, but did not turn over the colored photographs. These were not processed in Vietnam, so far as anybody can determine, and there has been no legal identification of those pictures with any of the persons who have been charged—at least, up to date.

What has been the result of this? I have received a great deal of mail, and I am happy to say that a good deal of it has been very favorable. But I also have received a great deal of mail arising out of the speeches I made last week, in which people have already prejudged the events. People say, "Punish them. Don't do anything about a fair trial. Punish them. Put them to death."

What kind of an explosive atmosphere have we created, under our legal system, with this type of trial by press? What they have said about me is of minor importance. The general feeling, however, seems to be, in most of these "anti" letters—I say they are not a majority, but there are a substantial number—that I was trying to cover up something, simply because I was asking the press to let our judicial system work and not to prejudice the case by further activities than they have published already.

I have referred to the $40,000 paid by Life for these pictures, and I must say that I am appalled by the profiteering going on by at least some of the individuals intent only on cashing in on a hot story before it cools. According to Mr. Haeberle, himself, he received an offer to sell these pictures on an exclusive basis overseas for $100,000, and then he decided he wanted more than that, when they were actually the property of the Army and should have been there for trial purposes when identified. It is my understanding that he got approximately $40,000 or $45,000.

Other money has been paid—$20,000, we were told, by CBS to Dispatch News for the so-called exclusive interview. Just yesterday, a member of my staff was called by Dispatch News with reference to asking me to write an article, under my name, for a Sunday package to be peddled on a 60–40 commission basis. I do not know whether I was to get the 60 or he was to get the 60. But all I can say is that this is the kind of "garbage" I referred to in my statements last week.

The December 5 issue of Time states as follows:

> Inevitably, there were those who, while not denying the deed, felt it would be better left untold. After a G.I. witness described on television what he had seen at My Lai, Colorado Senator Peter Dominick asked: "What kind of country do we have when that kind of garbage gets put on the air?"

My statement was, of course, taken out of context, and the garbage I was referring to was the sensationalism that was building up in the news media with-

out regard to the need and right for fair trial. Thus sensationalism bloomed in full flower this weekend and yesterday.

Time magazine, by quoting me out of context, implied I wanted the incident left untold. To the contrary, it is because of the gravity of this incident and my concern that the full story be told that I spoke out. I attacked the airing of interviews with prospective witnesses with no apparent concern for their rights. I objected to reporting that goes beyond news reporting and exploits sensationalism to outsell its competition. I object strongly to trial by press. I had hoped by speaking out last week that the media would cease publication of extrajudicial statements by potential witnesses. I had hoped that trial by press would not occur, that a fair trial could be held as required under our legal system, and that the news media, including the broadcast segment, would undertake to follow this course on their own responsibility and exercise their own balancing of values in this case.

But it seems every story must be more sensational than the last. Only a few news services, newspapers, magazines, and individuals will realize a profit. The people of this country may be the real losers.

The trial court last week tried to halt this trend of the press so that a fair trial could be held. One can look at the statement of the court as a plea or a threat but the comments take on added significance today. It would appear that the confidence of the court that the news media would police themselves to insure the fairness of the proceedings seems poorly misplaced after just 6 days. The court stated:

As I understand the previous military press release, this case was under investigation. Thus, I can understand how responsible news media did not deem it improper to assist the military in furthering its investigation.

We are now past that stage of the proceedings. I agree completely with counsel that further news contact with witnesses and premature out of court disclosure of testimony would be in violation of law.

On the other hand, I am reluctant to issue any show cause order immediately to prohibit publicizing the testimony of potential witnesses. I believe the responsible news media are capable of policing their own activity and will self-impose the necessary sanctions to insure that the fairness of these proceedings are not jeopardized. Therefore, I am declining the request of counsel today to issue a show cause order. A reasonable time will be granted the news media to act in a responsible legal manner. And, I am confident you will find that witnesses will not be contacted further by any responsible news agency. The issue will be held in abeyance at this time. with leave to counsel to re-petition this court for relief at any later time.

Mr. President, that was in reply to a petition from the defense counsel and the prosecuting attorney. It is one of the few times in my life, in a murder case I have ever heard of both sides petitioning the judge to ask the media to be more objective and to tone down their own disclosures.

What has happened after 6 days? Yesterday, for the second time, the trial counsel and defense counsel jointly petitioned the U.S. Military Court of Appeals for an injunction against the media from further publication of statements of witnesses and prejudicial materials. A unique case has been presented to this appellate court. It is certainly one of first impression. A decision is to be rendered today. There are certainly problems of jurisdiction. Beyond the mere problem of enforcing such an order across the country, basic constitutional issues are involved. To my knowledge, no such order of such scope has ever been entered. But then only a handful of cases in our history have received this type and extent of exposure. And I repeat freedom of the press does not permit trial by press. The line is drawn there.

Mr. President, the New York Times published an article yesterday reporting on the appeal that I referred to before the U.S. Military Court of Appeals. They asked for an injunction against CBS, NBC, ABC, the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Atlanta Constitution, the Atlanta Journal, the Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, the Columbus Enquirer, Time-Life Corp., Newsweek magazine, United Press International, the Associated Press, and Dispatch News Service.

This indicates the scope of the re-publication and sensationalism which they felt was prejudicing the right of a fair trial. It is particularly pertinent to note that it is the State of Georgia itself that they asked the media to be enjoined because that is where the panel of jurors is located which will be determining the fate of the individuals charged. That panel is as much subject to influence and prejudice as anyone else in this country, be they man, woman, or child, be they in the military, or be they ordinary civilians.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article referred to printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it would be my guess, and all I am doing is guessing, that the military court will reject this request and the issue will be taken to the Supreme Court.

The concern of the trial court last week was simple. This was an attempt to regain a rational atmosphere so that a fair trial could be held. This was my only concern last week. I am not critical of the press for reporting news, but they go too far when interviews of potential witnesses are carried on nationwide TV, when these interviews are re-published in newspapers all across the country over and over, and when a nationwide magazine publishes photographs of a highly inflammatory, and, I might add, revolting nature, most likely inadmissable at trial.

We are heaping one tragedy on top of another. It seems that when the story is this big only the press is big enough to try it. We seem to say our legal system cannot be trusted to develop the facts. I want to make myself very clear. I do not want to be misunderstood, even out of context. I want even Time magazine to be able to get it right. This story could have been reported without eyewitness statements, unverified photographs and sensationalism. A fair trial could have been held and this matter investigated thereafter by any congressional committee, special commission, or any other group, in case the people thought all the facts had not been brought out.

It is not necessary to emasculate the rights of individuals charged with serious crime or those who might be charged in this incident.

It seems to me this country is one of the few, if not the only country in the world which would in effect put itself on trial. We actually filed charges against our own servicemen before the news media entered the case.

As a matter of fact, the Army published a release, which was picked up by the AP on September 6, pointing out that Lieutenant Calley had been charged with murder. This was over 2 months before the press started going and they said the military was trying to hide it under a rug. This seemed self-evidently false to me.

That trial would be in a courtroom based on evidence and facts. The trial would be public. The basic constitutional rights of the defendants would be protected. We may now be unable to have that trial because of the very fairness and impartiality we require under our Constitution. In that event, we not only will have failed to protect the rights of individuals charged with crimes, we will have allowed our legal system to fail in its duty to protect the freedoms of all the people. That is the second tragedy.

In the name of "free press" we may doom this incident to unproven rumors and infamy, leaving our political bones, for those who chose, to pick over.

It will not appease our national conscience if we fail to make our system work now. It could then be said that our system of government cannot function under severe stress. We may find we have established that in a case of extreme national significance, the courts and our judicial system have no role to play. The right of fair trial and due process must give way to the overriding freedom of the press, even when that freedom is exercised to usurp the functions of our courts. I do not believe that. Our system is strong. It can function properly. But it has no defense against sensationalism by the media in a case like this. We have faced moral crises in the past. We must do so this time. We must each shoulder our responsibilities—including the press.

This event marks a tragic and unfortunate chapter in the history of this Nation. We can only hope that its ending is not so dismal as its beginning and the last few days. It has called into question the character of our people, our Government, the press and, finally, our belief in freedom and justice for all people.

Mr. President, I ask, once again, that the press begin to exercise some restraint so that we can get at the true facts, so that we can develop them in a trial, and so that those charged will have their constitutional rights defended and we

can determine and fix responsibility for what seems to be a horrendous and horrible tragedy for the Nation as a whole.

EXHIBIT 1

BOTH SIDES IN CALLEY TRIAL ASK SONGMY PUBLICITY BAN

(By E. W. Kenworthy)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—The prosecution and the defense in the pending court-martial of First Lieut. William L. Calley Jr. asked the United States Court of Military Appeals today to ban all further pre-trial publication and broadcast of statements and photographs concerning the alleged massacre at Songmy, South Vietnam, on March 16, 1968.

The court took the petition under advisement.

In the opinion of lawyers interviewed here tonight, such a total nationwide ban on the publication of any statement concerning an alleged eyewitnesses or any other person, would be without precedent.

Some lawyers expressed doubt that the court, if it is guided by recent rulings of the Supreme Court in relevant cases, would grant such a blanket injunction.

In their petition to the three-judge civilian court, Maj. Kenneth A. Raby, who is Lieutenant Calley's military defense counsel, and Capt. Aubrey M. Daniel 3d, who is the trial counsel, or prosecutor, asked that the requested injunction remain effective until the first witness testifies at the court-martial.

The decision to court-martial the lieutenant was announced a week ago by Maj. Gen. Orwin C. Talbott, commanding general at Fort Benning, Ga., where Lieutenant Calley is stationed. The lieutenant will be tried on six specifications charging him with murder of 109 men, women and children "without justification or excuse." The date of the court-martial has not been set.

Maj. Raby and Captain Daniel asked that the injunction sought against pretrial discussion of the case be extended "to all radio and television networks and stations, newswire services, newspapers and magazines operating or otherwise doing business in the United States."

But the two attorneys specifically asked the enjoining of the Columbia Broadcasting System, the National Broadcasting Company, The New York Times, The Washington Post, The Atlanta Constitution, The Atlanta Journal, The Columbus (Ga.) Ledger, The Columbus Enquirer, the Time-Life Corporation, Newsweek magazine, United Press International, The Associated Press, and Dispatch News Service.

The last-named, a small service handling free-lance journalists, distributed one of the first stories of the alleged massacre.

CLIPPINGS AND TRANSCRIPTS

In support of their argument that such an injunction was necessary "to protect the constitutional rights" of Lieutenant Cally, the prosecution and defense attorneys submitted to the court two thick loose-leaf books in which has been pasted clippings from newspapers and magazines.

The lawyers read only one clipping to the court—from a Chicago paper. But they showed the judges copies of this week's Life magazine, which contains nine photographs—eight color and one black-and-white—allegedly taken at Songmy on March 16 by Ronald L. Haeberle, who had been a staff photographer attached to Company C, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry, 11th Light Infantry Brigade.

Several of these photographs had been shown to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees last Wednesday by Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor.

Included in the two books of clippings were nine articles and columns from The New York Times plus two articles by Times reporters and one by a Times columnist that appeared in other papers subscribing to The New York Times News Service.

The first article from The New York Times was a four-paragraph Associated Press dispatch from Fort Benning last September, quoting the announcement of post authorities that Lieutenant Calley had been charged with murder in the deaths of an unspecified number of persons. That report was based on a news release issued by the post information officer.

THREE ORDERS SOUGHT EARLIER

Last Tuesday, November 25, Major Raby and Captain Daniel asked Lieut. Col. Reid W. Kennedy, the military judge at Fort Benning, for three orders.

The first would have prohibited prospective witnesses from pretrial disclosures of their prospective testimony. The second would have directed the named military jurors not intentionally to read or listen to news accounts of the alleged murders. The third would have prohibited the news media from further publication of statements by any individual purportedly connected with the alleged massacre, or the reproduction of pictures of the alleged massacre.

The judge complied with the first two requests but held in abeyance the request for an order to the news media, saying that this raised constitutional questions of freedom of the press. The media, the colonel said, should be given a "reasonable" time to show that they could "act responsibly."

Last Friday, Nov. 28, the judge held a closed meeting with opposing counsel, at which time, according to their petition today, they again requested an order to the news media. The lawyers buttressed their argument with "additional evidence," they said.

At that time, according to the two lawyers, Colonel Kennedy "concluded that the spirit of his order to potential witnesses were being wilfully violated by local and national news media," and entered certain findings.

The first of these, the lawyers said in their petition today, was that "the possibility of prejudice to the defendant's constitutional right of a fair trial is real and apparent."

WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, an interesting commentary was published in the Boston Globe on November 28, 1969, written by Robert Healy, entitled "A Case for Withdrawal." It refers to the Song My situation.

There is a great deal of food for thought in Mr. Healy's comments. I invite the attention of the Senate to his last sentence:

Those soldiers who squeezed the triggers do not bear all the blame.

Mr. President, truer words were never written.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the commentary by Mr. Healy printed in the RECORD.

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

A CASE FOR WITHDRAWAL

(By Robert Healy)

There never was a better argument for getting out of Vietnam than Song My village. It tells it all.

It tells about the problems of the United States getting mixed up in Vietnamese civil war.

It tells about the difficulties of the United States soldier operating under this set of circumstances.

It tells of the fear of the American G.I. who must operate where men hoeing the rice fields of the Mekong Delta in the daylight hours are the Viet Cong terrorists and the enemy when the sun goes down.

It tells about the innocents—the women, the children, the old. In the areas which are exchanged weekly and monthly between the Viet Cong and the South Vietnam government units, they must survive. And the massacre of Song My shows that, for them, even survival is difficult.

One must understand, to begin with, that there are really two kinds of war being fought in Vietnam. In the northern part of South Vietnam near the Demilitarized Zone and along the Cambodian border, it is a war to stop infiltration of men and supplies from the north. This war is fought largely in jungle terrain. It is a war where the U.S. military is pitted against the guerrilla units.

But the war in the Mekong Delta is another thing. The Mekong is the breadbasket of all Vietnam. It produces from its fields large quantities of rice. The people here are mostly farmers. They live in the small villages or on their land.

Here in the Mekong, South Vietnam rebels—the Viet Cong—have operated against the government of Saigon for years. They have held certain villages all of that time. Saigon's appointed province chiefs have learned to do business with the Viet Cong leaders. Even now, for instance, reporters have been told in Vietnam that to travel to the village of Song My would be dangerous because it is considered enemy territory.

The farmers in the Delta area are in no position to protect themselves. And neither the regular South Vietnam ARVN troops nor the U.S. troops can secure this area from the Viet Cong.

The reason goes back to the man behind the hoe in the rice fields by day, who goes out at night to collect taxes and bounty in the villages for the Viet Cong. Is the American soldier to gun him down during the day, or is he to wait until night where the guerrilla soldier has the advantage and where it takes three or four and possibly more regular soldiers to operate against him effectively? Song My, as terrible as it may sound, is the military solution to Vietnam. Then there is nothing for the victor or the vanquished. And a military solution to Vietnam cannot be tolerated. The American conscience will tolerate no more Song Mys.

There is public debate both at home and at the congressional level about soldiers involved in this massacre. One senator even condemns those who have brought Song My to the Attention of the American public.

But Song My should be discussed and clearly understood by everyone in the United States because it is the microcosm of the whole Vietnam war.

The government and the military should be concerned with what happened at Song My. But they should be more concerned even with the cause of Song My.

It is not enough for our leaders to say that we are in Vietnam and we must accept it. We should not accept it. If there was error in the first commitment then that must be corrected.

And it should be corrected quickly before there is any more involvement of United States soldiers in another Song My.

Those soldiers who squeezed the triggers do not bear all the blame.

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 ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NATIONAL MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACT AUTHORIZATION, 1970–72

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 554, H.R. 10105.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 10105, to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. 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 Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 8, after "1970,", strike out "$35,000,000" and insert "and $40,000,000"; in line 9, after the word "year", strike out "1971, and $35,000,000 for the fiscal year 1972.'" and insert "1971. Of the sums appropriated for fiscal year 1970 pursuant to the preceding sentence, $2,800,000 shall be available only for the employment of additional personnel for service in the National Highway Safety Bureau to carry out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966."; on page 2, after line 5, strike out:

SEC. 2. Section 102(4) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1391(4)) is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "and any protective helmet or headgear manufactured, offered for sale, or sold for use by drivers of, and passengers on or in, motor vehicles."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

SEC. 2. Section 102(4) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (15 U.S.C. 1391(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) 'Motor vehicle equipment' means any system, part, or component of a motor vehicle as originally manufactured or any similar part or component manufactured or sold for replacement or improvement of such system, part, or component or as any accessory, or addition to the motor vehicle, and any device, article, or apparel not a system, part, or component of a motor vehicle (other than medicines, or eyeglasses prescribed by a physician or other duly licensed practitioner), which is manufactured, sold, delivered, offered, or intended for use wholly or in part to safeguard motor vehicles, drivers, passengers, and other highway users from risk of accident, injury, or death."

On page 3, line 9, after the word "Act", insert "in the following manner—"; in line 12, after the word "resale" insert "at each location where any such manufacturer's vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment are offered for sale by a person with whom such manufacturer has a contractual, proprietary, or other legal relationship in an appropriate manner which may include, but is not limited to, printed matter (A) available for retention by such prospective purchaser and (B) sent by mail to such prospective purchaser upon his request;"; in line 23, after the word "purchase," insert "in printed matter placed in the motor vehicle or attached to or accompanying the item of motor vehicle equipment."; on page 4, after line 4, insert:

(b) Section 113(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The notification required by subsection (c) or (e) shall contain a clear description of such failure to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards or defect, an evaluation of the risk to traffic safety reasonably related to such defect, a statement of the measures to be taken to repair such failure or defect, and the commitment of such manufacturer to cause such failure or defect to be remedied without charge."

At the beginning of line 15, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; at the beginning of line 19, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "records," insert "including procedures to be followed by distributors and dealers to assist manufacturers to secure the information required by this subsection which will not affect the obligation of manufacturers under this subsection."; after line 15, insert:

"(g) If—

"(1) any motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) or tire is determined by the manufacturer under subsection (a) to contain a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety; or

"(2) any motor vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment is determined by the Secretary under subsection (e) to contain a failure to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards prescribed under this title or a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety;

and the notification specified in subsection (c) is required to be furnished on account of such failure or defect, then—

"(A) the manufacturer of each such motor vehicle presented for remedy pursuant to such notice shall cause such failure or defect in such motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) to be remedied without charge; or

"(B) the manufacturer of each such other item of motor vehicle equipment presented for remedy pursuant to such notice shall cause such failure or defect in such item of motor vehicle equipment to be remedied without charge. If a manufacturer can establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary that a failure to comply with an applicable motor vehicle safety standard is of such an inconsequential nature that the purposes of this title and the public interest would not be served by requiring the applicable manufacturer to remedy such noncompliance, the Secretary may, upon publication of his reasons for such finding, exempt such manufacturer from the requirements of this subsection with respect to such failure.

On page 6, at the beginning of line 20, strike out "(g)" and insert "(h)"; at the beginning of line 23, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)"; in the same line, after the word "subsection," strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)"; in line 25, after the word "subsections," strike out "(a) and (c)" and insert "(a), (b), and (d)"; on page 7, line 23, after the word "be," strike out "retarded" and insert "retreaded"; at the top of page 8, strike out:

SEC. 7. Title III of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III RESEARCH AND TEST FACILITIES

"SEC. 301. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to plan, design, and construct (including the alteration of existing facilities) facilities suitable to conduct research, development, and compliance and other testing in traffic safety (including highway safety and motor vehicle safety), except that no appropriation shall be made for any such planning, designing, or construction involving an expenditure in excess of $100,000 if such planning, designing, or construction has not been approved by resolutions adopted in substantially the same form by the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and on Public Works of the House of Representatives, and by the Committees on Commerce and on Public Works of the Senate. For the purpose of securing consideration of such approval the Secretary shall transmit to Congress a prospectus of the proposed facility including (but not limited to)—

"(1) a brief description of the facility to be planned, designed, or constructed;

"(2) the location of the facility, and an estimate of the maximum cost of the facility;

"(3) a statement of those agencies, private and public, which will use such facility, together with the contribution to be made by each such agency toward the cost of such facility; and

"(4) a statement of justification of the need for such facility.

"(b) The estimated maximum cost of any facility approved under this section as set forth in the prospectus may be increased by the amount equal to the percentage increase, if any, as determined by the Secretary, in construction costs, from the date of the transmittal of such prospectus to Congress, but in no event shall the increase authorized by this subsection exceed 10 per centum of such estimated maximum cost."

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

SEC. 7. (a) Title III of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 304. The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to plan, design, construct, and operate facilities suitable for conducting testing of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment necessary to determine (1) whether such motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment are in compliance with applicable motor vehicle safety standards established under this Act, and (2) whether such motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment contain any defect which relates to motor vehicle safety.

"SEC. 305. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $10,000,000, to remain available until expended, for planning and design of traffic safety (including but not limited to motor vehicle and highway safety) research and test facilities, including engineering studies and site surveys.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $8,200,000, to remain available until expended, to plan, design, and construct facilities authorized by section 304 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Act of 1966. There is authorized to be appropriated for the operation of the facilities authorized by section 304 of such Act not to exceed $3,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971 and $3,500,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, of which not to exceed $1,500,000 shall be available in each fiscal year for the purchase of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment to be used in the operation of such facilities."

(b) The heading of such title is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE III—RESEARCH AND COMPLIANCE TESTING FACILITIES".

On page 10, line 20, after the word "Transportation", insert "(hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary")"; in line 22, after the word "than", strike out "April 1, 1970," and insert "January 1,

1971,"; on page 11, after line 21, strike out:

(c) In order to facilitate the prompt completion of this report, officials of other Federal departments or agencies shall make available to the Secretary, upon his request, any data or information in their possession relating to agricultural tractor accidents and shall otherwise provide assistance.

And, in lieu thereof, insert:

(c) In order to facilitate the prompt completion of such report, the Secretary of Agriculture, with the assistance of officials of other Federal departments or agencies possessing data or information concerning agricultural tractor operations and accidents, shall submit to the Secretary by June 30, 1970, his findings and recommendations with respect to the report required by this section. Such findings and recommendations shall be considered by the Secretary and incorporated where appropriate in his report to the Congress.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–559), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

H.R. 10105, as amended, would authorize the appropriation of $23 million for fiscal 1970, of which $2,800,000 is to be available only for the employment of additional personnel, and $40 million for fiscal 1971, for the implementation of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. It would also amend the act in several respects. A summary of these changes follows:

(1) The bill would broaden the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" presently contained in the act in order to enable the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum safety standards for the manufacture of wearing apparel and other devices which are not a part of a motor vehicle, but which are intended for use to safeguard motor vehicles, drivers, passengers, and other highway users from the risk of accident, injury, or death.

(2) It would make clear that the Secretary of Transportation has the authority to require a motor vehicle manufacturer to provide performance and technical data to prospective purchasers of motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment at each location where such manufacturer's vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment are offered for sale.

(3) It would amend the defect notification provisions of the act in order to place manufacturers of tires under an obligation to provide notification to purchasers of tires which are found to contain a safety-related defect or which fail to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards. Tire manufacturers, therefore, will assume a legal responsibility which is comparable to that which presently exists for manufacturers of motor vehicles.

(4) The bill would provide that whenever notification is required to be furnished because of a failure to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards or because of a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety, the manufacturer of each motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) or each other item of motor vehicle equipment presented for remedy pursuant to such notice shall cause such failure or defect to be remedied without charge. It would further provide, however, that if a manufacturer can establish that a failure to comply with an applicable motor vehicle safety standard is of such an inconsequential nature that the public interest would not be served by requiring the applicable manufacturer to remedy such noncompliance, the Secretary of Transportation may exempt such manufacturer from the compulsory remedy requirement with respect to such failure.

(5) It would add to the annual report provisions of the present act an additional requirement that the Secretary of Transportation include in his annual report a statement of enforcement actions including judicial decisions, settlements, or pending litigation which arose under the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act during the period covered by the report.

(6) The bill would require the Secretary of Transportation to establish safety standards setting maximum limits on the age of tire carcasses which can be retreaded.

(7) It would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to plan, design, construct and operate a compliance test facility, and it would authorize the appropriation of $8,200,000 for this purpose. The bill would also authorize the appropriation of $3,500,000 for fiscal 1971 and 1972 for the operation of the compliance facility and the purchase of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment for testing purposes.

(8) The bill would authorize the appropriation of $10 million for the planning and design of traffic safety (including but not limited to motor vehicle and the highway safety) research and test facilities, including engineering studies and site surveys.

In addition, the bill would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study and to submit a report to the Congress by January 1, 1971, on the causes and means of prevention of agricultural tractor accidents on both public roads and farms.

NEED

Motor vehicle accidents are one of the major causes of death in the United States today. In 1938, over 55,000 Americans died on our Nation's highways—more than have lost their lives in the entire Vietnam war. In addition, an estimated 2 million persons are seriously injured each year in motor vehicle collisions. The total direct cost due to injury and property damage resulting from motor vehicle accidents has been estimated by the National Safety Council to exceed $11 billion annually.

These additional grim statistics forcefully demonstrate that in motor vehicle deaths this country faces a destructive problem equal in size and complexity to other social ills such as crime, disease, and poverty;

Highway injuries exceed by 10 times all violent criminal acts combined, including homicides, armed robbery, rape, riot, and assault.

Motor vehicle crashes rob society of nearly as many productive working years as heart disease and of more than are lost to cancer and strokes. Only about 1 out of 5 man-years of life lost to heart disease is in the age interval between 20 and 65; in contrast, 7 out of 10 man-years of life lost in motor vehicle accidents are in the productive years between 20 and 65.

It was in response to statistics such as these that Congress in 1966 enacted the comprehensive traffic safety program which is incorporated in the Highway Safety Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–563) and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–564). And, notwithstanding the overwhelming loss of life still being sustained on our highways, the effectiveness of these programs for improving motor vehicle crash survivability and highway safety is already demonstrable. In the 5 years preceding the passage of the two safety laws, highway deaths were increasing at an average rate of 6.9 percent each year. This has been reduced to 2.3 percent in the past 2 years, a significant accomplishment in the face of increasing total mileage, increased average speeds, and increases in the number of vehicles and young drivers (leaders in high fatality rate) on the road. Had the previous average rate of increase in highway fatalities continued, the 1968 death figure would have been 5,000 individuals higher.

More detailed evidence is being gathered through in-depth accident investigation and the analysis of mass accident data which indicates that the injury reducing devices required by existing motor vehicle safety standards, such as energy absorbing steering columns, high penetration resistant windshields, and safety belts, may already be paying a significant return in the reduction of fatalities and the severity of injuries. For example, several independent studies have measured the effectiveness of safety belts (even with their low rate of usage) in preventing fatalities. When applied to the national statistics, these studies indicate an estimated saving of 2,500 to 3,000 lives in 1968. Similarly, the energy absorbing steering column, which is designed to reduce driver injury in crashes that cause the driver's chest and head to hit the steering assembly, has apparently reduced fatalities in certain types of crashes by as much as 70 percent.

Although these examples indicate that the potential reduction in highway deaths and injuries which will result from improved motor vehicle safety feature is great, the impact of the new effort to reduce nationwide casualty statistics may be slower than originally hoped. In 1968 relatively few automobiles were equipped with the new safety features. Even in 1975, almost 60 percent of the pre-1968 automobile population—automobiles that have not been subject to any new car safety standards—will still be in use. Moreover, unless the Federal Government begins giving greater priority to the funding and personnel requirements of the motor vehicle safety program, even the newer model vehicles will fail to provide the full measure of safety which can reasonably be demanded of them.

At the present time the National Highway Safety Bureau has a 3- to 4-year backlog in rulemaking actions. Major safety improvements such as the air bag restraint system, increased side impact protection, roof strengtheners, energy absorbing front ends, functional bumpers, and improved rear lighting systems are all still in the discussion stage. Statutory dates for the establishment of a uniform quality grading system for tires and the issuance of used car safety standards have already passed with no action. But still the legitimate staffing needs of this vital safety program continue to be neglected.

In the amended version of H.R. 10105, the committee, by increasing the House authorization for the motor vehicle safety program for fiscal 1971 by $5 million, and by earmarking $2,800,000 of the sums appropriated in fiscal 1970 for the employment of additional personnel in the National Highway Safety Bureau, has stressed the importance of giving greater budgetary emphasis to our traffic safety program. In addition, through the other amendments to the original act incorporated in this bill, the committee has attempted to strengthen the Department of Transportation's enforcement capability, to take the first steps toward providing the Department with an independent and substantial motor vehicle research capability, and to eliminate disparities and close gaps which exist in the act's present provisions.

PROVISIONS

There follows a section-by-section summary of the provisions of H.R. 10105 and a discussion of the committee's interpretation of these various provisions and the need for them where appropriate.

Section 1.—Section 1 of the bill would au-

thorize the appropriation to the Department of Transportation of $23 million for fiscal year 1970, and $40 million for fiscal year 1971, for the implementation of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. In addition this section would provide that of the sums appropriated for fiscal year 1970, $2,800,000 shall be available only for the employment of additional personnel for service in the Highway Safety Bureau. It is the committee's understanding that this amount of money should be sufficient to hire 150 new employees.

The amendments incorporated in this section—rising the authorization for fiscal 1971 by $5 million, and earmarking $2,800,000 of the sums appropriated during fiscal 1970 for the employment of additional personnel—reflect the committee's deep concern that the critical motor vehicle safety program has been receiving inadequate priority in both past and present budget proposals. The committee cites the following examples for consideration by the Appropriations Committee as indications of the urgent need for additional funding and personnel for the National Highway Safety Bureau:

1. Since the initial new vehicle safety standards were issued in 1967 there has been only one major new car safety standard issued each year during 1968 and 1969.

2. The uniform tire quality grading system required under title II of the act to be established by September 9, 1968, is still at least 1 year away from completion.

3. The experimental safety car program authorized under section 106 of the act is limping along with only two professional employees. The first vehicle is still at least 2 years away from competion.

4. Only one professional employee is presently assigned to develop used motor vehicle safety standards. No used car standards have been issued to date, even though the act specifies that the initial standards were to be issued prior to last June.

5. Only nine engineers are monitoring the entire defect notification program in which 14 million vehicle owners have been notified of safety related defects over the past 3 years. There are over 50 pending investigations of vehicles which may contain safety related defects or failures to comply with the safety standards.

6. Only one professional employee is assigned full-time to school bus safety programs.

7. Only one professional employee is assigned to the field testing of the highly promising air-bag restraint system.

These examples are not exhaustive. They are merely indicative of the disturbing lack of emphasis that has been given to a program that could undoubtedly return a spectacular payoff in the saving of lives, the reduction of injuries, and the lessening of property damage. The committee amendments in section 1, while modest, indicate its conviction that stronger steps must be taken to reverse the highway death trend. Now programs must be started and present programs accelerated. This can occur only if additional funds are appropriated and additional personnel are hired as quickly as possible.

Unlike the House, the committee has limited the authorization contained in section 1 to a 2-year period. Since the administration had requested a 2-year authorization and had no budget projections for fiscal 1972, and since the committee believed that it would be valuable to review again the operation and effectiveness of the safety program within the next 2 years, it deleted the provision in the House passed bill which would authorize the appropriation of $35 million for fiscal 1972.

Section 2.—Section 2 of the bill would amend the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" which is presently contained in section 102(4) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 in order to enable the Secretary of Transportation to set minimum safety standards for the manufacture of any device, article, or apparel not a system, part, or component of a motor vehicle (other than medicines, or eyeglasses prescribed by a physician or other duly licensed practitioner) which is manufactured, sold, delivered, offered, or intended for use wholly or in part to safeguard motor vehicles, drivers, passengers, and other highway users from risk of accident, injury, or death.

Both the present and prior administrations had requested a broad definition of the term "motor vehicle equipment" which is comparable to that which is contained in this bill. The House narrowed the proposed expansion of the definition, however, so that it would be extended to additionally cover only motorcycle helmets, in part because the Department of Transportation had not indicated any intention to set standards for other types of motor vehicle equipment. Since then, however, the Department has indicated that it would prefer the broader language so that it can subsequently set standards for other types of equipment such as motorcycle goggles, tire repair equipment vehicle safety testing equipment, and tire inflation equipment if the establishment of such standards should prove necessary. The committee agreed that it would be desirable to delegate the broader authority to the Secretary so that he can move quickly to set standards as the need is demonstrated without further resort to legislative action for each item, but in so doing, it specifically excluded medicines and eyeglasses prescribed by a physician or other duly licensed practitioner from the definition in order to make sure that this expanded language would not be construed too broadly.

Although section 103 of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act requires the Secretary to establish appropriate Federal motor vehicle safety standards, the committee would emphasize that the decision to set a minimum safety standard for the manufacture of any particular item of motor vehicle equipment is discretionary. It would not expect the Secretary to set minimum safety standards for any of the items of motor vehicle equipment mentioned in this report, for example, unless he is satisfied that a need for such minimum standards actually exists.

Section 3.—Subsection 112(d) of the present law authorizes the Secretary of Transportation to require a manufacturer of motor vehicles or motor vehicle equipment to give to the first purchaser who buys a new motor vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment for his own use such performance and technical data as the Secretary determines is necessary to carry out the purposes of the act. The House, recognizing the importance of giving similar technical and performance data to prospective purchasers of motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment so that such persons may make rational and informed purchasing decisions, amended this section to make clear that the Secretary of Transportation has the authority to require that this data also be given to prospective purchasers.

Because certain manufacturers feared, however, that the broad House language might be read to require a detailed statement of this information in their print and broadcast advertising, the committee amended this section to provide for notification to prospective purchasers at each location where a manufacturer's vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment are offered for sale by a person with whom such manufacturer has a contractual, proprietary, or other legal relationship. The committee further indicated that this notification could include printed matter which would be available for retention by the prospective purchaser or sent by mail to him upon his request. As in the House version, the committee retained the notification requirement for the first purchaser, but it limited the manner of notification to printed matter placed in the motor vehicle or attached to or accompanying the item of motor vehicle equipment. The committee envisions, of course, that under the general rulemaking authority contained in section 119 of the act, the Secretary will issue regulations to clarify further the nature of the manufacturer's responsibility under this subsection.

In making these amendments, the committee intends that the manufacturer need have available at the location where its motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment are being sold, only the performance and technical data which relate to the particular products which are being sold, advertised, or otherwise promoted or offered for sale at that location. It would also point out that although the requirement that printed matter be furnished is optional with the Secretary, if it is required, it should be both available at the dealership for retention by the prospective purchaser or sent by mail to such person upon his request. The committee intends, however, that if an individual actually appears at a dealer's showroom, since the technical and performance data will be available to him there, it need not also be sent to that prospective purchaser, even if he specifically requests that it be mailed.

The mail requirement was included principally to cover the situation, particularly common in certain rural areas, where a person does his initial shopping for a new motor vehicle without actually going to a dealership. If he requests a manufacturer or dealer to furnish technical and performance data on certain motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment which he is considering buying, the manufacturer would be responsible for seeing that it was mailed to him. The committee does not anticipate that this mail requirement will impose any significant burden on either the manufacturer or the dealer, but it would hope that an equitable arrangement for bearing this cost could be worked out between the parties.

Section 4.—Section 4 of the bill would make two basic changes in the defect notification section (section 113) of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. First, it would amend that section in order to require manufacturers of tires to provide notification to persons who have purchased tires which the manufacturer determines contain a safety related defect. In addition, by requiring the manufacturer to keep more detailed records of the names and addresses of tire purchasers, it will improve the effectiveness of a recall campaign whenever the manufacturer or the Secretary of Transportation determine that certain tires contain a safety related defect or fail to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards. These changes are accomplished by the amendments made by subsections 4(a) and 4(c) and by the addition of the new subsections 113(f) and 113(h) to the act which are contained in subsection 4(d) of the bill.

Second, section 4 would provide that whenever a defect notification is required to be furnished because of a failure to comply with an applicable motor vehicle safety standard or because of a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety, the manufacturer of each motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) or each other item of motor vehicle equipment presented for remedy pursuant to such notice, shall cause such failure or defect to be remedied without charge. This change is accomplished by the amendment in subsection 4(b) and by the addition of a new subsection 113(g) to the act which is contained in subsection 4(d).

Under subsection 113(a) of the present law, the manufacturer of a motor vehicle is required to notify new vehicle purchasers of any safety related defect it discovers in the vehicle, including any defect in an item of original motor vehicle equipment—a term which includes original equipment tires.

However, the act imposes no parallel obligation on the tire manufacturer to notify tire purchasers of defects it discovers in its own products which it sells directly to the public. Subsection 4(a) would therefore amend subsection 113(a) of the traffic safety act to impose a duty on tire manufacturers to notify purchasers of any tires which they discover contain a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety.

This is an extremely significant amendment to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, for by far the largest proportion of tires manufactured in the United States are sold by the tire companies as replacements to the original ones supplied with the vehicle. Last year more than 225 million motor vehicle tires were produced but less than 58 million of these were delivered as original equipment. Obviously this amendment will close a serious gap in the safety protection afforded by the present act.

Under subsection 113(e) of the present act, if the Secretary of Transportation determines that a motor vehicle or an item of motor vehicle equipment fails to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards or contains a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety, he can require the manufacturer of such motor vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment to notify purchasers of the failure or defect. Particularly in the case of tires, however, notification of purchasers has been difficult to effectuate because of the failure of manufacturers to maintain complete records of the names and addresses of their purchasers. As a result this bill would add a new subsection (f) to section 113 which would require the manufacturers of motor vehicles or tires to maintain records of the names and addresses of the first purchaser (other than a dealer or distributor) of motor vehicles or tires produced by that manufacturer. This requirement should facilitate the prompt notification of purchasers after a defect or failure is discovered under either the amended subsection 113(a) or subsection 113(e).

The committee has retained the provision, included in the House bill, which states that when a tire is marketed under a brand name not owned by the manufacturer of the tire, the brand-name owner shall maintain the records required by the new subsection. The committee intends, however, that this language should not be interpreted to preclude a brand-name owner, if he so desires, from contracting or otherwise arranging with the manufacturer to keep the records (without shifting the legal responsibility). Since the manufacturer will be required to establish a recordkeeping system for its own tires, private-brand customers may want to utilize, or at least tie in with, the manufacturer's recordkeeping system. This would be especially true for the smaller brand-name owners who may not have the necessary facilities for adequate recordkeeping. However, whether large or small, there is a possibility of significant economies in per-unit record cost if the manufacturer could utilize his system for keeping private-brand customers' records, as long as both parties so agree. In addition, it is the understanding of the committee that in establishing recordkeeping procedures, the Secretary is not bound to adopt a single set of procedures that would be uniformly applicable to all manufacturers, large or small.

Instead, the committee intends that he may use his discretion to permit different procedures if he is satisfied that such procedures will assure the establishment of effective recall systems. This understanding could avoid unnecessary hardship and expense for companies with small sales volume.

The one change which the committee has made in the proposed subsection 113(f) is to include a provision which would authorize the Secretary to establish procedures to be followed by distributors and dealers to assist the manufacturers in securing the information required by the subsection, as long as these procedures do not affect the basic obligation of the manufacturer to keep the records. Tire manufacturers have stated that with a specific congressional directive to the tire dealers and distributors to assist in the recordkeeping, they are more likely to secure effective cooperation. The committee is eager to secure this cooperation and has agreed to include this directive with the understanding that it should not obscure in any way the fact that the fundamental obligation to maintain the records will remain with the manufacturer.

The committee recognizes that it would be practically impossible for the Secretary of Transportation to police the many thousands of motor vehicle or tire dealers and distributors in the United States in order to secure compliance with a recordkeeping requirement. As a result, it does not wish to dilute the legal obligation which the House bill would place on the manufacturer. If the penalties for failure to keep adequate records are assessed against the manufacturer, he will have an incentive to make sure the dealers provide the necessary information. Should the expression of congressional desire for dealer cooperation prove inadequate, then specific terms in the contract between the manufacturer and dealer may be necessary. But regardless of the method used to secure cooperation, the result should be that records will be well kept. Thus in a recall campaign the manufacturer will be more likely to remove successfully a large percentage of the defective or noncomplying vehicles or tires from the highway.

The second basic change in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act incorporated in section 4 of the bill—and this is a change in the House-passed measure as well—would provide that whenever a notification is required to be furnished because of a determination under subsection 113(a) or (e) that a motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) or an item of motor vehicle equipment (a term which includes tires) contained a defect which relates to motor vehicle safety or a failure to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards, the manufacturer of each such motor vehicle (including any item of original motor vehicle equipment) or each such other item of motor vehicle equipment presented for remedy pursuant to such notice shall cause such failure or defect to be remedied without charge.

The committee has no doubt that the present defect notification provisions in the law have been of great value. During the first 3 years since the law was enacted in September 1966, the four major domestic manufacturers of motor vehicles have provided notification of safety related defects to the owners of over 12 million vehicles in some 375 safety defect campaigns. In contrast, in the 5½ years from the start of the 1960 model year in September 1959, through May of 1966, the four major American companies conducted some 425 recall campaigns involving approximately 9 million vehicles, and these figures include many recalls which were not directly safety related. Thus, since the enactment of the safety legislation just 3 years ago, the average annual number of "Big Four" vehicles involved in safety defect notification campaigns increased about 250 percent over the average number involved in safety and non-safety campaigns during the 5½ years prior to enactment. In total, since enactment of the act, some 14 million vehicles have been subject to safety defect notification. Unquestionably, this provision of the law has provided substantial benefit to the American consumer in alerting him to safety problems in vehicles on the highway.

In most past instances the defect notification has been accompanied by a recall of the vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment for correction without expense to the owner. Unfortunately, however, there have been some occasions where this has not been the case. Moreover, in instances where there has been a disagreement between the manufacturer and the Secretary under subsection 113(e) of the act over the existence of a safety related defect, a difficult situation has been created. Under the present section 113, the Secretary can only direct the manufacturer to send letters to the vehicle or vehicle equipment purchasers notifying them of the defect. He cannot require the manufacturer to remedy the defect without charge. But as the National Highway Safety Bureau has learned from experience, unless notification of the safety related defect is accompanied by an offer to correct the defect without expense to the owner, the response to a recall campaign falls off dramatically. As a result the Secretary could be placed in an awkward position. In some instances he might be forced to settle for much less than the full recall campaign which he believes safety considerations should demand in order to secure the manufacturer's agreement to remedy without charge the most seriously defective vehicles or equipment. Otherwise he could not be sure that the most dangerous vehicles or items of equipment would be removed from the road immediately.

It was because of considerations such as these that the committee adopted the amendment which would add a new subsection (g) to section 113 to set forth the manufacturer's obligation to remedy safety related defects or failures to comply with applicable motor vehicle safety standards without charge. The committee, of course, intends that this obligation to remedy a defect or noncompliance extends not only to the complete cost of providing a replacement part, but includes the cost of any labor required to repair the defect or failure or to install the replacement part.

The automotive manufacturers, pointing out that the expenditure of significant sums of money could flow from a secretarial determination requiring a recall campaign, suggested that they should receive additional protection to make sure that the Secretary does not make his determinations under subsection 113(e) casually or arbitrarily. They suggested that that section should be amended so that the Secretary's recall determination would be based upon substantial evidence. The committee considered the suggestion, but found it unnecessary. As pointed out in a letter dated November 11, 1969, from the Chief Counsel of the Federal Highway Administration, a copy of which appears as appendix B of this report, the Secretary's recall determinations are not self-executing. Enforcement can only be compelled by judicial proceedings in which a manufacturer is free to challenge the validity of the Secretary's determination.

Moreover, such proceedings will be tried de novo in the district courts, and subsection 10(e) of the Administrative Procedure Act expressly provides that the court, in such a trial de novo, may set aside administrative determinations where it finds them to be unwarranted by the facts (5 U.S.C. 706). In view of the safeguards against arbitrary or unreasonable determinations by the Secretary which are not factually supported, the committee did not find it necessary to amend the procedures established in subsection 113(e).

The manufacturers also expressed concern over the possible economic cost which might be involved under the new subsection 113(g) if all cases of noncompliance with applicable motor vehicle standards were to be remedied without charge. However, it is not intended that every instance of failure to comply with safety standards will require a recall campaign and remedy by the manufacturer. As

Under Secretary Beggs advised the committee in a letter dated November 3, 1969, a copy of which appears as appendix A of this report, the Department, under the provisions of existing law, "does not require the sending of notification letters for inconsequential violations of safety standards which do not substantially affect motor vehicle safety. To do so would not be reasonable administration of the act."

This policy will continue under the provisions of the new subsection which expressly provides that the Secretary may, upon publication of his reasons for such findings, exempt manufacturers from the compulsory remedy provision when the manufacturers can establish to the Secretary's satisfaction that a failure to comply with a standard is of such an inconsequential nature that the purposes of the act and the public interest would not be served by requiring the manufacturer to remedy the noncompliance. Examples of the kinds of noncompliance which the Secretary might exempt under this provision include such things as the failure of a label to comply with size and type of print requirements or the failure to meet other requirements which do not affect strength or utility (such as a requirement that seat belts be resistant to strain. Slight shortfalls in meeting strength, load, and other performance requirements may be more difficult to deal with, but the committee would expect the Secretary to exercise his judgment in considering whether the failure to comply was not significant enough to require remedy. It would expect the Secretary to take into account the danger to the public which would exist if the noncompliance were not remedied and also the cost to the manufacturer of providing a remedy. The committee would also stress, however, that although this provision may be invoked to save the manufacturer from incurring the expense of an extensive recall campaign for an inconsequential violation of a standard, it is not intended to have any bearing on a manufacturers possible liability in a private damage suit where the failure to comply with a standard is at issue.

The committee would anticipate that to clarify a manufacturer's responsibilities under this section, the Secretary would utilize the general rulemaking authority provided in section 119 of the act. For example, it might be necessary for the Secretary to adopt regulations to spell out that a vehicle or vehicle equipment owner would not have to present his motor vehicle or item or motor vehicle equipment for remedy under the new subsection (g) at a distant or unreasonable location.

In view of the addition of the new subsection (g) to section 113, the committee also made some conforming amendments in subsection 113(c) which deals with the form of the manufacturer's notification. These changes appear in subsection 4(b) of the bill. The amendments include a reference to subsection 113(e) and a mention that notification may refer to a failure to comply with a standard—both of which were inadvertently omitted in the original act—and also include a requirement that the notification refer to the commitment of the manufacturer to remedy the failure or defect without charge.

Subsection 4(e) of the bill provides that the amendment which the bill makes to subsection 113(d) of the act—adding a requirement that the manufacturers of tires must file copies of their defect notification letters with the Secretary of Transportation—will become effective immediately. It further provides that the other amendments to section 113 made by this section of the bill will become effective 180 days after enactment, unless the Secretary of Transportation finds, for good cause shown, that a later effective date, not more than 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, is in the public interest and publishes his reasons for such finding. In the interim, however, the committee expects that manufacturers of motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment will continue to voluntarily remedy without charge any motor vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment which is determined to contain a safety related defect or failure to comply with a standard. And the committee of course anticipates that once the remedy without charge provision becomes effective, it will apply in all recall campaigns, regardless of the date of manufacture of the vehicles or vehicle equipment which is involved.

Section 5.—The existing subsection 120(a) of the act requires the Secretary of Transportation to submit an annual report to the Congress concerning his administration of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act. He also is required to submit an annual report concerning his administration of the Highway Safety Act. The reporting requirements with respect to the Highway Safety Act, however, include notification to Congress in the report of any enforcement actions including judicial decisions, settlements, and pending litigation. The committee believes that a similar requirement should be applicable to the annual report concerning the administration of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, so it has included this amendment in section 5 of the bill.

When the committee discussed H.R. 10105, it also considered an amendment which would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to examine, inspect, or temporarily impound motor vehicles which have been involved in motor vehicle accidents. It was argued that this authority would assist him in studying the behavior of various types of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment involved in motor vehicle accidents, in gathering information for the purpose of identifying design failures or defects in motor vehicles and motor vehicle equipment, and in collecting data to assist in the preparation of new and used car safety standards.

The committee decided that it would be premature to include such a provision in the bill at this time without greater discussion of its need and possible ramifications. The committee was disturbed, however, by reports that present research teams, operating under contract with the National Highway Safety Bureau, are sometimes finding it difficult to obtain data on vehicle accidents because of their inability to get permission to inspect the vehicle or because of the refusal of drivers to answer questions relating to the accident. As a result the committee resolved to urge the States to do their utmost to cooperate with the Department of Transportation in developing statistical data and information about automobile accidents. In addition, the committee requests the Secretary of Transportation to include in his annual report to Congress a description of any difficulties the Department has had in investigating motor vehicle accidents, as well as his recommendations for any legislation in this area which would help the Department to carry out its responsibilities fully.

Section 6.—Section 6 of the bill amends title II of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966 by adding a new section 206 which would require the Secretary of Transportation, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this bill, to establish safety standards setting limits on the age of tire carcasses which can be retreaded. This section further directs the Secretary, in setting such standards, to establish varying age limits for carcasses which can be retreaded, based on the extent to which the carcass was designed and constructed to be retreaded, the rate of deterioration of the materials in the tire, and such other factors as he determines are necessary to carry out the purposes of the act.

Section 7.—Section 7 of the bill would amend title III of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act by adding two new sections at the end of the present title. The first, section 304, would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to plan, design, construct, and operate facilities suitable for conducting testing of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment (a term which includes tires) in order to determine whether such motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment are in compliance with applicable motor vehicle safety standards or contain defects which relate to motor vehicle safety. The new subsection 305(b) would authorize the appropriation of $8,200,000, to remain available until expended, for the design and construction of the compliance test facility and the purchase of testing equipment. It would also authorize the appropriation of $3,500,000 for fiscal 1971 and 1972 for the operation of the compliance facility, but it specifies that not more than $1,500,000 of the sums authorized in either year is to be available for the purchase of motor vehicles or items of motor vehicle equipment for testing purposes.

The new subsection 305(a) would authorize the appropriation of $10 million, to remain available until expended, for planning and design of traffic safety (including but not limited to motor vehicle and highway safety) research and test facilities, including engineering studies and site surveys.

One of the keys to a successful motor vehicle safety program is an adequate compliance testing program. Without such testing, there can not be vigorous prosecution of failures to meet the minimum safety standards which are established in the act. And without adequate enforcement, there will not be the same incentive to make certain that a motor vehicle or item of motor vehicle equipment exceeds the minimum safety standards. Failure to provide an adequate compliance program would materially weaken the protection afforded by the act.

Thus far, in the absence of its own compliance testing facilities, the Department of Transportation has been contracting with testing laboratories throughout the country to conduct its compliance tests. In fiscal year 1968 the Congress appropriated $1,200,000 for this aspect of the safety program. With these funds the Department was able to purchase only 73 vehicles and 6,043 pieces of equipment to be tested against only 13 of the 22 standards effective in 1968. This number is an insignificant sample of the 10 million vehicles sold each year in some 500 different make/model combinations. Yet despite the small size of this random sample, the Department found an average failure rate for vehicles of 11.5 percent and for equipment of 10 percent. The failures covered such critical safety areas as hydraulic service and parking brakes—14 percent; tires and rims—12 percent; seat belt assembly anchorages—11 percent; and fuel tanks—29 percent.

Because the Department does not itself conduct the compliance testing, it cannot automatically act on the test results. After the test reports from the testing contractors are received by the Department, the failure cases are thoroughly analyzed to determine, whether a detailed investigation should be made of the problems. In the absence of error by the contractor, an investigation is initiated for each failure. In some cases this involves conducting one or more additional tests to confirm the original failure. But because staffing levels are inadequate to handle the investigative work and the subsequent followthrough with the manufacturers, many of the 1968 investigations are still in progress. By the time they are completed, the vehicles under investigation will have been on the highway for more than 2 years.

The Department's fiscal year 1969 test program is now in progress. Although the ap-

propriation was the same as in 1968, in order to continue the investigations which are required because of the many failures found during the 1968 program, it has been necessary to use some fiscal 1969 money. This has left enough for the purchase and testing of only 20 vehicles and 7,500 pieces of equipment during 1969.

In commenting on the compliance testing program in testimony before the committee, a Department representative stated:

"Based upon the experience to date, the Bureau fully recognizes that it has as yet hardly scratched the surface of what an adequate compliance program should entail in an effective regulatory program. The fact that significant numbers of potential noncompliance indications have already emerged with this extremely modest effort only serves to emphasize that additional resources will be required in future years if a Federal enforcement program of more adequate scope and depth is to be achieved. Especially serious, is the lack of [a] Government facility where tests can be conducted to insure compliance with safety standards. Without a Government facility, the Bureau * * * has no recourse other than to continue to utilize independent testing laboratories. Apart from the fact that even these laboratories in some cases have to use makeshift arrangements to conduct many of the corroborative tests, the more serious situation is that to stay in business they have other clients in addition to the Federal Government.

"The testing conducted by these laboratories for the Government has been largely satisfactory to date, but the possibilities of at least appearance of conflict of interest must be recognized as long as these firms are also conducting standards testing for industrial clients. Therefore, the importance of a Government-owned or at least a fully Government controlled compliance facility cannot be overstated; such a facility must be provided as soon as possible for the Bureau to meet its regulatory responsibilities properly."

The committee agrees that immediate action should be taken by the Department to design and construct its own compliance facility and to conduct a more intensive compliance program. Since the Department has not been able to request an appropriation for this purpose as part of its regular fiscal 1970 budget. However, due to the late date of this authorization, the committee hopes the Department will submit a supplemental request for funds which could be expended this year in order to expedite the completion of the facility.

Section 7 of the bill also contains the authorization of $10 million for planning and design of traffic safety research and test facilities, including engineering studies and site surveys. It should be noted that the authorizing language contains a parenthetical clause indicating that the facility is to be used for traffic safety purposes which include but is not limited to motor vehicle and highway safety. This clause is in the bill to clearly indicate that while the primary purpose of the facility is to conduct research and testing in motor vehicle and highway safety, the committee anticipates that other closely related safety work might also be carried out, particularly work which relates to the programs of other modal elements in the Department of Transportation.

The committee views the research and test facility as being of particular importance if the Department of Transportation is to acquire the technical expertise to enable it to develop increasingly complex engineering, technical, and behavioral data on which to base future vehicle and highway safety performance standards and to develop other programs designed to reduce highway deaths and injuries. The committee recognized the importance of this research capability when it first reported the motor vehicle safety legislation to the Senate over 3 years ago. In its report, the committee stated:

"The Federal Government must develop a major independent technical capacity sufficient to perform comprehensive basic research on accident and injury prevention, adequate to test and contribute to the quality of the industry's safety performance; a technical capacity capable of initiating innovation in safety design and engineering and of serving as a yardstick against which the performance of private industry can be measured; and, finally, a technical capacity capable of developing and implementing meaningful standards for automotive safety."

The committee hopes that now that the Department has conducted a detailed study and submitted an extensive report justifying construction of this facility, initial planning and design can commence. The need is even greater today, than it was 3 years ago.

Under the plans recently submitted to the committee by the Department, a copy of which appears as appendix C to this report, the research facility will consist of seven different units: a driving simulation laboratory to measure operator response to a variety of different highway situations; a vehicle and highway safety proving ground to test the behavior of vehicles in various types of driving and crash situations and to experiment with new types of vehicle and highway designs; a bioengineering laboratory to conduct tests on the physiological damage to vehicular occupants and pedestrians resulting from deceleration, collision, second collision, and overturning; an applied research laboratory to conduct testing associated with the improvement and updating of design standards for highways, traffic control devices, and other features of the highway environment; a human performance laboratory to increase understanding of human capabilities, behavior, and attitudes as they relate to the driving environment; a vehicle performance laboratory to develop procedures for testing and evaluating vehicles; and an injury research/treatment facility to generate improvements in the speed and adequacy of the post-accident response of emergency personnel.

The authorization for the research and test facility contained in section 7 differs from the House-passed bill which authorized the Secretary to plan, design and construct research, development and compliance testing facilities, but provided that no appropriation should be made for any such work in excess of $100,000 unless it had been approved in substantially equivalent resolutions adopted by the House and Senate Commerce and Public Works Committees.

The committee carefully considered the procedure set forth in the House bill, but it felt that agreement by the four different committees on specific construction plans within any 2-year period would be extremely unlikely. The result could be a serious relay in the planning and construction of the research and test facility which the committee views as essential to the future of the traffic safety program. As a result it decided to authorize the full $10 million requested in the budgets for fiscal 1970 submitted by both the present and prior administrations.

Because the amendments to title III made by this bill would include authorization for a compliance test facility, subsection 7(b) would amend the title of title III to read "title III—Research and Compliance Testing Facilities." Moreover, the committee did not delete the present sections 301–303 of title III from the act, as the House-passed bill would do, because it understands that these sections have not yet been fully implemented. Section 301, for example, authorizes the Secretary to study the need for a facility to conduct research, development, and testing relating to the safety of machinery used on highways or in connection with the maintenance of highways (with particular emphasis on tractor safety). To the committee's knowledge, this study has not yet been conducted, and since the report on that study has therefore not been filed either, it is necessary to retain the report requirement presently contained in section 302. Finally, the committee has preserved the authorization contained in section 303, for it understands that the full sums authorized under that section have not yet been expended.

Section 8.—Section 8 of the bill would authorize the Secretary of Transportation to conduct a study and submit to the Congress, not later than January 1, 1971, a report on the extent, causes and means of prevention of agricultural tractor accidents on both public roads and farms. This section further directs the Secretary to make such legislative proposals as he determines are needed, and it specifically directs him to give careful consideration to the advisability of establishing uniform Federal safety standards for the design and manufacture of all agricultural tractors sold in interstate commerce.

Over the past 8 years, more than 1,000 persons have died annually in farm tractor accidents and over five times this number are injured. Because of this surprisingly high rate of death and injury the committee agreed with the House that it would be desirable to authorize a study of tractor accidents in order to determine whether there were feasible methods of improving the safety characteristics of tractors. The committee would suggest, however, that the Secretary couple this tractor study with the study of the safety of tractors and other highway maintenance machinery which is required under section 301 of the act.

The committee has made two substantive amendments in the House language authorizing the tractor study. First, it has extended the report date from April 1, 1970, to January 1, 1971. In view of the late date at which this bill may finally be enacted, the committee decided that April 1 was an unreasonably early date for completion of the study. Since a report submitted after only 3 to 4 months study would be subject to criticism on the grounds that it is based on insufficient research, and since it is unlikely that any recommendations would be acted upon before the 92d Congress, the committee decided that a January 1, 1971, report date would be more reasonable.

In addition, the committee believed that it would be useful to draw more heavily upon the expertise of the Department of Agriculture in the preparation of the report. As a result, in the second substantive change to section 8, it has amended subsection 8(c) to require that the Secretary of Agriculture transmit his findings and recommendations with respect to the tractor study to the Secretary of Transportation by June 30, 1970. These findings and recommendations are then to be considered by the Secretary of Transportation and incorporated, where appropriate, in his report to Congress. The committee would also hope, however, that these findings and recommendations in their entirety would be transmitted as an appendix to the Secretary's report, so that the Congress would have the full benefit of the Department of Agriculture's thinking when reviewing this study.

The committee also understands that several other agencies, such as the Department of Health, Education and Welfare's injury control program, may have valuable data or information concerning agricultural tractor operations and accidents. The committee expects that these agencies will cooperate fully with both the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Transportation in developing the data on which the tractor study report is to be based.

In deliberating over H.R. 10105, the committee also considered adopting an amendment to the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act which would prohibit the tampering with motor vehicle odometers and which would require the Secretary of Transportation to develop standards for odometers which, so far as is practicable, are tamperproof. The committee recognized that resetting a vehicle's odometer so as to understate

the number of miles it has traveled is a common practice among certain persons who desire to deceive car buyers with respect to the age and condition of a vehicle which is being offered for sale. It agreed that strong action should be taken to prevent this deceptive practice, but it expressed the belief that enforcement might better be handled on the State level.

As a result the committee would encourage the States to adopt legislation to prohibit tampering with motor vehicle odometers. In addition, it would suggest that the States consider including in their certificates of title for motor vehicles, or on any other evidence of vehicle ownership which is required by State law, a blank space where the vehicle's mileage can be recorded at the time of a transfer of ownership. The committee believes that such an arrangement could greatly facilitate effective enforcement of an antitampering statute by enabling law enforcement officers to verify the discrepancies between a vehicle's mileage and actual condition merely by examining the vehicle's title history at the State registry of motor vehicles. The committee would also encourage the Secretary of Transportation, under the general standard setting authority contained in section 103 of the act, to develop standards for odometers which, so far as is practicable, are tamperproof. Should these recommendations be implemented, the committee believes that there would be a significant reduction in the frequency with which used car buyers are deceived over the condition of motor vehicles which are being offered for sale.

COSTS

The bill would authorize the appropriation to the Department of Transportation of $23 million in fiscal 1970, and $40 million in fiscal 1971, for the implementation of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966. In addition, it would authorize the appropriation to the Department of $10 million, to remain available until expended, for the planning and design of traffic safety research and test facilities, and $8,200,000, to remain available until expended for planning, design, and construction of a compliance test facility. The bill would also authorize the appropriation of $3,500,000 in both fiscal 1971 and fiscal 1972, for the operation of the compliance test facility and the purchase of motor vehicles and items of motor vehicle equipment for testing purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendments are considered and agreed to en bloc.

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

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 10105) was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to amend the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, and for other purposes."

NATIONAL CAPITAL TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 2185.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2185) to authorize a Federal contribution for the effectuation of a transit development program for the National Capital region, and to further the objectives of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 663) and Public Law 89-774 (80 Stat. 1324) which was to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. That this Act may be cited as the "National Capital Transportation Act of 1969".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Adopted Regional System" means that system described in the Transit Authority's report entitled "Adopted Regional Rapid Rail Transit Plan and Program, March 1, 1968 (revised February 7, 1969)", as that system may hereafter be altered, revised, or amended in accordance with the Compact.

(2) The term "Compact" means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Compact (Public Law 89-774; 80 Stat. 1324).

(3) The term "Transit Authority" means the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority established under article III of the Compact.

AUTHORIZATION OF FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 3. (a) To provide the Federal share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, which system supersedes that heretofor authorized by the Congress in the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-173; 79 Stat. 663), the Secretary of Transportation is authorized to make annual contributions to the Transit Authority in amounts sufficient to finance in part the cost of the Adopted Regional System; except that the aggregate amount of Federal contributions for the Adopted Regional System, including the $100,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965, shall not exceed the lower amount of $1,147,-044,000 or two-thirds of the net project cost of the Adopted Regional System.

(b) Federal contributions for the Adopted Regional System shall be subject to the following limitations and conditions:

(1) The work for which contributions are authorized shall be subject to the provisions of the Compact and shall be carried out substantially in accordance with the plans and schedules for the Adopted Regional System.

(2) The aggregate amount of such Federal contributions on or prior to the last day of any given fiscal year shall be matched by the local participating governments by payment of the local share of capital contributions required for the period ending with the last day of such year in a total amount not less than 50 per centum of the amount of such Federal contributions.

(c) There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Transportation, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $1,047,-044,000 to carry out the purposes of this section. The appropriations authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized by section 5(a)(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

AUTHORIZATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CONTRIBUTIONS

SEC. 4. (a) To provide the District of Columbia share of the cost of the Adopted Regional System, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized to contract with the Transit Authority to make annual capital contributions aggregating not to exceed $216,500,000. To carry out the purposes of this section there is authorized to be appropriated out of the general fund of the District of Columbia, without fiscal year limitation, not to exceed $166,500,000.

(b) The last sentence of paragraph (3) of subsection (b) of the first section of the Act of June 6, 1958 (D.C. Code, sec. 9-220(b)(3)), is amended by striking out "$50,000,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioners under this subsection shall be utilized to carry out the purposes of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (D.C. Code, secs. 1-1404, 1-1421-1-1426); and" and inserting in lieu thereof "$216,500,000 of the principal amount of the loans authorized to be made to the Commissioner under this subsection shall be utilized to make the contributions authorized by section 4 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969. To such extent, not exceeding $166,500,000, as may be necessary for this purpose, the District of Columbia may exceed the limitation on aggregate indebtedness established pursuant to this subsection."

(c) The appropriations authorized by subsection (a) of this section shall be in addition to the appropriations authorized on behalf of the District of Columbia by section 5(a)(2) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965.

(d) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is further authorized to contract with the Transit Authority and to pay in accordance with the terms thereof for the service to be provided to the District of Columbia by the Adopted Regional System.

CONSTRUCTION APPROVALS

SEC. 5. (a) No portion of the Adopted Regional System shall be constructed within the United States Capitol Grounds except upon approval of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol.

(b) Construction of the Adopted Regional System in, or, under, or over public space in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of the District of Columbia shall, in the interest of public convenience and safety, be performed in accordance with schedules agreed upon between the Transit Authority and the Commissioner, to the end that such construction work will be coordinated with other construction work in such public space; and the Commissioner shall so exercise his jurisdiction and control over such public space as to facilitate the Transit Authority's use and occupation thereof for construction of the Adopted Regional System.

REPAYMENT FROM EXCESS REVENUES

SEC. 6. To the extent that revenues or other receipts derived from or in connection with the ownership or operation of the Adopted Regional System (other than service payments under transit service agreements executed between the Transit Authority and local political subdivisions, the proceeds of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness issued by the Transit Authority and capital contributions received by the Transit Authority) are excess to the amounts necessary to make all payments, including debt service, operating and maintenance expenses, and deposits in reserves required or permitted by the terms of any contract of the Transit Authority with or for the benefit of holders of its bonds, notes, or other evidences of indebtedness issued for any purpose relating to the Adopted Regional System, other than extensions thereof, two-thirds of such excess revenues shall, at the end of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year in which the Adopted Regional System (exclusive of extensions) is first put into substantially full revenue service, be paid into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

STUDY OF DULLES AIRPORT EXTENSION

SEC. 7. (a) The Secretary of Transportation is authorized to contract with the Transit

Authority for a comprehensive study of the feasibility, including preliminary engineering, of extending a transit line in the median of the Dulles Airport Road from the vicinity of Virginia Route 7 on the I–66 Route of the Adopted Regional System to the Dulles International Airport.

(b) The study to be undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall be completed within six months after execution of the contract authorized therein at a cost not in excess of $150,000; and there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 to carry out the purposes of this section.

REPEAL AND AMENDMENT OF EXISTING LAWS

SEC. 8. (a) The following provisions of law are repealed:

(1) The National Capital Transportation Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–669; 74 Stat. 537).

(2) Sections 3 and 4 of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89–173; 79 Stat. 664–665).

(b) Section 5(a) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "authorized in section 3 hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of the Adopted Regional System (as defined in section 2(1) of the National Capital Transportation Act of 1969)".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, with the passage of S. 2185 today, the Senate has given final congressional authorization for the long delayed, urgently needed 98-mile rapid mass transit system for the Washington metropolitan area.

Congressional action on this bill has been prompt, efficient, and overwhelmingly favorable. President Nixon submitted the bill to Congress on May 16. The House and Senate District of Columbia Committees met in unusual joint session to conduct hearings on the bill on June 10 and 11. The Senate passed the bill July 8 without a single dissenting vote. The House took final action last Monday, approving the bill by a vote of 12 to 1, 285 to 23. Today, the Senate has cleared the bill for the President's signature.

While congressional action has been swift, we had no time to lose. The entire financial plan on which the transit system depends has been jeopardized by the passage of time and inflation. Three times in this decade Congress has enacted legislation to authorize this transit system. Actual construction has been delayed for 2 years, however, while the freeway controversy has been ironed out. During these delays, inflation has driven transit construction costs up at a rate of a quarter of a million dollars a day, eroding the transit financial plan to the peril point.

Now that the controversies and delays are past history, it is time to go full speed toward completion of the full 98-mile system at the earliest possible date.

The House of Representatives has voted to appropriate the full amounts necessary to move forward with the subway plan at the maximum speed economic and fiscal prudence dictate. I hope Congress can agree on this full level of appropriations so that the triumph of 10 years' effort will not slip away.

Further delay for the transit system spells financial disaster. The final congressional hurdle for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit System is Senate action on the appropriations.

I urge my colleagues to continue their 10-year support of this vital transit program by supporting full appropriations this session.

AMERICAN TAXPAYERS PAID FILIPINO MERCENARIES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, when we consider that billions of dollars of taxpayers' money have been spent since 1961 in maintaining an undeclared war in Vietnam, one begins sorrowfully and thoughtfully to wonder when and how we Americans can find the resources for needed projects in our own country. One wonders how we can raise the standard of living of our own people, provide adequate housing for millions of Americans undergoing privation in miserable slums, and end starvation in our country which should all along have had top priority.

Mr. President, 30 million of our neighbors, most of them women and children, are living below the poverty level. Little children in every State of our Union go to bed hungry every night. It is sad that in this the wealthiest country in the world, blessed by the Almighty with abundance, millions live in abject poverty, denied adequate schooling with many youngsters denied even the oportunity to attend school but for a few years or to obtain any job training to enable them to live like human beings should live in decency and with dignity.

Yet, during these years we have poured our resources by the billions of dollars into an undeclared war in Vietnam. Beyond all that, the cost of priceless lives of Americans serving in our Armed Forces has exceeded 50,000 with approximately 260,000 men wounded, many of them maimed for life. All this, by reason of President Johnson and now President Nixon yielding to the demands of the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA. They have prevailed by their false statements and persuasive propaganda in causing first President Johnson and now President Nixon to maintain half a million fighting men at one time throughout these years in an undeclared, immoral, and unpopular war in Vietnam. They have involved us in a civil war in South Vietnam where we now support the Saigon government of militarists headed by 10 generals, nine of whom were born and reared in what has been termed North Vietnam since the Geneva Agreement of 1954.

President Thieu and Vice President Ky and seven of the eight other generals who govern in Saigon by force and violence all came from North Vietnam. Ky and others of the present leaders of the Saigon regime fought with the French against their own fellow countrymen seeking national liberation from 1946 to 1954 when the French sought to reestablish their lush Indochinese empire.

Now, Americans learn that President Ferdinand Marcos of the Philippine Republic having been safely reelected for a 4-year term has scornfully recalled from Vietnam the noncombat force of 1,500 Filipino engineers who were conveyed to Vietnam from the Philippines by American ships and planes. Now, even this token force is recalled.

The Philippine Republic owes its existence to the United States. In World War II American soldiers invaded the Japanese-held islands and many gave their lives to free the Filipinos. The 37th Infantry of my State of Ohio was in the forefront of that invasion. Many young men from Ohio were killed and wounded in combat in driving the Japanese from those islands. Since 1899, Americans have given lives and treasures which in the end created the Philippine Republic. Yet, the utmost President Johnson had forthcoming from the Philippine Government was not one combat soldier but simply 1,500 noncombat engineers. Now, after Ferdinand Marcos has been reelected, these are being withdrawn.

The American public at last knows that the United States paid the Philippine Government more than $39 million for those nonfighting troops. It must be startling to Americans to know that they equipped those noncombat engineers, and that they provided the entire pay of the noncombat engineers of the Philippine Republic at a cost ranging from $33 a month for each private to $210 a month for Filipino officers. Those noncombat engineers of the Philippine Republic were mercenaries. Unfortunately, that is not all.

The U.S. Government under treaty arrangements with the Philippine Republic maintains Clark Air Force Base about 60 miles from Manila. At this base we have hospitals where severely wounded and maimed soldiers are flown from Vietnam. Many lives have been saved by our Army and Navy surgeons working around the clock at our hospitals there. Also, American aircraft and crews are based there. Americans are entitled to know that there has been an insurrection raging against the government of Ferdinand Marcos for many months and without any act of Congress nor congressional authority whatever our combat planes on many occasions have bombed and strafed outposts of Huk guerrillas waging an insurrection against the present government.

It is not generally known, but in the event of an armed attack on the Philippine Republic, the United States is explicitly committed to a pledge that any such attacks would be instantly repelled. President Eisenhower in 1958 and President Johnson in 1964 publicly used the "instantly repel" language in joint communiques with Philippine leaders. This pledge was also formally included in a moratorium of agreement between the American ambassador and the Philippine foreign secretary. This blanket commitment to the Philippines was made without congressional approval. It is in direct conflict with our formal obligations under the SEATO Treaty.

Despite this commitment, despite more than $1 billion given in two decades to the Philippine Republic, President Johnson had to hire a noncombatant Filipino construction battalion to go to Vietnam

at a cost to American taxpayers of approximately $39 million. Now, even that paltry contribution is being withdrawn by President Marcos.

Pentagon officials requested an appropriation of $5,200 million to supply ammunition to GI's and marines fighting in that immoral, undeclared war in Vietnam. Therefore, more than $21,000 would be spent for ammunition to shoot at each Vietcong or North Vietnamese soldier. At the same time, the administration has requested only $3,200 million for aid to education for the 58 million schoolchildren and college students of our Nation. The philosophy of this administration is clearly revealed in the fact that it is willing to spend $55 for education for each American child and $21,666.67 to shoot at each Vietcong and North Vietnamese.

Mr. President, we Americans have every reason to marvel that notwithstanding the madness and in fact national insanity on the part of leaders who have involved us in Vietnam and other areas of Southeast Asia, our Government remains solvent. It is true that all Americans bear a heavy tax burden. Here is how some of the taxpayers' money is spent and all without any authorization of the representatives of our people.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT ON THE JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

A letter from the Chairman, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Center for the period July 1, 1968, through June 30, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition, signed by Scott G. Reed, and sundry other citizens of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in support of the Vietnam moratorium; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 3194. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Theodosia E. Daley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPONG:

S. 3195. A bill to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities payable from the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

S. 3195—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING A 5-PERCENT INCREASE IN CERTAIN ANNUITIES PAYABLE FROM THE CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT AND DISABILITY FUND

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on October 20, the President signed H.R. 9825, the bill amending the Civil Service Retirement Act. That bill included a provision for a 5 percent cost-of-living increase to those retired by October 31, 1969. On October 29, just 9 days after the bill was approved and just 2 days before the increase provision expired, the Secretary of Defense announced extensive reductions in many Defense installations throughout the Nation. Although the total effect of these reductions is not yet known and probably will not be known for several months, it is conceivable that, faced with the prospect of a reduction in grade resulting from a reduction in force, a number of employees would find it advantageous to retire now.

Also, I have received reports that a number of longtime career employees, both female clerical and secretarial and male journeymen employees, are considering retirement because they have been informed they will be required, in addition to their regular duties and outside their regular working hours, to perform custodial services.

It seems probable that a number of individuals eligible for retirement faced with these alternatives may retire and thereby eliminate at least some of those separations making it unnecessary to separate other career employees not now eligible for retirement.

In the light of this, I am today introducing a bill to extend the time during which individuals may qualify for the 5-percent increase until May.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 3195) to provide a 5-percent increase in certain annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, introduced by Mr. SPONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION

S. 2919

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) be added as cosponsors of S. 2919, the Criminal Offender Rehabilitation and Crime Prevention Act of 1969.

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

S. 2920

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President on behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) be added as cosponsors of S. 2920, to amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to authorize consideration of danger to the community in setting conditions of release, to provide for pretrial detention of dangerous persons, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 61

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 61, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A RESOLUTION

SENATE RESOLUTION 285

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 285, to authorize a study by the Foreign Relations Committee, pursuant to its jurisdiction in matters relating to the relations of the United States with foreign nations generally and to the United Nations organization, of the possibilities for international cooperation and cost sharing in the exploration of space.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 329 AND 330

Mr. HARTKE submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 13270) to reform the income tax laws, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 331

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. HOLLINGS, and Mr. PERCY, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by us, jointly, to the section of the Tax Reform Act dealing with private foundations, which would delete the "40 Year Rule" (section 507(b)(2)).

What follows is an outline—to be amplified later—of the basic reasons why we have joined in this amendment.

First, we believe that an arbitrary limitation on the life of foundations runs counter to the intent of the Tax Reform Act and would create a bad precedent.

We strongly support the provisions of the Finance Committee bill designed to correct abuses in the operations of foundations. The Finance Committee has adopted a number of such commendable reforms. However, the 40-year rule contributes neither to reform nor to the correction of abuses.

We do not believe that it is good policy or good law to reform an institution and at the same time act to destroy it. It makes little sense to call for capital punishment—after 40 years probation.

If the Congress this year legislates a time limit on the tax-exempt status of foundations, it might, with equal logic, legislate a time limit on the tax-exempt status of hospitals, labor unions, schools, churches, and trade associations.

Second, there is general agreement by all who have investigated the subject that most foundations have done a first-rate job in bringing private initiative and diverse approaches to the solution of our Nation's problems. The list of foundation accomplishments is heartening and long. Among the dramatic achievements of foundations have been: fantastic improvement of wheat and rice yields; prevention of hookworm, malaria, and yellow fever; early research in rocketry; discovery of insulin, penicillin, and polio vaccines; and preservation of invaluable open space for public recreation. Population planning, public television, educational reform, scholarly research, adult education, criminal justice, voter registration, and the arts and humanities have also received great contributions from private foundations.

The list of foundation abuses is notably short, and for the most part, can be traced to a small group of institutions which would be reformed, or lose their tax-exempt status, under the committee's bill. Yet the 40-year rule makes no distinction between nonoperating foundations which have made vital contributions to the Nation and to our society and those which serve individuals as tax shelters only. The 40-year rule would simply destroy them all.

If foundations are fundamentally bad, we should legislate them out of existence; if they are fundamentally good—as we believe them to be—their abuses should be curbed and their charitable work encouraged and sustained.

Third, the 40-year rule disregards the fact that older foundations are often as effective and worthwhile as the younger ones; indeed the older foundations are among the most responsive, independent, and professional private philanthropic institutions in our society, perhaps for the very reason that they have gained experience with age.

Fourth, foundations are not controlled by the "dead hand" of the past. Most of their charters are broad, and outdated trust instruments can be changed under existing laws. Moreover, they are directed by living, responsible trustees—men of distinction and leadership, including some who have served or are serving in this body. The ironical fact is that foundations are more frequently charged with being too innovative and venturesome than with being too hidebound and tradition-minded.

Fifth, foundations do not—as some have alleged—hold an increasing share of the Nation's wealth. The facts are that although the absolute value of assets held by foundations has increased over the years, the total of their assets today represents a smaller portion of the Nation's wealth than 10 years ago. In 1969, some 22,000 foundations, together hold less than seven-tenths of 1 percent of the Nation's wealth.

Sixth, the perpetual existence accorded foundations is not unique. In 43 States businesses may be incorporated in perpetuity. Most nonprofit tax-exempt institutions such as churches, labor unions, schools, social welfare organizations, trade associations, and hospitals are not subject to an arbitrarily determined expiration date. We agree that the tax-exempt status of individual foundations which no longer serve charitable purposes should be terminated—but this can be done under present law. It would be wrong to destroy all foundations—good and bad—at an arbitrary time.

And it would be clearly discriminatory to single out foundations—from among all tax-exempt institutions—for such treatment.

Seventh, Treasury and others who have systematically examined this question have rejected an arbitrary limitation. In its 1965 report, under the Johnson administration, the Treasury opposed the idea of a death sentence. Two months ago, under the Nixon administration, the Treasury accepted and reaffirmed that position before the Finance Committee. The Peterson Commission on Foundations and the House Ways and Means Committee have also rejected it.

Eighth, an arbitrary 40-year life would be extremely harmful to the operations of foundations. Recent Treasury testimony has made clear the extraordinary staffing difficulties which foundations would confront, especially in later years. Precipitous and wasteful disbursement of capital would be encouraged. Creation of new foundations would be discouraged.

Mr. President, in sum, we believe the "death sentence" is unwise policy and bad law.

It is a clear case of "overkill" under the guise of reform.

It strikes at the root of private initiative and the private sector.

It is a blow against private philanthropy and charitable purposes.

We urge its deletion.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 332

Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. METCALF, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. HART, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BAYH, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. CASE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. COOK, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. JAVITS) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13270, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 333

THE BIG TAX LOOPHOLE: ASSETS TRANSFERRED AT DEATH

Mr. TYDINGS. I am submitting an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the pending tax bill which will close perhaps the largest single loophole in our tax system. This is the present treatment of unrealized appreciation of assets transferred at death.

My amendment will correct an injustice against the average taxpayer more onerous than even an excessive oil and mineral depletion allowance.

It will accomplish real, long-term reform in the pending tax bill by ultimately recovering an estimated $2.5 billion in annual revenue.

It will bring within the Federal tax system each year an estimated $20 billion of appreciated wealth which now forever escapes taxation.

I testified before the Finance Committee this fall to urge adoption of this amendment. I believe the final form of the Senate Finance Committee's reported bill makes adoption of my amendment necessary as a matter of fiscal responsibility.

THE PROBLEM

Under present law, when an individual sells a capital asset—stocks, real estate, et cetera—which has increased in value the appreciation is subject to a capital gains tax based on the difference between cost and sale price. However, if appreciated property is held until the owner dies, the appreciation escapes capital gains taxation completely. The heir receives a tax free stepup in basis, that is, he is only responsible for an increase in value realized from the time he inherits the property until the time he sells it.

The result is a tremendous loophole in our Federal tax system which permits $15 to $20 billion a year in capital gains to escape taxation, and costs the Treasury an estimated $2.5 billion a year in potential revenue.

Compare, for a rough demonstration, the present tax loophole for assets transferred at death with the present gift tax. If Mr. A, for example, gives his heir a gift of stock worth $5 million which he purchased 10 years ago for $1 million, the entire $4 million of appreciated value is subject to taxation. But if Mr. A. dies and leaves this same stock to his heirs through his estate, the same $4 million of appreciated value is—except for estate taxes—forever exempted from taxation.

The Tydings amendment would close this loophole by keeping the original cost of an asset as the basis for determining a capital gains tax when the asset is eventually sold, even though the asset passed through an estate. Importantly, however, the amendment would add to the original cost, as the basis for a capital gains tax, the amount of the estate tax paid on the asset when it passed through the estate.

In other words, when an heir sold ap-

preciated property, he would have to pay a capital gains tax on the entire increase in the property's value including that which occurred when the decedent held the property as well as on, as is now the case, the increase in value which occurred while the heir held it.

However, to avoid the problem of double taxation, the amendment would diminish the amount on which an heir would have to pay a capital gains tax when he sold the property by the amount of estate tax paid on the asset when inherited. This would be accomplished by increasing the basis carried over at death by the amount of the estate tax paid on the asset when it passed through the estate.

In addition to its injustice to the average taxpayer, this loophole also produces an undesirable economic side effect of distorting investment decisionmaking. Older investors who would normally sell assets and reinvest the proceeds hold on to them, knowing that, at death, neither their estates nor their heirs will ever have to pay the capital gains tax on the appreciated value. Capital which would otherwise be free to flow into sound and productive investments is locked in.

A third important point is that the amendment would restore long-term fiscal balance to the tax bill before the Senate. As you know, the current tax proposal is expected to yield a long-term fiscal deficit of roughly $2.5 billion—by 1979. When this amendment is fully effective, the Treasury estimates it would provide an additional $2 to $2.5 billion a year in revenue—precisely the amount needed to balance the tax reform bill.

Therefore, enacting this amendment would: First, eliminate a major inequity in our tax system which favors a chosen few; second, help remove an incentive to hold on to investments that market conditions dictate ought to be sold; and third, restore long-term fiscal balance to the tax proposal currently before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 334

Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. HARTKE) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13270, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 335

Mr. McINTYRE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 13270, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 336

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to House bill 13270, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 337

Mr. GORE (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MONTOYA, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. YARBOROUGH, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. McCLELLAN) proposed amendments to House bill 13270, which were ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. GORE when he proposed the amendments appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 338

Mr. PERCY proposed amendments to House bill 13270, supra, which were ordered to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. PERCY when he proposed the amendments appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO 339

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HARTKE, and Mr. McINTYRE I submit a further amendment to be proposed to H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill. I ask that the amendment be printed and lie on the table.

This is one of a number of small business amendments that have been proposed, and it is my hope that the Members of the Senate will give them their careful consideration and support.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

AMENDMENT NO. 340

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. CASE) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 13270, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he submitted the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the period for transaction of routine morning business has been concluded, the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

PENTAGON PROPAGANDA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I noted in this morning's New York Times story about my statement yesterday that Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs Daniel Z. Henkin said that the five military service television crews that have been turning out newsfilm for Vietnam since mid-1966 were considered "an experiment that would be reviewed for its effectiveness."

I welcome the fact that this experiment is being reviewed after 3 years and look forward to its cancellation either by Executive action or the amendment I plan to place on the Defense appropriation bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the New York Times, Dec. 2, 1969]

PENTAGON "PROPAGANDA" IS ASSAILED BY FULBRIGHT

(By Warren Weaver)

WASHINGTON, December 1.—Senator J. W. Fulbright charged today that the Defense Department was spending millions of dollars on "public relations" programs that promote military activity rather than merely furnish information about it.

The Arkansas Democrat said he would move to strike from the defense appropriation bill all financing for five television camera crews working in Vietnam and producing film with "A propaganda rather than a journalistic thrust."

"It is one thing," the Senator said in a floor speech, "for the Defense Department to have employes available to provide quickly and responsively—factual information to both the public and the press, upon request.

"It is quite another when that department and the individual military services use taxpayers' money to generate and promote public support to military weapons and military programs."

CITES COST FIGURES

Senator Fulbright said conservative estimates indicated that the Pentagon was now spending $27.9-million for public relations, compared to $2.8-million ten years ago. He said he thought "the real total figure is much larger."

Today's was the first of four speeches that Mr. Fulbright will give this week on the public relations activities of the military. In the others he will discuss specific promotional activities of the Navy, Air Force and Army.

Mr. Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, indicated that he would move to impose a dollar ceiling on Pentagon public relations spending and restrict it to information rather than propaganda when the defense appropriation bill reaches the floor later this month.

In response, the Assistant Secretary of Defense for public affairs, Daniel Z. Henkin, said he was operating on instructions from Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird that "propaganda has no place in the Defense Department public information program."

Promising that the department would give the Fulbright speeches "careful study," Mr. Henkin said the television crews in Vietnam were "an experiment" that would be reviewed for its effectiveness.

BUDGET CUT

The assistant secretary noted that he had already cut the $3.7-million budget of his own public affairs office by $338,000 this year.

Senator Fulbright singled out for "special concern" these aspects of Defense Department public relations work:

Cross-country tours for selected community leaders to a variety of defense installations, by which "the Defense Department is able to propagandize and influence attitudes toward their activities."

A program of providing military leaders as speakers had made 59 such appearances from August, 1968, to May, 1969 * * * professional soldier whose mission was to act as Chief of Staff of the Army."

Production of films made available to the public on subjects like Vietnam and Communism, "which, in order to support the Administration or the military establishment's point of view at the time, usually distort key facts."

LEGAL POSITION QUESTIONED

Senator Fulbright questioned the justification or legal authority for the Defense Department's producing newsfilm on what it called "feature aspects of the military participation in Southeast Asia."

Perhaps Vice President Agnew, who last week appealed to the networks to put on different commentators, has not felt the necessity to complain about the TV coverage from

Vietnam because he knows that at least a portion of it was emanating directly from Administration sources in Vietnam," Mr. Fulbright declared.

The Senator concluded that "there is enough Administration propaganda on Vietnam being provided the American public through speeches and statements, without providing this additional outlet in the guise of 'objective' newsfilm stories."

THE NAVY PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, shortly after assuming office, Secretary of Defense Laird told the Defense Establishment that "Propaganda has no place in the Department of Defense public information programs." There is a narrow line between "information" and "propaganda." Secretary Laird apparently meant that the information programs of the Department should not be used for propaganda purposes, defined by Webster as the "dissemination of ideas, information, gossip, or the like, for the purpose of helping or injuring a person, an institution, a cause, etc." The military services do not seem to appreciate the distinction; each service's public affairs program is not aimed at providing the public with unvarnished facts, but at persuading it that the programs and weapons systems of the Army, Navy, or Air Force—as the case may be—should have the first claim on public funds and are the key to peace. The Navy's public affairs effort typifies the competition within the military services for the public's affections.

Mr. President, I digress for a moment to refer to a story published in this morning's newspaper in which it is estimated that the weapons system now under construction, I suppose one would say, through the Pentagon, are now estimated to run $20 billion over the estimates.

This is the largest figure I have seen. We have seen various figures for the Minuteman and the C–5A. However, the accumulative figures published in this morning's newspaper reveal that it is now estimated that the costs will be $20 billion more than the original estimates.

The Secretary of the Navy, setting forth the 1969 objectives for Navy public relations, stated that "Public affairs activities should be directed toward gaining the understanding and support of American citizens through active public information and community relations programs." Among the items to be emphasized in 1969 public affairs activities were:

(1) "The need for modern ships, aircraft, and equipment throughout the Navy"; and to justify the billions required for those "ships, aircraft, and equipment" the public would be duly warned of:

(2) "The challenge of the continued growth of Soviet sea power and its expanding worldwide operations."

I ask unanimous consent that a memorandum dealing with the Navy public affairs plan be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[SECNAV Notice 5720]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1969.

From: Secretary of the Navy.
To: All Ships and Stations.
Subj.: Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1969 (NPAP 1–69) Planning Directive.
Ref.: (a) U.S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations (NAVSO 9–1035).

1. Purpose: To promulgate public affairs planning guidance and the Department of the Navy specific public affairs objectives for calendar year 1969.

2. Background: The Navy and Marine Corps (the Naval Service) must have the support of the American people in order to attract high caliber personnel and obtain modern ships, aircraft and equipment needed to be an effective element of the United States defense forces.

(a) Public affairs activities should be directed toward gaining the understanding and support of American citizens through active public information and community relations programs.

(b) The public affairs mission and basic objectives, set forth in reference (a), are intended to form a common basis for planning and coordination of command efforts so as to support each other and uniformly address major matters.

(c) Guidance and responsibilities for developing specific public affairs plans and programs by individual commands are contained in reference (a).

3. Specific public affairs objectives: The following specific public affairs objectives will be emphasized in the coming year:

(a) The combat and support roles of the Navy and Marine Corps in Southeast Asia.

(b) Recognition of the individual accomplishments of men and women of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(c) The need for modern ships, aircraft, and equipment throughout the Naval Service.

(d) The challenge of the continued growth of Soviet sea power and its expanding worldwide operations.

(e) The equal opportunity for members of all racial and ethnic groups within the Naval Service.

(f) The Marine Corps' Air-Ground Team and its role as the Nation's Amphibious Force-in-Readiness.

(g) Recognition of the increasing importance of Navy Oceanography for its vital role in national security and the benefits that accrue to the national welfare.

(h) The understanding of the Marine Corps' special capabilities for limited war.

4. Action: Public affairs planning by all commands will be in support of the basic Department of the Navy objectives and those special objectives listed above.

5. Cancellation: This Notice is cancelled on 31 December 1969.

JOHN W. WARNER,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

[SECNAVNOTE 5720]

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1969.

From: Secretary of the Navy.
To: All Ships and Stations.
Subj: Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1968 (NPAP 1–68).
Ref: (a) U.S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations (NAVSO P–1035).
Encl: (1) Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1968 (NPAP 1–68).
(2) Reporting Format.

1. Purpose: To promulgate the Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1968 (NPAP 1–68).

2. Background:

(a) The requirement for a Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan is contained in paragraph A–1006 of reference (a), and was originally established by a SECNAV Notice in 1965 to ensure an effective and highly coordinated annual public affairs program for the Navy and the Marine Corps.

(b) Guidance and responsibilities for development of specific public affairs plans and programs by individual commands and methodology are included in reference (a) and enclosure (1).

3. Action: Action addressees will furnish the Chief of Information their public affairs plans implementing the Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan for calendar year 1968 within 30 days following the receipt of this plan. The Chief of Information is directed to coordinate addressees' efforts for the Secretary of the Navy to ensure effective and coordinated Navy and Marine Corps public affairs activities for calendar 1968.

4. Reports: Action addresses will report quarterly to the Chief of Information, beginning 30 June 1968, and each three months thereafter, in the format contained in enclosure (2), on their cumulative efforts to implement the Navy Department Public Affairs Plan. Reports Control symbol CHINFO 5720–3 is assigned this report which should reach the Chief of Information by the 15th of the month following each quarter to enable action addresses to consolidate the reporting data.

5. Cancellation: This Notice is canceled 31 December 1968.

CHARLES F. BAIRD,
Under Secretary of the Navy.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY PUBLIC AFFAIRS PLAN, 1968

1. Situation:

(a) The Navy and Marine Corps have vital roles in the national security. To fulfill them, each must have the best-trained personnel, the most modern equipment, and the necessary logistic support to establish and maintain a state of constantly high readiness.

(b) This readiness is attained only with the full support from the people of the United States and their Congress.

(c) Keeping the people and the Congress constantly informed in this area is, in large measure, the responsibility of the Office of Information of the Department of the Navy.

2. Mission: The public affairs mission of the Department of the Navy is to inform the public and the Naval Service about the Navy and Marine Corps as instruments of national policy, their operations, responsibilities and achievements of the men and women in the Navy and Marine Corps.

3. Basic Objectives:

(a) The basic public affairs objectives of the Department of the Navy in 1968 are to gain public understanding and support of:

(1) The combat and support roles of the Navy and Marine Corps in Vietnam.

(2) The importance of seapower in the nuclear age and the predominant role of the Navy in the field of nuclear propulsion.

(3) The need for an adequate, well-trained and well-equipped Naval Service together with the crucial need for qualified officers and enlisted men to keep it operating.

(4) The career advantages in the regular and reserve Naval Service.

(5) The predominant role of the Naval Service in ocean sciences, together with its activities in other scientific research.

(b) To make the public aware of the importance and high priority which Soviet Russia attaches to a significant seapower of its own.

4. Specific Objectives: U.S. Navy Public Affairs Regulations state:

"Certain aspects and programs of the Navy are of greater public interest than others and require greater support from the public, if they are to be effective. Some of

these will be of a continuing nature; others are of short-term interest. Periodically a priority list of these is compiled. It constitutes the specific public affairs objectives of the Navy."

5. Execution: (a) The list that follows is in the priority which will be effective with publication of this Notice. Action addresses will tailor their 1968 public affairs programs within the broad limits of the following objectives:

(1) Vietnam:

(a) The Navy and Marines—primarily in Vietnam, but with no less emphasis wherever they may be.

(b) Construction by SEABEES in Vietnam and their general civic action role.

(2) Importance of the naval supply and logistical efforts and the need for a strong merchant marine.

(3) Recognition of individual officers and men of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(4) Drama of naval research and development, and its role in providing new and better equipment and weapons systems.

(a) POSEIDON and the FBM weapons system.

(b) Potential of the SABMIS weapons system.

(5) The Navy and Marine Corps as careers.

(6) Contributions of the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve components, including the exploits of the more than 100,000 reservists on active duty.

(7) Special events including Navy Day, Armed Forces Day, the commissioning of JOHN F. KENNEDY (CVA–67), the recommissioning of NEW JERSEY (BB–62), and SEALAB III.

(8) Role of the Naval Service in United States diplomacy and in maintaining the freedom of the seas.

(9) Growth of the Soviet Navy and its expanding operations.

(b) It should be recognized that "spot news", interesting events that cannot be foreseen—combat operations, rescues, deeds of valor, deeds of compassion, awards, "newsworthy" incidents afloat and ashore, and similar accounts of the Navy and Marine Corps and their personnel always have a top priority; and, that invitations from groups outside the service for speakers, visits, displays and similar events rate closer to "spot news" in importance as a means of focusing public attention on the Naval Service.

(c) A series of annexes and appendices to the Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan is included. Annex A, the basic OPNAV Plan, sets forth specific Navy public affairs objectives. Annex B provides a public affairs plan in support of Marine Corps objectives.

6. Reports: Action addressees will submit reports in accordance with paragraph 4 of the transmittal Notice.

ANNEX A (OPNAN)

1. World-wide Naval Operations and Versatility:

(a) The Navy's effort in Vietnam is a classic portrayal of the effectiveness and flexibility of seapower. The ability of the Navy to project national policy will be exploited for public affairs value. The spectrum of the Navy's capabilities will be publicized, including strategic deterrence provided by Carrier Striking Forces and Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarines; security against the submarine threat provided by Hunter Killer Groups, will be emphasized along with the world-wide ambassadorial and public relations roles fulfilled by visiting Navymen.

(b) The Navy's mobility, readiness and versatility will be emphasized. The Navy's quick reaction time will be stressed whether in response to requests for naval gunfire/airborne support, international crises, or search and rescue missions.

(c) Major efforts will be devoted to maintaining public awareness of the deterrence of the Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine, 'round-the-clock operations of the numbered fleets, and enhancement of western hemisphere solidarity achieved by UNITAS. Antarctic operations, the Navy Navigation Satellite System and Deep Submergence Systems Project provide excellent material to demonstrate the scope of Navy interest in national security and to scientific objectives.

(d) The FDL concept, meanwhile, is designed to provide high-speed military sealift and improve significantly our rapid military deployment capabilities. Together with airlift and land-based prepositioning of Army equipment, FDL will be an integral part of a U.S. national, rapid deployment system.

2. Freedom of the Seas and Diplomacy: World-wide naval operations and their versatility continue to demonstrate a necessity for the Navy to inform others of the danger to all free nations from encroachment on the high seas. About 98 per cent of all military equipment and supplies to support the United States in Southeast Asia is provided by sealift. The ability of the Navy to retain unrestricted use of the sea is vital.

3. Nuclear Power:

(a) There are now four nuclear-powered surface ships in commission. The commissioning of Will Rogers, the Navy's 41st Polaris-launching submarine, marked completion of the Fleet Ballistic Missile Submarine construction program. Construction is scheduled to begin this year on the Nimitz (CVA(N)–68). Over 25 nuclear attack submarines are currently under construction. The advantages of nuclear power will continue to be stressed. The Navy seeks continuing introduction to the fleet of additional nuclear-powered ships, concentrating on ships where return in effectiveness is greatest.

(b) An associated area is the requirement for an educational program leading to acceptance of nuclear-powered ships in harbors throughout the world. Engineering reliability and the safety record of the Navy's nuclear ships over the past 13 years are a matter of great pride.

(c) Continuing day-to-day safe operation of nuclear-powered ships and land-based nuclear-powered facilities will help gain public acceptance of atomic energy.

4. Growth and Expanding Operations of the Soviet Navy:

(a) Events indicate the Soviet Navy, increasing in number and quality of ships, plans to deploy more fleet units beyond its coastal sea areas.

(b) It is necessary to develop public understanding of the nature of this change in its sea-power from a largely continental one, with naval operations in coastal waters, to one not limited to the Eurasian continent. Its activities now include more widespread operations, including operations adjacent to the territorial waters of the United States.

5. Anti-submarine Warfare:

(a) Continued growth and wider operating capabilities of the Soviet Navy require renewed public affairs activity relating to developments in anti-submarine warfare.

(b) Despite public focus on Southeast Asia, the importance and the role of ASW will continue to be emphasized. Efforts will be directed to the significance of the role of ASW forces in the Vietnam War, as well as to describe the total world-wide underseas threat and the important mission of the carrier-airplane combination in offensive anti-submarine warfare. Priority emphasis will be directed toward naval personnel to keep them informed and conversant in the ASW area—an area recognized as vital to the security of the United States.

6. The Navy/Marine Corps Team: Operations in Vietnam will continue to be emphasized to enhance public understanding of the effectiveness of seapower in modern war. Carrier and amphibious operations, gunfire support missions, logistic support to *all* services, support of Vietnamese River Assault Groups, the construction effort in Vietnam, Marine Corps operations and Riverine Warfare will be emphasized to promote respect for the effort of the Naval Service in Southeast Asia. (Annex B deals in more detail with Marine Corps areas of interest.)

7. Personnel (See Appendices III and VI):

(a) In a free society, public support of almost every endeavor depends on the esteem in which it is held. This involves knowledge and senses of value, honor, pride and respect.

(b) Navy public affairs programs for 1968 will assume wider identification with life at sea and wider recognition for the problems, responsibilities and the rewards of the Naval Service and command at sea. Greater recognition will be given to personnel in the Navy, and the outstanding job they are doing.

(c) Youth, its contribution to our current manning efforts, as well as its influence in the family of the American public today, must be recognized (see Appendix VI).

8. Retention and Internal Information (see Appendix III):

(a) Maximum exposure will continue to be given to implementation of Retention Task Force recommendations as they occur, and the Family Information Branch of the Office of Information will be given wide latitude in the communication of internal information to all personnel and their dependents.

(b) Use of Armed Forces Radio and Television will be expanded for internal news of interest and concern to Navy personnel and their families.

(c) Use of the seapower film series and seapower presentation to internal and external information media will be utilized to insure that Navy personnel and their families as well as other "publics" appreciate the Navy's role in maritime national defense.

9. Naval Logistics and the American Merchant Marine:

(a) Some 98 per cent of U.S. supplies move by sea to Southeast Asia, and it is obvious that worldwide military sealift (MSTS) operated by the Navy and backed by a Merchant Marine of modern, fast cargo ships, is indispensable to successful deployment and support of all United States services overseas in peace and war. This is especially important in maintaining the flexible response of Marine Corps landing teams.

(b) The need for modernization (qualitative and quantitative) of the United States Merchant Marine will be pressed vigorously. The United States now has about 90 privately-owned active ships engaged in oceanborne commerce. Of the 600 engaged in foreign trade, about 60 tankers have speeds of about 15 knots and about 116 dry cargo ships in operation or building have speeds over 20 knots.

(c) The Navy's capacity to respond to mission requirements and emergency needs is dependent on the quality of its logistics operations. United States naval power today includes guided missiles, nuclear-powered vessels and complex electronic systems as well as many ships and types of equipment of earlier design. All of these systems work under constant threat of malfunction, making it imperative that components and repair items be constantly stocked and readily provided where they are needed.

(d) The Navy Supply system is a global, computerized system—comprised of inventory control points, supply centers, supply depots and ships' and shore activities' supply departments. Shore stations ranging from Southeast Asia to Iceland, and ships operating around the world are constantly being supplied and provisioned.

10. Construction:

(a) Awareness of the Navy role as the construction agent for the Department of Defense in Southeast Asia will be stressed.

(b) The Naval Facilities Engineering Command is responsible for all civilian contracts construction in Southeast Asia, now totaling $1.5 billion, the single greatest construction program in world history.

(c) Direct Seabee military construction continues to expand. All battalions are committed to Vietnam, and more than one-half the battalions in-country are increasingly engaged in providing tactical construction support to U.S. and allied troops under fire.

(d) Seabee Teams, especially selected, trained and equipped to teach construction skills to villagers, are effectively forwarding the U.S. civic action mission in Vietnam and Thailand, gaining respect and affection of local people toward the United States.

11. Research and Development:

(a) All scientific discoveries contain elements of drama and are potential sources of news. The following is a list of major areas to be emphasized: Contributions of Navy Laboratories; Advanced Electronics in the Navy; Computers in the Navy; Oceanography—Man in the Sea; the Modern Missile Navy; Navy Experience in Desalinization; Navy's Basic Point Defense Surface Missile; the All Weather Carrier Landing System; Counterinsurgency; Arctic Research Laboratory; the Navy in Space; Air and Water Pollution; computer-aided education technology; deep submergence and medical developments.

(b) Automatic Data Processing (ADP) has become more and more a daily function of Navy administration. The use of ADP will be publicized to promote the Navy's interest in administrative efficiency and economy.

12. Strike Force:

(a) The worth of our sea-based tactical air force (CVAs/CVA(N)s) has been validated in Vietnam. Attack Carriers and embarked Air Wings have furnished almost half of the total tactical air effort in that theater.

(b) It must be assured that Attack Carriers (CVAs) are modern and able effectively to support increasingly sophisticated tactical (VF/VA) aircraft. The John F. Kennedy (CVA–67) will complete construction and join the fleet in 1968. A second nuclear-powered carrier, the Chester W. Nimitz (CVA(N)–68), is currently under construction and scheduled to join the fleet in FY 1972.

(c) Strike Warfare operations, spearheaded by attack carrier task forces, will continue to be emphasized to enhance public understanding of seapower as an instrument of national policy.

13. Oceanography (see Appendix V): The President's Science Advisory Committee Report on "Effective Use of the Sea" sets forth far-reaching implications on the oceans' importance to national security. The committee recommended that a national ocean program concern "effective use of the sea for all purposes currently considered for terrestrial environment: commerce, industry, recreation and settlement; as well as for knowledge and understanding". There is nothing in the science of oceanography which does not affect the Navy, and our efforts and potential in this area must be exploited.

14. The Naval Reserve (see Appendix VII):

(a) Internal and external information programs will include emphasis on providing a two-way flow of information designed to educate the public on the need for and the importance of the Naval Reserve—why it exists, how it works and what it does. As a corollary, the Navy's internal information program will keep the inactive Naval Reserve abreast of current operations and the contributions of the Navy and its active duty forces.

(b) More than 100,000 Naval Reservists are serving with the Navy's active duty forces either voluntarily or in the performance of their two-year obligation. Approximately 13 per cent of personnel manning ships and stations throughout the world are Naval Reservists, and Naval Reservists provide the backup force of men with the training and skills needed in the event of mobilization.

APPENDIX I—NAVAL MATERIAL

1. Purpose: To formulate the Naval Material Command public information plan in support of the Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1968.

2. Objective: To attain increasing public awareness, understanding and support of the Navy's many achievements in the fields of science and technology and the major role played by the Naval Material Command in the support of the Navy and Marine Corps.

3. Programs: (a) Public Affairs Program Highlights for calendar year 1968 under cognizance of the Chief of Naval Material and supported by the various and specific subordinate commands are listed below. Additional Public Affairs Programs are listed in Tab A and are maintained in the Naval Material Command Public Affairs Officers' Future Book.

(1) Ocean Science and Engineering-Research Development Test and Evaluation focused on deep ocean engineering, involving ocean-bottom studies, effects of submergence on materials, personnel existence in ocean depths, search, rescue and salvage vehicles and systems.

(2) Laboratory and Management Personnel. To highlight laboratory accomplishments and the caliber of personnel in the field of management.

(3) Naval Material Command Magazine—Target late in CY–68.

(4) Ship Acquisition Programs.

(a) DX/DXG Program. To provide vitally-needed escort ships for the Navy of the 1970's. This program is scheduled to go into contract definition phase.

(b) LHA Program. To provide the Navy with a new ship type for amphibious warfare incorporating features of the LPH, LPD, LSD and AKA. This program is in the contract definition phase. Subsequent to evaluation of contractor proposals, development and production contracts for the LHA will be awarded.

(c) FDL Program. A new procurement plan for the FDL ships has been approved by the Secretary of Defense and the program is to be resubmitted to Congress. The new procurement plan has retained as many advantages of the Total Package Contract as possible.

(5) Automatic Carrier Landing Systems (ACLS)—continued test and evaluation of the SPN–41 on board CV with latest Navy jet aircraft.

(6) Resource Management at station (base) level to design, develop, test and evaluate a Resources Management System.

(7) F–111B Aircraft. Limited field and carrier trials.

(8) A–7A (CORSAIR II). The return of the Navy's newest operational aircraft from its first combat tour.

(9) Accelerated Strike Aircraft Program (ASAPR). The dynamic processes involved in the production and rework of current fleet aircraft.

(10) Air-to-Surface Missiles. To pay tribute to the Navy Industry team of ordnance developers whose foresight made possible the nigh percentage of weaponry now available to the operating forces.

(11) CH–53. Explain the role, mission and features of the latest and most capable helicopter available to Navy and Marine Corps today.

(12) VANS. The unique forward area avionics workshops, prepared by Naval Air Rework Facilities now being deployed to remote areas on short notice to serve aviation units of the Atlantic and Pacific Fleets.

(13) Re-establishment of the 16-inch gun capability of the NEW JERSEY.

4. Industry Indoctrination: Indoctrination of industry in the procedures for clearing industry-originated material for release to the public and efforts to expedite the present clearance review system within the Naval Material Command.

5. Implementation: Continued emphasis will be placed on publicizing programs listed in paragraph 3 and Tab A, through employment of accepted public information practices. These include, but are not limited to news media, technical publications, Navy films, TV and radio.

TAB A—OTHER PUBLIC AFFAIRS PROGRAMS TO BE DEVELOPED

Other public affairs programs to be developed during the year include:

(a) Dedication of Conical Shock Tube Test Facility.

(b) Naval Weapons Laboratory, Dahlgren, Va. 1968—50th Anniversary.

(c) Navy's Natural Resources Conservation Program.

(d) Study of Radioisotope Devices.

(e) Seabee Battalion military construction in Republic of Vietnam.

(f) Naval Hospital Construction; Oakland, California.

(g) C–3 (Poseidon) Testing.

(h) Advanced Planning Briefings for Industry.

(i) NMC Laboratory Accomplishments.

(j) Phoenix Missile Program.

(k) Shipbuilding and Conversion Program; Apollo Ship Conversion.

(l) Hydrofoil Research Vessel.

(m) General Ship Related Programs.

(n) Talk quick/Autosevocom-Interim secure-voice system.

(o) Microelectronics in the Navy.

(p) Satellite Communications (SATCOM).

(q) Development and use of weaponry for riverine warfare.

(r) Advanced missile programs.

(s) Mine and undersea warfare.

(t) New developments in guns and projectiles for future ships.

APPENDIX II—BUMED

1. The basic purposes of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery's Public Affairs Program are to:

(a) Create an awareness of the variety and scope of the Navy Medical Department's responsibilities and activities.

(b) To publicize accomplishments.

(c) To point up further objectives.

(d) To establish and justify the requirements necessary for achieving these goals.

2. The program is addressed to those entitled to medical service as well as to the general public. A proper image of the Navy Medical Department is essential if understanding and support by both the internal and external publics, is to be achieved and maintained.

3. The agenda for accomplishing the public affairs plan is presented under the following categories:

(a) Medical Support to Military Operations in Southeast Asia.

(1) Medical support to forces in the Vietnam area:

(a) Seventh Fleet.

(b) III MAF.

(c) USS RESPOSE, USS SANCTUARY.

(d) Station hospital—Danang.

(e) Naval hospitals—Guam, Yokosuka, and Subic Bay.

(f) River Assault Groups.

(g) Market Time.

(h) Game Warden.

(i) SEABEES.

(j) Dental support in Vietnam.

(k) Training of a flight surgeon as a parachutist and assignment to a Para-medical Team at Cubi Point.

(2) Preventive Medicine in Vietnam:

(a) Preventive Medicine Program.

(b) Vector Control Program.

(3) Other Medical Programs:

(a) Civic Action Programs.

(b) Military Provincial Hospital Assistance Program (MILPHAP).

(c) Dental Contributions to Civic Action Programs.

(b) Other Operational Medicine.

(1) Medical support to NASA-manned space flight operations (surgical teams to recovery fleet, naval hospital recovery teams, medical specialty teams, port medical liaison teams, flight surgeon medical monitors and pre- and post-flight medical evaluators).

(2) Aeromedical team visits to operating units (evaluate fatigue and morale factors).

(3) Medical Aspects of Man-in-the-Sea.

(4) Control of insects by aerial spraying from helicopters.

(5) Medical aspects of Operation "Deep Freeze".

(6) Preventive Medicine Unit services, including epidemiologic investigations, to units ashore and afloat.

(7) Assignment of a flight surgeon to Manned Orbiting Laboratory, Naval Space Systems Activity, Los Angeles, California.

(8) Assignment of a flight surgeon as scientist/astronaut.

(c) Clinical Medicine and Patient Care (excluding Southeast Asia).

(1) Progress of construction at Naval Hospitals, Oakland and Jacksonville.

(2) Availability of medical facilities and services both ashore and afloat.

(3) Doctor-patient relations: continue to foster mutual understanding and appreciation.

(4) Continuing critical review of suggestions, complaints and congratulations.

(5) Plans and legislation for improvements and expansion of medical care facilities and services.

(6) Intensified program for education of dependents and their sponsors' problems in providing medical care.

(7) Expanded dependents medical care, retired members and their dependents care of Military Medical Benefits Amendment.

(8) Family planning services for dependents of Active Duty and Retired Members.

(9) Preventive Dentistry.

(10) Establishment of Naval Hospital, Orlando, Florida.

(11) Approval by Congress for U.S. Naval Hospital, Roosevelt Roads, Puerto Rico.

(12) Audio-Visual Training film "LSD", discussing the dangers of personal, illicit experimentation with the drug.

(13) Audio-Visual Training in Mental Health Series "Trip to Where" depicting dangers (personal and career-wise) of usage of illicit drugs (LSD, marijuana, amphetamines, barbiturates).

(d) Training Facilities and Programs:

(1) Training as inducement for career in Navy medicine (medical student program, intern programs, residency training, subspecialty training).

(a) Medical Student Program.

(b) Naval Intern Program.

(c) Residency Training Program.

(2) U.S. Naval Dental Corps Dental Officer Education Program.

(3) U.S. Naval Dental Corps Continuing Education Courses.

(4) Training as career incentive for retention of Medical Service Corps officers.

(5) "Flight Surgeon Handbook"

(6) Continuing review of training facilities and educational programs.

(7) Training as inducement for a career in Navy Nursing.

(8) Training as career incentive for retention of enlisted Hospital Corpsmen.

(9) Global Medicine Series—To acquaint medical personnel with tropical diseases and other illnesses not common to the United States.

(10) MILPHAP Team Orientation—Training in tropical medicine, physical conditioning and Vietnamese language.

(11) Computer-programmed course of instruction for laboratory diagnosis of malaria.

(e) Research:

(1) Medical Research directly related to Vietnam operations.

(a) Use of frozen blood under combat conditions.

(b) Shock studies of combat wounded.

(c) Combat surgery.

(d) Combat performance prediction.

(e) Immersion foot prophylaxis study.

(f) Diarrheal and infectious disease; epidemiology, control and prevention.

(2) Medical Research related to other military operations.

(a) Control and prevention of Meningococcal infection.

(b) Underwater medical research.

(1) SEALAB III.

(2) Other oceanographic application.

(c) Human Effectiveness:

MarCorps Enlisted personnel.

Aviation personnel.

Submarine personnel.

(d) Assault Swimmer and Seal Team disease, casualty prediction and control.

(3) Other Medical Research.

(a) Study methods to improve training and education of Medical Department personnel.

(f) Recruiting and Retention Matters:

(1) Training as incentive for Navy medical service:

(a) Early commissioning program (Ensign medical and dental).

(b) Senior Medical Student Program.

(c) Naval Medical Intern Program.

(d) Service in Navy Medical Corps at selected schools.

(e) Navy Flight Surgeon.

(f) "Your Career in the U.S. Naval Dental Corps."

(g) Opporunities for careers as dietitians, occupational therapists and physical therapists.

(h) Annual Professional Meetings.

(i) Opportunities for careers in Navy Medical Service Corps.

(2) Student AMA Meeting in Chicago.

(3) Rekindle interest in Naval Medical Reserve.

(4) Active duty for Training for Reserve Officers.

(5) Military medical training program (MC, MSC, NC, USNR).

(6) Nursing Symposium (NC, USNR).

(7) Hospital Corpsmen Awards and Decorations.

(8) Continuous Review of Hospital Corpsmen Resource utilization.

(9) Retention of Nurse Corps officers on active duty.

(g) International Professional Activities:

(1) Navy assistance to foreign countries.

APPENDIX III—BUREAU OF NAVAL PERSONNEL

1. The major aim of public affairs activity by the Bureau of Naval Personnel in 1968 will be to gain recognition for individual Navymen and their accomplishments. The objectives of such a program are to contribute to high morale by fostering a favorable Navy image in the eyes of Navymen, to educe from the general public respect and admiration for Navymen and the Navy to foster, in the youth of America, the concept that a naval career is a challenging, rewarding, respectable and honorable profession.

2. Internal information programs will be aimed at two publics; Navymen and dependents/next of kin of Navymen.

(a) To this end, greater utilization of the facilities services of the Armed Forces News Bureau and Armed Forces Radio and Television networks is anticipated for the release of news of personnel policies, educational opportunities and other programs that benefit a Navy career.

(b) Continued support will be given to the Navy Wifeline's effort to keep Navy families informed in those areas that directly affect them.

(c) The role the Navyman plays in the Vietnam war will continue to be publicized.

3. External information programs and public affairs activities will include the following:

(a) Recruiting.

(b) First anniversary of the Master Chief Petty Officer of the Navy.

(c) The commissioning of the Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

(d) Additional units of the Junior NROTC.

(e) Establishment of Surface Combatant Officers School.

(f) First graduates of Immediate Master's Degree Program.

(g) Establishment of Hotel/Motel service in Washington area.

(h) Accomplishments of minority group members who are Navy personnel.

(i) Navy participation in Project 100,000.

(j) Navy participation in Project Transition.

(k) Dedication of Michelson Hall, U.S. Naval Academy.

(l) Significant Personnel assignment.

(m) Chief of Chaplains News Conference.

(n) Special Medals and Awards.

APPENDIX IV—RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT

1. Scientific discoveries are news, and media recognize and continually seek such material. The aim of the public affairs program of the Office of Naval Research is to present this material to the public through various news media in an organized manner. This program is divided into the following basic elements:

(a) News releases.

(b) Exhibits.

(c) Scientific symposia and professional meetings.

(d) Scientific publications (such as Naval Research Reviews).

(e) Visual aids.

(f) Speeches.

(g) Other special programs.

2. News events likely to be of public interest during 1968 (but are not limited to):

(a) Exhibits at:

(1) American Institute of Aeronautics & Astronautics annual meeting.

(2) State of Science Exposition.

(3) Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers conference.

(4) American Institute of Biological Sciences meeting.

(5) Instrument Society of America conference.

(6) American Association for the Advancement of Science conference.

(7) ONR exhibits during Engineers' Week, Navy Day, Armed Forces Day and at the Pentagon.

(b) Navy Science Cruiser Program:

(1) Approximately 220 youths, both boys and girls, will be selected at regional science fairs to participate in the annual one-week Navy Science Cruise/Tour at the East Coast or West Coast Navy facility.

(2) At the International Science Fair, which in 1968 will be held in Detroit 15–18 May, ten grand winners and ten alternates will be selected to receive offers of summer employment at Navy laboratories. One of this group will also serve as the Navy representative in the Department of Defense delegation which visits the Annual Japanese Science Fair in Tokyo.

(c) Two prototypes of the "Monster Buoy" Ocean Data System, which is designed to collect and transmit oceanographic data over distances of 2,500 miles while moored in deep water unattended for up to one year, will begin operation in 1968 as part of a broad oceanographic survey of the North Central Pacific.

(d) The prototype of an exoskeleton device known as HARDIMAN, which will augment a man's strength and endurance, will be completed in 1968.

(e) ALVIN, the Navy's first deep-diving

research at depths down to 6,000 feet. Two new ALVIN-type vehicles will be completed in the latter half of 1968.

(f) "Rotor-Wing"—rotates to provide an aircraft with lift and hover capabilities of a helicopter, then is stopped and fixed in place to convert to high-speed, fixed-wing aircraft—is undergoing exploratory development.

(g) Development of Navy's computer-aided instruction system—computers instruct students both in academic subjects and how to operate and maintain complicated equipment.

(h) Development of frozen blood bank systems in supplementing standard system in combat areas.

(i) Dedication of new Space Science building at Naval Research Laboratory and groundbreaking for new Chemistry Laboratory building in Spring of 1968.

(j) Deep Freeze 1968, the Navy's annual Antarctic operation, involves over 2,500 men of the Navy, Coast Guard, Army and Air Force, plus over a dozen ships and aircraft. The major mission of these forces is to provide logistic support for civilian scientists who are prosecuting more than 60 scientific projects.

(k) SEALAB III is the third of a continuing series of ocean experiments designed to develop methods for men to live in the ocean for extended periods. Success of SEALAB projects will hasten the development of major engineering activities on the continental shelves.

(l) AUTEC, Atlantic Undersea Test and Evaluation Center, is located in the "Tongue of the Ocean" off Andres Island in the Bahamas. Commissioned in February 1967 the Ocean-bottomed instrumentation areas and island-based computer facilities will help the Navy assess effectiveness of sensors and determine ways of more silently operating warships and submarines.

APPENDIX V—OCEANOGRAPHY

1. Exploration and use of the deep oceans has become increasingly practicable and important to national and Free World defense. Various military, political and economic factors tend to merge into a realm of total national interest where traditional dividing lines between strictly civilian and military pursuits may no longer be distinguishable.

(a) The growing involvement of the Navy's oceanographic program with the scientific, educational and industrial communities indicates the need for direct information channels to these areas. Special literature should be made available and questions should be answered promptly.

(b) It should be noted also that Navy and Navy-sponsored oceanographers already produce a considerable amount of scientific and technical literature suitable for publication in academic and institutional periodicals.

2. The Oceanographer's Public Affairs program 1968 will be carried out under his supervision with the cooperation of all Navy Offices, bureaus and activities having a direct interest in oceanography.

(a) The program will put appropriate emphasis on each of the major fields of oceanography, ocean engineering and development and oceanographic operations in support of the Fleet.

(b) Support of the Office of the Chief of Information is available and all important contacts with the national media will be through that Office and the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs).

3. Therefore 1968 public affairs objectives of the Oceanographer of the Navy will include stress on:

(a) The vital importance of oceanography to national defense, particularly in the fields of antisubmarine and undersea warfare.

(b) Social and economic benefits to the United States of the Navy's sharing of oceanographic data and techniques with other government agencies and private industry.

(c) Career opportunities in oceanography and ocean engineering.

(d) The economic opportunities oceanography offers to assist emerging nations in their searches for minerals and food.

(e) Special Oceanographic events 1968.

APPENDIX VI—YOUTH PROGRAMS

1. Several public service organizations sponsor and direct youth programs of interest to the Navy which merit its attention and support. Commands at every level should seek to insure their success. Some typical organizations and the programs they sponsor are:

(a) The Navy League:

(1) The Navy League Cadet Corps, for boys 12 and 13 years of age, is an indoctrinational program for the U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps.

(2) The U.S. Naval Sea Cadet Corps, for boys 14 through 17 years of age, is a Federally chartered corporation jointly sponsored by the Navy Department and the Navy League.

(3) Both Navy League youth programs aim to develop the skills of basic seamanship and the traits of self-reliance, courage and patriotism. Both are committed to Navy training, including the teachings of seapower and naval customs, traditions and usage.

(4) Shipmate is a program designed to interest high-caliber, well-motivated high school students, 12 to 18 years of age, in a naval career, and to acquaint them with the traditions, purposes and role of the Navy as part of our national defense organization.

(b) Boy Scouts of America:

(1) The objectives of the naval program of cooperation with the Boy Scouts of America are:

(a) To familiarize the nation's youth with the objectives, customs and traditions of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(b) To encourage voluntary participation by naval personnel in programs sponsored by the Boy Scouts of America.

(c) Explorer Scouts—boys 15 to 18 years of age. (The Explorer Service will receive the most extensive support, due to the more mature age level of Explorers. Cooperation with the Boy Scouts will best be achieved at the local level. However, the Chief of Information maintains contact with the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America.)

(c) Newspaper Carrier Boys:

(1) the Navy Department also honors the request of newspaper executives to establish tours and host newspaper carrier salesmen at various naval installations. The support provided by the Navy to groups of this nature is not as broad in scope as the support provided to Federally-chartered youth groups and is normally limited to group visits to naval ships and installations.

(2) Newspaper carrier salesmen can also be incorporated into the Navy League Shipmate Program or the Boy Scouts.

(d) Amateur Scientific Groups:

(1) Commanding officers, in dealing with youth science groups, will stress the importance of formal basic scientific training to provide leadership for future technological progress.

(2) Typical forms of cooperation:

(a) Speakers.

(b) Films.

(c) Instructional and informational materials.

(d) Demonstrations, exhibits and displays of military hardware of scientific interest.

(e) Tours, visits to ships and briefings.

(e) Aerospace Education Workshops: (1) The Aerospace Education Workshop Program is designed by teacher-training institutes to give university, college and secondary school educators a comprehensive background in the field of aviation.

APPENDIX VII—NAVAL RESERVE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMPANIES

1. Naval Reserve Public Affairs Companies (NRPAC) are organized to provide a source of trained public affairs personnel in the event of mobilization and to provide District Commandants and their subordinate commands with public affairs assistance. They also assist the Chief of Information in the implementation of the overall public affairs program of the Navy and Marine Corps which is designed to gain support of the Navy from the American public.

2. To achieve this support, the following procedures will be followed:

(a) Each year a list of public affairs projects will be prepared by CHINFO which will support the Department of the Navy Public Affairs Plan and will be included as a part of that plan. Each NRPAC will submit within 30 days, a plan to accomplish selected projects after they receive the annual plan. NRPAC plans should include specific dates, targets, titles of projects and name of personnel assigned to the project. Plans should be forwarded to the appropriate district commandant and the Chief of Information (OI–420).

(b) Each NRPAC will continue to submit the standard project report (CHINFO 5725–2).

3. Listed below are projects for which support is desirable during calendar year 1968. These projects are intended as examples of the type of support desired from NRPA companies. It is not expected that each company will attempt to accomplish every project. However, it is expected that every company, large and small, will establish and vigorously promote a Navy speaker/seapower presentation program, maintain direct and frequent contact and cooperation with other local Navy commands and Navy-oriented groups, maintain a vigorous recruiting program and pursue a training program which will strengthen the professional qualifications of company members.

(a) Contact local naval activities in respective areas to offer assistance and to assist in publicity for human interest Navy stories about local personnel (re-enlistments, serving aboard ship, assisting in a civic project, awards, returning veterans of Vietnam war.)

(b) Contact Naval District Commandants who maintain Navy films available for public showing. Canvass local civic groups and organizations concerned with welfare and recreation of young men, e.g., PTA, school boards and church groups, with the purpose in mind of selling Navy as a future career for young men. Use films as background. There are loads of them.

(c) Arrange for interviews by local newspapers, radio and TV with personnel returning from Vietnam. Arrange appropriate ceremonies to support and honor these personnel.

(d) Arrange news conferences for visiting Navy VIPs. If schedule permits, suggest they address a local civic group.

(e) Promote flying the American Flag on all national, local holidays and Navy Day.

(f) Assist naval hospitals in exposing the general public to the fact that the serviceman is receiving the best medical care available, but that patients here can use and appreciate receiving personal comfort items such as books, stationery and toilet articles. Sponsor a drive to make the public aware that these men would appreciate visits and help, if physically unable, in writing letters, etc. They may need legal or other help for their families or themselves.

(g) Prepare regular radio shows for broadcast by cooperating stations, for example, a five-minute weekly show about the Navy at a local station.

(h) Visit (by appointment) daily newspapers, radio and TV stations to see firsthand how media operate. Establish closer working

ties with the media and identify the NRPAC as the Navy's voice in the community. In communities where the Navy has large installations, identify the NRPAC as an official assisting agency in continuing the flow of the Navy's information to the American public.

(i) Coordinate publicity for or sponsor such touring Navy groups as the Naval Air Cadet Choir, Naval Academy Glee Club, Naval Air Training Command Flag Pageant, Blue Jackets Choir, Blue Angels, Sea Chanters and the Marine Corps Drum and Bugle Corps, etc. The Commandant's public affairs office receives all notices of this type.

(j) Suggest feature story or documentary possibilities to local media on various naval activities. The SEABEES and medical personnel, for instance, often are involved in projects that suggest feature treatment.

(k) Assist in publicizing naval ship launchings and commissionings. These should get more publicity than they get at present.

(l) Sponsor annual "Day in the Navy" for high school journalists at Training Centers or other naval activities in the area.

(m) Establish a definite schedule of meetings with the Commandant or principal naval command in your area. If other than the Commandant, keep him informed.

(n) Have a systematic release of stories to local media, particularly neighborhood papers, about individual reservists who enlist, re-enlist, go on training duty or are promoted. (Large dailies ordinarily won't run this kind of story, but smaller suburban and neighborhood papers often do.)

(o) Establish a local Navy Speaker's Bureau in coordination with the commandant as a systematic means to promote, encourage and coordinate the dissemination of the "Navy's story" throughout the community. Use the Speech Bureau in the Office of Information as a source of material and assistance with speeches. Use the seapower presentation and other command presentations plus films to tell the Navy story.

(p) Promote local Navy Science Day to emphasize the Navy's research and development activities and capabilities. Sponsor an appropriate event (a Science Day dinner for community leaders together with outstanding high school science students). Coordinate Navy Science Day with Office of Naval Research and Director of Navy Laboratories, Office of Naval Material. Get local high school and college professors to judge the science exhibits.

(q) Cooperate with local Navy League, NRA and other Navy/Marine Corps-oriented organizations and newspapers to sponsor newsboys' visits to historic sites, naval station, training centers, ships, etc.

(r) Assist reserve units, including NROS, ROC and NROTC, in charting publicity and community relations programs that will spur recruitment and retention.

(s) Make a continuing, vigorous effort to replace NRPAC personnel lost because of attrition, promotion, transfer, retirement, etc. Further efforts to augment NRPACs through persistent recruiting, especially through the direct commission program for 1655 officers. We must get young talent into the program.

(t) Plan and make field trips to installations for briefings on the latest scientific, technological and military developments as a means to stay abreast of changes, improvements and new techniques. A story has to be known before it can be told. Schedule through the Commandant.

(u) Maintain closer support relationships with the District PAO to promote speed, efficiency, accuracy and coordination of district-wide public affairs efforts.

(v) Organize a program to bring entertainers, politicians, sports figures and other celebrities to naval hospitals.

(w) Have a systematic release program for localized Navy news photography through the unit's Press Officer.

(x) Plan special cruises aboard Navy ships for media representatives to:

(1) Demonstrate air and surface ASW techniques.

(2) Stress Navy's role in scientific and technological research and development.

(3) Show Polaris deterrent.

(y) Nominate top media executives for two yearly trips to Hawaii (15 per trip) on an aircraft carrier and return via Navy air to the West Coast.

(z) News releases to papers and spot announcements to radio stations on reserve enlistment opportunities, aimed mainly at bringing skilled personnel into Reserve Units. The Navy's advanced pay grade program (formerly special rating program) is one example of how a NRPAC can assist individual units in recruiting enlisted personnel with special skills.

(aa) Contact other Reserve Units in area to establish a Public Affairs Liaison Representative to:

(1) Gain a closer working relationship between the other Reserve Units and the NRPAC.

(2) Keep the NRPAC informed about newsworthy projects and events of the Reserve Units.

(3) Coordinate reserve public affairs activities in the area.

(bb) Place Navy display material in airports and other appropriate areas.

(cc) Create professional training workshops for PAOs to teach them the methods of preparing and disseminating news releases, techniques of community relations, and principles and guidelines of Navy public affairs.

(dd) Investigate the local area for museums and other accommodations suitable for exhibiting Navy Combat Art and other exhibits.

(ee) Nominate to CHINFO, through the Commandant, outstanding leaders of the area for the Global Strategy Discussion at the Naval War College, VIP cruises and other special orientation cruises.

(ff) Sponsor practical training for PAOs, JOs, and PH/JOs at local newspapers, radio and TV stations.

(gg) Contact Navy Recruiters in the area, Presidents of Navy League Councils, NRA Chapters, ROA Chapters (Navy Element), CHINFO Branch Officers (L.A.-Chicago-N.Y.) and NRTC units for mutual support and help.

(hh) Help the CHINFO Branch Officers and recruiters to get Navy film series on local TV stations.

(ii) Identify new TV outlets, especially educational, and notify CHINFO Branch Offices and the Commandants for possible placement of Navy educational, training and public information films.

(jj) Assist local Navy-oriented organizations to celebrate Navy Day in appropriate fashion.

(kk) Promote the showing of Navy-oriented films; i.e., the Enterprise story, through local business circles.

(ll) If local radio, TV and newspapers are favorable to Navy news call them up from time to time and tell them how much people appreciate getting the Navy news.

(mm) If the news is devoid of Navy activity, call the media and ask the simple question, "Where is the Navy news today?".

(nn) Promote the playing and singing of the Navy Hymn in local churches.

(oo) Help NRA and Navy League promote Navy Sabbath during Navy Day Week.

(pp) To enhance the Navy educational image, promote:

(1) Naval officers and enlisted men speaking at their high school or college graduation exercises.

(2) Sponsor Honorary Degrees for naval personnel from their respective colleges.

ANNEX B—MARINE CORPS

1. The Marine Corps and its responsibilities in National Defense remain of historic and continuing importance to the public. To this end, the following areas should be noted in 1968: the conflict in Vietnam, covering all areas of Corps involvement; the individual Marine and the factors affecting his morale, welfare and well-being; the training of Marines, officer and enlisted, to include formal schooling as well as physical training; personnel procurement, officer and enlisted, regular and reserve; the Marine Corps Reserve as a ready backup force and delivery of new weapons and equipment.

2. This Annex provides for a public affairs plan in support of, and based on, the mission of the Marine Corps. Its aim is to keep the American public informed concerning:

(a) Marine Corps missions, organization and performance.

(b) Activities of the Marine Corps compatible with military security.

3. Objectives of the Marine Corps public affairs plan are to enlighten the public in the:

(a) Understanding of the Marine Corps' role as an integral part of the Nation's "Amphibious Force-in-Readiness", and the Navy/Marine Corps Team.

(b) Understanding of the balanced fleet concept and the role of Fleet Marine Forces in seapower.

(c) Understanding of the Marine Corps' special capabilities for limited war.

(d) Awareness of the capabilities of the Marine Corps' integrated airground team.

(e) Recognition of the Marine Corps' emphasis on the development of physical fitness.

(f) Acceptance of the Marine Corps for career service.

(g) Support of a strong Marine Corps Reserve.

4. The following are opportunities to be emphasized during the year:

(a) The Marine Corps' role in Vietnam.

(b) The individual Marine and the factors affecting his morale, welfare and well-being.

(c) The training of Marines, officer and enlisted, to include military education, citizenship and moral leadership as well as physical training.

(d) The total personnel procurement effort, officer and enlisted, regular and reserve.

(e) The Marine Corps Reserve as the Corps' ready backup force.

(f) The delivery of new weapons and equipment.

(g) The 25th Anniversary of Women Marines; continuous, unbroken service since February 1943.

(h) Development and implementation of Command, Control and Management systems within the Marine Corps.

(i) The Marine Corps Youth Physical Fitness Program; primarily directed at high school males, with the goal of raising the general level of physical fitness of the Nation's youth.

5. Methods of communicating with the public will include:

(a) Speakers, other public appearances and pronouncements, news conferences and personal interviews.

(b) News releases, filmed, taped and written, for use by radio, television, magazine and house organs, as well as newspapers.

(c) Community relations programs at all levels.

(d) Support to veterans and service-oriented civilian organizations.

(e) Appearances of musical units and troop units at appropriate occasions in the civilian community.

(f) A Command Visit Program for prominent civilians and media representatives to observe the Marine Corps in action.

(g) Development and exploitation of a Combat Art Program.

From:
To: Secretary of the Navy (Attn: Chief of Information)
Subj: Quarterly Report of Implementation of Navy Public Affairs Plan, 1968 (NPAP 1–68) Report Symbol CHINFO 5702–3
Ref: (a) SECNAVNOTE 5720 of (b) NAVSO P–1035

1. The following data support reference (a):

(a) General news releases (Total) _____
(1) Radio/television _____
(2) Newspapers/Magazines _____
(b) Photographic news releases (Total) _____
(c) Cruises (Less SECNAV Guest Cruise) (Total) _____
(1) Media _____
(2) Dependents [1] _____
(3) Other * _____
(d) Community Relations (Total number of events) _____
(1) Locations of events (List) _____
(2) Types and numbers of events (Open Houses, General Visiting, Workshops, Displays, etc.) _____
(3) Numbers of participants by types (Boy Scouts, businessmen, teachers, etc.) _____
(e) News inquiries received (Total) _____
(1) Radio _____
(2) Television _____
(3) Newspapers/Magazines _____
(4) Photographs _____
(f) Youth Activities (Total) _____
(1) Locations of events (List) _____
(2) Boy Scouts _____
(3) Girl Scouts _____
(4) Navy League _____
(5) Other (List by types of organizations)
(g) Speeches (Total) _____
(1) Locations (List) _____
(2) Audiences (Types: Business or social groups; public service organizations, etc.) _____

[1] If media embarked, so indicate by types (Radio, newspapermen, etc.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In order to gain the understanding and support of American citizens of the need for modern ships, aircraft, and equipment the Navy, in fiscal year 1969, maintained a public relations apparatus consisting of a full-time staff of 1,086, plus 1,600 to 1,800 more working at it part time on ships and in other installations. The Navy's identifiable costs last year for public relations were $9,901,000.

I ask unanimous consent that a report relating to the staff and cost of the Navy's public affairs program be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

1. What is the basic overall cost of these public affairs programs? Please include within that your estimate of personnel as well as operations costs.

The only information available Navy-wide for public affairs programs is for those in the public information and community relations fields. (I.e. activity involving preparation of materials for release to the public via the mass communication news media and activity involving direct contact with the public via response to individual inquiries about Navy subjects, and response to private and civic group requests for exhibits, speakers, etc.) (Internal relations programs—passing the word within the Navy—are so integrated with normal command and administrative functions that it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible to separate). Information in the table below is based on a Navy-wide survey made in November–December 1968. [These figures also include personnel costs for military and civilian personnel attached to the Office of Information, Navy Department who are involved in the execution, supervision and planning of these programs.]

Navy-wide personnel and other costs of public information and community relations activities conducted incident to Navy public affairs programs.

[In thousands of dollars]

	Military pay	Civilian pay	Other costs	Total costs
Fiscal year 1966	3,818	1,984	1,062	7,864
Fiscal year 1967	5,020	2,576	1,397	8,993
Fiscal year 1968	5,227	2,941	1,037	9,205
Fiscal year 1969	5,635	3,128	1,138	9,901

2. Please estimate the number of officers, enlisted men and civilians, both full and part-time, who are part of the Navy's public affairs program.

The table below reports personnel involved full-time in the programs costed in paragraph 1. (i.e. public information and community relations) [This includes the numbers of CHINFO personnel involved as noted for paragraph 1.] On board practically all ships in the Navy, the duties of public affairs officer are assigned to one officer as a collateral duty. Usually, an extremely small percentage of his time is spent on this collateral duty. Any paperwork generated by him would be handled by a ship's yeoman in the course of his regular duty as time permits. Based on the number of ships in the Navy, this would mean on the order of 800–900 officers and a similar number of enlisted men, primarily yeomen, engaged part time (to a very small degree) in these programs.

	Officers	Enlisted	Civilian	Total
Fiscal year 1966	191	492	288	971
Fiscal year 1967	207	493	363	1,063
Fiscal year 1968	214	499	374	1,087
Fiscal year 1969	215	493	378	1,086

3. With regard to the Office of Information, please supply information about the following:

(a) How many officers, enlisted men and civilians are working for the Office of Information in Washington? Elsewhere?

The Office of Information consists of the departmental staff in the Pentagon plus field activities as follows:

U.S. Navy/Marine Corps Exhibit Center Washington Navy Yard, Washington, D.C.

Fleet Home Town News Center/High School News Service Great Lakes, Illinois.

Public Affairs Office East Coast New York City.

Public Affairs Office Mid-West Chicago, Illinois.

Public Affairs Office West Coast Los Angeles, California.

3a. Personnel Involved.

	Officers	Enlisted	Civilians	Total
Fiscal year 1966:				
Departmental	42	32	19	93
Field activities	13	60	34	107
Grand total				200
Fiscal year 1967:				
Departmental	37	32	38	107
Field activities	14	48	56	118
Grand total				225
Fiscal year 1968:				
Departmental	47	36	56	139
Field activities	20	47	52	119
Grand total				258
Fiscal year 1969:				
Departmental	54	35	58	147
Field activities	18	50	56	127
Grand total				272

(3(b) What is the approximate cost, including personnel costs, for this outfit?

FUNDS INVOLVED

[In thousands of dollars]

	Military pay	Civilian pay	Other costs	Total
Fiscal year 1966:				
Departmental	851	122	79	1,052
Field activities	526	208	383	1,117
Grand total				2,169
Fiscal year 1967:				
Departmental	811	245	177	1,233
Field activities	536	319	653	1,508
Grand total				2,741
Fiscal year 1968:				
Departmental	997	406	128	1,531
Field activities	557	376	245	1,178
Grand total				2,709
Fiscal year 1969:				
Departmental	1,135	481	129	1,745
Field activities	640	432	333	1,405
Grand total				3,150

Note: As indicated in the response to question No. 1, full costs for public affairs activities Navy-wide are not available. Only costs for public information and community relations activities were obtained in the 1968 survey referred to. This table, on the other hand, shows total costs for operation of the Office of Information (departmental) and its associated field activities.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I emphasize that these figures are based upon the figures supplied to the committee by the Pentagon itself. These are not my estimates. These are based upon as solid facts as we can get. Overall direction of the campaign is through the Navy's Office of Information, manned by a Washington staff of 147, operating with a budget of $1,745,000. Parkinson's Law has found fertile ground in the Navy's public affairs program; the overall budget has gone up to 25 percent in the last 3 years; and the Washington operation is up 57 percent in staff and 65 percent in cost. These figures are only for programs aimed at the public. They do not include the costs of the Navy's internal information and education programs.

In addition to this public affairs effort, the Navy message is spread by 31 Naval Reserve Public Affairs companies consisting of 409 officers and 6 enlisted men, and located throughout the country. Each company must submit an annual project plan to the Navy's Chief of Information detailing the ways it will sell the Navy locally in the coming year.

I ask unanimous consent that the Annual Plan for the Chicago Naval Reserve Public Affairs Company be printed in the RECORD a this point.

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

ANNUAL PLAN FOR CHICAGO NAVAL RESERVE PUBLIC AFFAIRS COMPANY

From: Commanding Officer, NRPAC 9–2, Chicago.
To: Chief of Information, Navy Department.
Via: Commandant, Ninth Naval District.
Subject: Annual Public Affairs Plan.
Reference: SECNAV Note, 5720.
cc: Commander, Group Command 9–2, Chicago.
Commander, Naval Reserve Training, Omaha, Nebraska.

1. *Background:* In accordance with the reference cited, the following plan is submitted

by NRPAC 9–2. It details this unit's activities which are targeted to help implement the overall Navy public affairs plan for fiscal year 1969. Many of the listed projects and activities have been completed or are currently in process. The combined plan is designed to meet Navy and Naval Reserve public affairs goals nationally and locally.

2. *Purpose:* This plan is not intended as a precise operating schedule. As with most public affairs plans which span a year's activities, it will serve as a general guideline with appropriate objectives, and plans to meet these objectives. However, flexibility must be maintained to take advantage of unforeseen opportunities that will arise as the year progresses. Therefore, this plan outlines the types of activities that will be used to reach the objectives and indicates the communications tools to be applied to specific goals.

3. *Organization:* NRPAC 9–2 is the largest Navy Reserve Public Affairs unit, and, as such, it is uniquely suited through size, geographical location and membership background to carry out Navy-oriented public affairs activities in the fertile and important midwest area.

4. *Public Affairs Plan:*

a. Objectives:

1. Increase awareness of need for keeping a powerful Navy, both for wartime and peaceful purposes.

2. Communicate traditions, opportunities and desirability of Navy career, active or reserve, to appropriate audiences.

3. Broaden the concept of the carrier strike force.

4. Increase support for expansion of nuclear fleet.

5. Publicize Navy-Marine Corps efforts in Viet Nam.

6. Increase awareness of active and reserve Navy forces in the Chicago area.

b. Audiences:

1. The general public within a 500 mile radius of Chicago.

2. The business community, and other civic, government and religious leaders including Navy League.

3. Young men and women of high school age, and above as potential active and reserve recruits.

4. Media representatives.

5. Active duty Navy and other military personnel.

6. Active and retired reservists, Navy and other services.

c. Media: It is the plan of NRPAC 9–2 to use every available communications medium to bring the story of the Navy and Navy reserve to the targeted audiences. This includes: print media, newspapers, trade magazines, Sunday supplements; direct mail; personal contact; broadcast, TV and radio; advertising; brochures; outdoor billboards and electronic devices; and others.

d. Projects and activities:

Following is a list of projects and areas of activity that will be (or are being) employed to meet the objectives of this program:

1. Expanded unit speaker's bureau from six to 20 people with the goal of giving at least 60 speeches before civic, fraternal, business, education and other groups during the current fiscal year.

2. Improve drill schedule to include more media and top Navy personnel as speakers.

3. Increase number of 9–2 personnel taking correspondence courses by 50 per cent during the fiscal year.

4. Increase number of 9–2 personnel going on ACDUTRA by 20 percent.

5. Establish special committee to promote and publicize 9–2 activities and personnel.

6. Appoint special Viet Nam officer within unit and provide committee to keep unit abreast of current Navy activities in Viet Nam. Publicize returning veterans of the Navy through "Heroes of Khe San" project.

7. Recruit 10 additional members for 9–2 during current year.

8. Increase the showing of Navy films in Chicago area by 20 per cent.

9. Produce special Navy film clip on Chicagoans who as Navy Reservists are "Twice a Citizen."

10. Increase number of Navy-oriented VIP visits to Chicago area that will produce media interests. Publicize each, including visits from VADM Martin, RADM Geis, etc.

11. Publicize the Navy/Air Force Football game, related visiting dignitaries, midshipmen and Naval Academy Choir through special project with City of Chicago.

12. Publicize Navy Day and Navy Sabbath by arranging for Navy Hymn to be sung in 4,000 area churches and through promotion of open houses.

13. Increase 9-2 attendance at annual NRPAC seminar to be held at GLAKES November 2–3.

14. Establish special project to improve use of Navy display materials in Chicago area. Set up four showings of Navy displays, in Chicago during year. Arrange for permanent display of 9–2 accumulated trophies in local bank.

15. Establish special project in conjunction with Chicago Tribune to give special attention and award to those people and organizations displaying American flag.

16. Establish project to provide entertainment personalities, books, VIP visits and other items to veterans in area Navy hospitals.

17. Complete at least one "Day In The Navy" project to take area high school and college editors, especially from minority group schools, to local Navy facilities. Objective is to gain publicity in area media and school media.

18. Produce 13-week Navy radio show in conjunction with NAS Glenview for WGN Radio, Chicago.

19. Obtain publicity on local Navy and Naval Reserve facilities, such as departure of USS SILVERSIDES (reserve submarine), Naval armory, local reserve units, Navy ball, Northwestern ROTC Ball, Marine Corps Ball, Desron in area.

20. Publicize local entries in Navy Science Day.

21. Gain publicity for 9–2 members in company house organs.

22. Suggest 10 candidates from area for SECNAV guest cruise program.

23. Set up and publicize cruise by local media representatives (member of Chicago Press Club) on Navy ships in Great Lakes.

24. Establish semi-monthly 9–2 newsletter ("The Captain Speaking") to improve communications, interest and morale within unit.

25. Set up project committee to arrange Lake Michigan cruise for members and families of 9–2. Publicize cruise.

26. Establish project and provide people for active duty for training to help organize, write and publish a special Naval Academy supplement for distribution through Chicago Sun-Times.

27. Set up permanent Feature Articles Officer in 9–2 to work on ideas for area trade, consumer, supplemental and other publications to publicize area Navy Reservists and their activities.

28. Work with other local commands to set up standard neighborhood release procedure for each unit's personnel as they go on ACDUTRA, get promoted and so forth.

29. Sponsor special program to take local newsboys aboard Navy facilities for a visit. Publicize visit.

30. Increase unit visits to local military and media facilities. (Three drills to each type of facility during year.)

31. Establish project based on search for sunken German Submarine in Lake Michigan to publicize Great Lakes Navy ships.

32. Provide aid, assistance and ideas for planning program to improve the Navy image nationwide. (National Navy League request).

33. Promote and publicize need for improved merchant marine fleet. Also produce special slide presentation telling this story in economic terms adding in the value of seapower.

34. Establish project to encourage area Reserve officers and men to speak at high school or college graduation exercises and promote honorary degrees for area Navy and Marine personnel.

35. Reactivate project to bring active duty Navy public affairs officers to Chicago area for seminar on how professional civilian communications organizations operate, how planning and market research is done.

36. Set up project to increase visits of general public and special groups to special Navy exhibit in Chicago's Museum of Science and Industry.

37. Publicize public affairs direct commission program to encourage greater participation in reserve by communicators, especially members of minority groups.

38. Establish project to create special Great Lakes Training center displays for Midway and O'Hare airports with cooperation from TDI.

39. Suggest five area media representatives for media cruise to Hawaii.

40. Encourage unit members to attend next Navy Speaker's Seminar, the first one of which was attended this year by CO, NRPAC 9–2.

41. Set up project to aid "Hands Across The Sea" program by providing six tons of chewing gum from The Wrigley Company for the Navy to distribute in Spanish speaking countries. Publicize movement and distribution of gum.

42. Promote sale and distribution of book "John F. Kennedy; Man of the Sea" through consumer media, within the Navy and other outlets.

Other project opportunities will no doubt arise in the course of implementing the above plan. These projects will be factored into the plan as appropriate.

Very respectfully submitted,

Cdr. A. L. CONRAD,
USNR–R, Commanding Officer,
NRPAC 9–2, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What does the Navy buy with the nearly $10 million it spends to persuade the public? Let me list a few examples of last year's effort:

One thousand one hundred and thirty-six news releases prepared by the Office of Information's News Branch;

Thirty-nine thousand photos distributed to news media;

Forty-nine news film releases prepared for TV use, on subjects ranging from the appearance of Russian trawlers off Virginia to the retirement of a Navy seaplane;

Fifty-five 1-minute TV "news featurettes" on subjects such as civic action in Vietnam and joint naval operations in Latin America;

Navy assistance in production of about 12 commercial films a year;

Assistance in producing some 100 noncommercial films, primarily for Navy contractors;

Operated a speakers bureau of top civilian and military personnel which filled 251 speaking engagements across the country;

At this point I ask unanimous consent that the list of speeches made by senior Navy officials in fiscal year 1969 be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT III

SENIOR SPEAKERS OF THE NAVY PROVIDED BY NAVY DEPARTMENT SPEECH BUREAU, JULY 1968 THROUGH JULY 1969, FISCAL YEAR 1969

The Office of Information does not "program" Navy speakers. Rather, speakers are provided in response to specific requests made to or referred to the Office. The attached list reflects speaking engagements filled by Navy Flag Officers and Senior Civilian Officials of the Navy in response to such requests. This list is not all inclusive, Navy-wide, but only for those speaking engagements coordinated through the Navy Department Speech Bureau.

July 1 68, Hon C. F. Baird, Commissioning of Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

July 1 68, Radm A. B. Gralla, USN, Dedication of Inert Diluent Plant, Naval Ordnance Station, Indian Head, Md.

July 1 68, Radm R. R. Speck, USN, Kiwanis Club Luncheon, Columbus, Ohio.

July 3 68, Radm O. S. Morrison, USN, Kiwanis Club Luncheon, Memphis, Tennessee.

July 9 68, Hon P. R. Ignatius, Marine Corps General Officers, Symposium, Washington, D.C.

July 11 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Marine Corps General Officers' Symposium, Washington, D.C.

July 12 68, Hon. R. A. Frosch, Marine Resources Symposium, Newport, Rhode Island.

July 14 68, Hon C. F. Baird, Senior Officer Executive Management Course Meeting, Newport, Rhode Island.

July 15 68, Hon C. A. Bowsher, Armed Forces Management Association Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.

July 15 68, Radm E. J. Fahy, USN, Share Design Automation Seminar Meeting, Washington, D.C.

July 17 68, Vadm R. Needham, USN, Launching USS M. T. Hood, Sparrows Pt., Md.

July 17 68, Hon C. F. Baird, Seniors Management Course, Naval Post Graduate School, Monterey, California.

July 20, 68, Radm R. A. MacPherson, USN. Launching, USS Cannole, Los Angeles, California.

Aug. 3, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Wing Officer Management Seminar Meeting, Newport, Rhode Island.

Aug. 8, 68, Radm. H. R. Renken, USN, NROTC Unit Seminar, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado.

Aug. 8, 68, Radm. H. R. Renken, USN, Kiwanis Club Luncheon, Boulder, Colorado.

Aug. 9, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Washington, D.C.

Aug. 12, 68, Radm. B. H. Bieri, Jr., USN, Food Service Executives Assn., Hollywood Florida.

Aug. 14, 68, Radm. H. L. Miller, USN, NROTC Seminar Meeting, Boulder, Colorado.

Aug. 15, 68, Radm. E. B. Hooper, USN, Management Club Meeting, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

Aug. 17, 68, Vadm. E. W. Grenfell, USN (Ret.), Commissioning USS Dolphin, Portsmouth, N.H.

Aug. 17, 68, Radm. L. R. Bernard, USN, Commissioning USS Tautog, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

Aug. 20, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, National War College, Washington, D.C.

Aug. 22, 68, Vadm. C. M. Duncan, USN, National Navy Mother's Club Convention, Denver, Colorado.

Aug. 23, 68, Radm. R. R. Crutchfield, USN, Chief Petty Officers' Meeting and Luncheon, Washington, D.C.

Aug. 31, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Commissioning USS John F. Kennedy, Norfolk, Virginia.

Aug. 31, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Mississippi National Guard, Jackson, Mississippi.

Sept. 3, 68, Adm B. A. Clarey, USN, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

Sept. 5, 68, Hon R. A. Frosch, Laboratory Advisory Board for Naval Ships, Annapolis, Maryland.

Sept. 5, 68, Adm. I. J. Galantin, USN, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

Sept. 5, 68, Vadm R. L. Shifley, USN, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

Sept. 7, 68, Radm R. S. Benson, USN, USS MT VERNON Assn Reunion, Boston, Mass.

Sept. 7, 68, Vadm T. F. Caldwell, USN, National Security Commission, American Legion, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Sept. 11–12, 68, Hon C. A. Bowsher, Colorado Society of Certified Public Accountants, Denver, Colorado.

Sept. 11, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, American Legion Convention, New Orleans, Lousiana.

Sept. 13, 68, Vadm B. M. Strean, USN, 6th Regional Navy League Convention, Mobile, Alabama.

Sept. 12–14, 68, Mr. N. J. Ream, Institute of Management Sciences Meeting, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sept. 17, 68, Hon P. R. Ignatius, 27th Marines' Homecoming, San Diego, California.

Sept. 18, 68, Vadm B. M. Strean, USN, Pompano Beach Council, Navy League Meeting, Pompano Beach, Florida.

Sept. 18, 68, Hon B. J. Shillito, Shipbuilders' Council, Washington, D.C.

Sept. 18, 68, Radm R. J. Stroh, USN, Monthly Dinner Meeting Navy League Council, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

Sept. 19, 68, Radm A. R. Gralla, USN, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Los Angeles, California.

Sept. 19, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Reader's Digest Assn., Mt. Pleasant, New York.

Sept. 21, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, "Tailhook" Reunion, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Sept. 24, 68, Hon C. F. Baird, Naval District Commandants' Conference, Washington, D.C.

Sept. 24, 68, Adm I. J. Galantin, USN, Naval District Commandants' Conference, Washington, D.C.

Sept. 26, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Navy League's "Naval Reserve" Luncheon, Washington, D.C.

Sept. 27, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Defense Orientation Conference Association, Washington, D.C.

Sept. 28, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Naval Academy Alumni Association Meeting, Annapolis, Maryland.

Oct. 1, 68, Hon R. A. Frosch, 1968 Government Microcircuit Applications Conference, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Oct. 2, 68, Adm I. J. Galantin, USN, Project Management Class, Naval War College, Newport, Rhode Island.

Oct. 3, 68, Radm D. W. Cooper, USN, Military Order of World Wars Luncheon, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 5, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, 15th Naval Reserve Association National Conference, Kansas City, Missouri.

Oct. 7–8, 68, Hon. C. A. Bowsher, Federal Government Accountant Association Meeting, Philadelphia, Pa.

Oct. 9, 68, Hon C. F. Baird, Port-of-St. Louis Propellor Club, St. Louis, Missouri.

Oct. 14, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, USMC Facilities Management Conference, Quantico, Virginia.

Oct. 18, 68, Hon. C. F. Baird, National Association of Supervisors, DOD; Pensacola Chapter, Pensacola, Florida.

Oct. 18, 68, Radm R. L. Townsend, USN, Military Affairs Committee Luncheon, Chamber of Commerce, Houston, Texas.

Oct. 21, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, National Contract Management Association, Dallas, Texas.

Oct. 21, 68, Radm L. B. McCuddin, USN, Joint "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council and Kiwanis Club, Oakland, California.

Oct. 21, 68, Adm E. P. Holmes, USN, Joint "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council and Kiwanis Club, Richmond, Virginia.

Oct. 22, 68, Radm G. R. Muse, USN, "Navy Day", Navy League Council, Sioux Falls, South Dakota.

Oct. 22, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, Annapolis, Maryland.

Oct. 23, 68, Radm C. A. Karaberis, USN, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Rotary Club, Long Beach, California.

Oct. 23, 68, Vadm A. McB. Jackson, USN, "Navy Day", Navy League Council, Bridgeport, Conn.

Oct. 23, 68, Radm R. J. Stroh, USN, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Rotary Club, Jacksonville, Florida.

Oct. 23, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, Harrisburg, Pennslvania.

Oct. 23, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council, Willow Grove, NAS, Pa.

Oct. 23, 68, Radm J. C. Dempsey, USN, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Williamsburg Council of Navy League, Yorktown, Virginia.

Oct. 23, 68, Radm E. P. Aurand, USN, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, Houston, Texas.

Oct. 24, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, Hampton Roads, Virginia.

Oct. 24, 68, Radm W. C. Hushing, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Portsmouth, N.H.

Oct. 24, 68, Lgen V. H. Krulak, USMC, (ret) "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council, Lemoore, California.

Oct. 24, 68, Lgen V. H. Krulak, USMC, (ret) "Navy Day" Dinner, Kings County Council of Navy League, Hanford, California.

Oct. 24, 68, Vadm J. V. Smith, USN, "Navy Day" Banquet, Navy League Council, Denver, Colorado.

Oct. 24, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Baltimore, Maryland.

Oct. 24, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, Baltimore, Maryland.

Oct. 24, 68, Vadm W. I. Martin, USN, "Navy Day", Navy League Council, St. Louis, Missouri.

Oct. 25, 68, Gen L. F. Chapman, USMC, "Navy Day", Luncheon Navy, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Oct. 25, 68, Radm G. R. Muse, USN, Joint "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council and Rotary Club, Phoenix, Arizona.

Oct. 25, 68, Radm H. J. Kossler, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Orlando, Florida.

Oct. 25, 68, Lgen V. H. Krulak, USMC (ret), "Navy Day" Navy League Council, San Francisco, California.

Oct 25, 68, Hon R. S. Driver, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Detroit, Michigan.

Oct 25, 68, Radm G. Cassell, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Dallas, Texas.

Oct 25, 68, Vadm W. I. Martin, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Chicago, Illinois.

Oct 25–27, 68, Hon B. J. Shillito, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Dayton, Ohio.

Oct 26, 68, Hon. P. R. Ignatius, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, McAlester, Oklahoma.

Oct 26, 68, Vadm B. M. Strean, USN, "Navy Day" Banquet and Ball, Navy League Council, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

Oct 26, 68, Adm W. F. A. Wendt, USN, "Navy Day" Dinner and Dance, Navy League Council, London, England.

Oct 26, 68, Radm R. J. Brush, USN, "Navy Day" Luncheon, Navy League Council, Hollywood, Florida.

Oct 26, 68, Radm R. W. McNitt, USN, "Navy Day" Dinner and Ball, Navy League Council, Perth Amboy, N.J.

Oct 26, 68, Mgen C. Duchein, USMCR, "Navy Day" Jersey Shore Council of Navy League, Seaside Park, N.J.

Oct 27, 68, Radm H. H. Ffeffler, SC, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Aurora, Illinois.

Oct 28, 68, Hon C. F. Baird, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, San Diego, California.

Oct 28, 68, Radm H. L. Miller, USN, "Navy Day" Navy League Council, Trenton, N.J.

Oct 28, 68, Radm F. Massey, USN, "Navy Day" Dinner, Casco Bay Council of Navy League, Brunswick, Maine.

Oct 29, 68, Hon R. A. Frosch, "Navy Day" Dinner, Navy League Council, New Brunswick, N.J.

Oct. 30, 68, Radm H. J. Kossler, USN, "Navy Day", Military Order of World Wars, Savannah, Georgia.

Oct. 30, 68, Radm H. A. Renken, USN, "Navy Day", Navy League Council, Lincoln, Nebraska.

Oct. 30, 68, Adm E. P. Holmes, USN, "Navy Day", Luncheon and Dinner, Boston, Mass.

Nov. 2, 68, Adm E. P. Holmes, USN, Forrestal Trophy Presentation, Greenville, South Carolina.

Nov. 2, 68, Radm T. B. Owen, USN, "Engineers Day", University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.

Nov. 2, 68, Radm F. E. Brush, USN, "Navy Day", Ceremony, Hollywood, Florida.

Nov. 4, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Armed Forces Audio-Visual Conference, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 4, 68, Radm M. W. Woods, USN, American Ordnance Association, Cumberland, Maryland.

Nov. 4, 68, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Officers' Conference, Pensacola Florida.

Nov. 6, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Foreign Service Institute, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 6, 68, Radm G. E. Moore, SC, USN, Supply Officers' Conference, San Diego, California.

Nov. 10, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, Government Procurement Relations, Electronics Industry Association, Key Biscayne, Florida.

Nov. 7, 68, Gen. L. F. Chapman, Jr., USMC, Marine Officers' Overseas Wives Club, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 7, 68, Vadm T. F. Caldwell, USN, Veterans' Day Ceremony, Sacramento, California.

Nov. 11, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Veterans' Day Luncheon and Ceremony, Birmingham, Alabama.

Nov. 11, 68, Radm T. J. Walker, III, USN, Veterans' Day Ceremony, Daytona Beach, Florida.

Nov. 11, 68, Radm W. M. Enger, CEC, USN, Veterans' Day Ceremony, Gulfport, Mississippi.

Nov. 11, 68, Radm J. W. Kelly, CHC, USN, Veterans' Day Ceremony, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Nov. 11, 68, Lgen L. W. Walt, USMC, Vietnam Veterans' Appreciation Banquet, Lawrence, Texas.

Nov. 12, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers, St. Louis, Missouri.

Nov. 12, 68, Radm G. E. Moore, SC, USN, Supply Officers' Conference, Long Beach, California.

Nov. 14, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, Federal Government Accounting Association, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 14, 68, Bgen J. R. Chasson, USMC, Retired Officers' Association, Clearwater, Florida.

Nov. 14, 68, Radm G. E. Moore, SC, USN, Supply Officers' Conference, Oakland, California.

Nov. 16, 68, Radm G. R. Muse, USN, Naval Reserve Presentation, Winfield Trophy, San Diego, California.

Nov. 16, 68, Radm E. J. Zimmermann, USNR, Naval Reserve Presentation, Halsey Trophy, Huntsville, Alabama.

Nov. 18, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, 6th Inter-American Naval Conference, Lima, Peru.

Nov. 18, 68, Radm. G. E. Moore, SC, USN, Supply Officers' Conference, Bremerton, Washington.

Nov. 19, 68, Adm I. J. Galantin, USN, Training Device Industry Conference, Orlando, Florida.

Nov. 19, 68, Vadm A. F. Schade, USN, Naval Reserve Presentation, Nimitz Trophy, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Nov. 19, 68, Radm O. D. Waters, Jr., USN, Sales Executive Club, New York, New York.

Nov. 21, 68, Hon. C. A. Bowsher, American Society of Military Comptrollers, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 21, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, National Contract Management Association, Baltimore, Maryland.

Nov. 21, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Propeller Club, Washington, D.C.

Nov. 21, 68, Radm. L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Council, Altoona, Pa.

Nov. 22, 68, Radm. H. J. Trum, III, USN, Idaho State Eagle Scout Honor Ceremony, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

Nov. 23, 68, Radm. E. J. Zimmermann, USNR, Naval Reserve Presentation, J. T. Manning Trophy, Tucson, Arizona.

Nov. 26, 68, Hon. B. J. Shillito, Graduation Address, Supply Corps School, Athens, Georgia.

Nov. 27, 68, Radm. B. W. Sarver, USN, Commissioning USS *Concord*, Long Beach, California.

Nov. 30, 68, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Recruit Graduation Class, Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

Dec. 6, 68, Radm. R. L. Townsend, USN, Navy League Luncheon, Rochester, New York.

Dec. 6, 68, Radm. W. L. Small, Jr., USN, Commissioning USS *Gunard*, Vallejo, California.

Dec. 7, 68, Radm. G. R. Larocque, USN, Pearl Harbor Survivors Association, Toledo, Ohio.

Dec. 7, 68, Hon. C. W. Bowsher, Launching USS *Badger*, San Pedro, California.

Dec. 7, 68, Hon. C. F. Baird, Launching USS *Finback*, Newport News, Virginia.

Dec. 7, 68, Radm. E. E. Christensen, USN, Pearl Harbor Survivors' Association, Memphis, Tennessee.

Dec. 10, 68, Radm T. B. Owen, USN, Naval Academy Alumni Association, Boston, Mass.

Dec 11, 68, Adm E. P. Holmes, USN, Naval Reserve Presentation, Forrestal Trophy, Greenville, South Carolina.

Dec 12, 68, Hon. P. R. Ignatius, Calvin Bullock, Forum, New York, New York.

Dec. 13, 68, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Southwest Commandery, Naval Order of U. S., Palm Springs, Calif.

Dec 14, 68, Vadm L. C. Heinz, USN, Commissioning USS *Charleston*, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Dec 14, 68, Radm J. M. James, USN, Annual Inspection, Naval Air Reserves, Memphis, Tennessee.

Dec 18, 68, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Destroyer Squadron Commander's and C. O.'s Meeting, Norfolk, Virginia.

Dec 19, 68, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Corps School Meeting, Athens, Georgia.

Jan 4, 69, Radm R. A. Macpherson, Launching USS *W. S. Sims*, Westwego, Louisiana.

Jan 6, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Meeting, Atlanta, Georgia.

Jan 8, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, SECNAV Guest Cruise Fellowship, New York, New York.

Jan 11, 69, Vadm B. M. Strean, USN, Wright Day, Greater Kansas City Aero Club, Kansas City, Missouri.

Jan 13, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Corps Conference, Hawaii.

Jan 14, 69 Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Navy League Dinner, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

Jan 15, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Industrial College of Armed Forces/National War College, Washington, D.C.

Jan. 16, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League and International Relations Group Meeting, Chicago, Illinois.

Jan. 17, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Corps Conference, Viet Nam.

Jan. 17, 69, Radm T. D. Davies, USN, Naval Academy Alumni Association, Hartford, Conn.

Jan. 17, 69, Radm J. T. Burke, Jr., USN, Military Affairs Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Houston, Texas.

Jan. 18, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Santa Fe Trail Chapter, Naval Reserve Association, Kansas City, Missouri.

Jan. 22, 69, Radm K. L. Veth, USN, Tri-Cities Navy League Council, Charter Ceremonies, Lancaster, Ohio.

Jan. 25, 69, Hon R. A. Frosch, Launching NR–1, Groton, Conn.

Jan. 25, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Illinois.

Jan. 25, 69, Radm A. R. Gralla, USN, 12th Annual Quality Control Conference, Pomona, California.

Jan. 26, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Conference, Subic Bay, Philippines.

Jan. 28, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Command and Staff College, Ft. Leavenworth, Kansas.

Jan. 29, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN, Supply Conference, Okinawa.

Jan. 31, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC, USN Supply Conference, Okinawa, Hawaii.

Feb. 2, 69, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC USN, Supply Conference, Japan.

Feb. 4, 69, Adm I. J. Galantin, USN, Naval Material Command Wives Club, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 4, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Naval Aviation Shore/Field Activities Conference, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 4, 69, Radm. G. E. Moore, II, SC, USN, Naval War College/Naval Supply Center, Newport, Rhode Island.

Feb. 4, 69, Radm. E. E. Christensen, USN, Lions Club Luncheon, Louisville, Kentucky.

Feb. 5, 69, Radm. G. E. Moore, II, SC, USN, Boston Navy Yard, Boston, Mass.

Feb. 8, 69, Radm. P. B. Armstrong, USN, National Security Forum, American Legion Auxiliary, Durham, Conn.

Feb. 10, 69, Hon. C. A. Bowsher, Institute of Internal Auditors, Philadelphia, Pa.

Feb. 13, 69, Radm. R. M. Isaman, USN, National Academy of Sciences; USNR Research Company 5–8, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 13, 69, Radm. O. D. Waters, Jr., USN, Department of State, Diplomatic and Counsular Officers, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 17, 69, Adm. B. A. Clarey, USN, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

Feb. 22, 69, Radm. F. T. Norris, MC, USN, Shriner's Dinner, Asheville, North Carolina.

Feb. 22, 69, Radm. J. C. Wylie, USN, Algonquin Club, Boston, Mass.

Feb. 22, 69, Radm. J. B. Osborn, USN, Commissioning USS ASPRO, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

Feb. 23, 69, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Military Ball, Dallas, Texas.

Feb. 24, 69, Radm. O. D. Waters, USN, American Management Association, New York, New York.

Feb. 24, 69, Radm. J. L. Holloway, USN, Air University, Navy Week, Maxwell AFB, Alabama.

Feb. 24, 69, Radm. A. R. Gralla, USN, American Ordnance Association, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 25, 69, Hon. C. A. Bowsher, George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 25, 69, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Navy League Seapower Symposium, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 25, 69, Radm H. J. Trum, III, USN, Kiwanis Club Luncheon, Seattle, Washington.

Feb. 26, 69, Adm I. J. Galantin, USN, Navy League Seapower Symposium, Washington, D.C.

Feb. 6, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, NACAL Art Presentation, Los Angeles, California.

Feb. 28, 69, Radm O. D. Waters, USN, Commonwealth Club of California, San Francisco, California.

Mar. 1, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Navy/Marine Corps Council, Washington, D.C.

Mar. 3, 69, Adm B. A. Clarey, USN, VFW "Voice of Democracy" Conference, Washington, D.C.

Mar. 13, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, American League Security, Washington, D.C.

Mar. 15, 69, Mgen N. K. Anderson, Commissioning USS ANCHORAGE, Portsmouth, Virginia.

Mar. 17, 69, Adm I. J. Galatin, USN, Coast Research Symposium, Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Mar. 18, 69, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Virginia.

Mar. 20, 69, Radm E. E. Christensen, USN, Navy League Council, Glynco, Georgia.

Mar. 21, 69, Adm. T. H. Moorer, USN, Naval Academy Alumni, New York, New York.

Mar. 24, 69, Radm W. F. Schlech, USN, Tulane University Institute of Foreign Transportation and Port Operations, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Mar. 25, 69, Hon. J. H. Chafee, Freedom Seminar, San Diego, California.

Mar. 27, 69, Radm H. J. Kossler, USN, Navy League Council, Columbus, South Carolina.

Mar. 27, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Aviation Schools Command, Pensacola, Florida.

Mar. 28, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Dinner, Pensacola, Florida.

Mar. 28, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Graduation Class, NAS, Pensacola, Pensacola, Florida.

Apr. 2, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Luncheon, Altoona, Pennsylvania.

Apr. 12, 69, Hon. F. Sanders, Launching USS HAWKBILL, Vallejo, California.

Apr. 16, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Luncheon, Ft. Lauderdale, Florida.

Apr. 18, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Southeast Florida Rotarians District Conference, Palm Beach, Florida.

Apr. 25, 69, Radm S. H. Kinney, USN, New York Yacht Club, New York, New York.

Apr. 25, 69, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Graduation Class, Naval Training Center, Orlando, Florida.

May 2, 69, Hon. C. A. Bowsher, Launching USS RATHBURNE, Seattle, Washington.

May 3, 69, Radm N. M. Harnish, Launching USS PATTERSON, Westwego, Louisiana.

May 3, 69, Radm J. L. Holloway, III, USN, U.S. Naval Academy Alumni, San Francisco, California.

May 8, 69, Radm O. D. Waters, Jr., USN, Conference of Southwestern Foundations, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

May 15–16, 69, Hon. J. D. Hittle, Armed Forces Day, Vallejo, California.

May 16, 69, Vadm F. J. Blouin, USN, Armed Forces Day Luncheon, Los Angeles, California.

May 16, 69, Vadm B. M. Strean, USN, Armed Forces Day, Corpus Christi, Texas.

May 16, 69, Radm L. H. Sell, USN, Armed Forces Day Luncheon, Knoxville, Tennessee.

May 16, 69, Radm D. W. Cooper, USN, Naval Reserve Company, Weekly Meeting, Washington, D.C.

May 16, 69, Radm T. R. Weschler, USN, Armed Forces Day, Scranton, Pennsylvania.

May 16, 69, Radm T. R. Weschler, USN, Navy League Dinner, Reading, Pennsylvania.

May 16–17, 1969, Radm H. V. Bird, USN, Armed Forces Day, McAlester, Oklahoma.

May 17, 1969, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Armed Forces Day Dinner, Louisville, Kentucky.

May 17, 1969, Adm I. J. Galantin, Launching USS Flying Fish, Groton, Conn.

May 17, 1969, Vadm L. C. Heinz, USN, Armed Forces Day, Virginia Beach, Virginia.

May 23–24, 1969, Radm B. H. Bieri, Jr., SC USN, Navy Exchange Service Center, San Diego, California.

May 24, 1969, Gen L. Chapman, Launching USS Inchon, Pascagoula, Mississippi.

May 24, 1969, Radm G. R. Larocque, USN, Navy League Council, Miami, Florida.

May 24, 1969, Radm R. R. Crutchfield, USN, Navy League Meeting, Crane, Indiana.

May 24, 1969, Radm F. B. Voris, MC, USN, Navy League Council, Miami, Florida.

May 26, 1969, Vadm F. J. Blouin, USN, USS Massachusetts, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Fall River, Mass.

May 26, 1969, Radm L. J. O'Brien, Jr., USN, Naval Reserve Company Weekly Meeting, Washington, D.C.

May 27, 1969, Adm T. H. Moorer, USN, Union Club, Philadelphia, Pa.

May 29, 1969, Radm C. E. Bell, USN, USO Dinner, Dallas, Texas.

May 30, 1969, Hon J. D. Hittle, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Paris, France.

May 30, 1969, Radm L. B. McDonald, USN, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

May 30, 1969, Radm D. H. Bagley, USN, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Portland, Oregon.

May 30, 1969, Radm J. C. Donaldson, Jr., USN, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Washington, D.C.

May 30, 1969, Radm F. J. Harlfinger, II, USN, Centennial Day, Nassau, New York.

May 30, 1969, Radm G. R. Muse, USN, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Fort Omaha, Nebraska.

May 30, 1969, Radm H. Ewart, DC, USNR–R, Memorial Day Ceremonies, Dearborn, Michigan.

June 12, 1969, Radm J. Osborne, USN, Flag Day, Kiwanis, Nashville, Tennessee.

June 13, 1969, Adm T. H. Moorer, Commissioning USS Bergall, Groton, Conn.

June 14, 1969, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Navy League Council, Wichita, Kansas.

June 17, 1969, Radm L. R. Geis, USN, Reserve Flag Officers, Washington, D.C.

June 21, 1969, Vadm T. F. Caldwell, USN, Military Ball, Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Lastly:

Publication of a monthly magazine, "Direction", for Navy public affairs officers, and periodic publication of three items for Navy ghost writers and speakers—"Navy Speakers Guide", "Outstanding Navy Speeches", and "Quotable Navy Quotes."

The list could go on but I wish to discuss in more detail two programs which, I think, illustrate the pervasiveness of the Navy's efforts to win friends and influence in the news media and the public. Twice a year the Navy invites a group of newsmen to spend a few days aboard ship, watching their Navy in action. One of the responsibilities assigned to the 31 Naval Reserve Public Affairs companies, according to an instruction issued last year by the Secretary of the Navy, is to "Nominate top media executives for two yearly trips to Hawaii (15 per trip) on an aircraft carrier and return via Navy air to the West Coast." The manner of selecting the local newsmen was made plain in this item from the annual public affairs plan for the Sioux City, Iowa, Reserve company which called for: Contact with media personnel and selection of those most closely cooperating." "Cooperating" obviously means thumping the Navy's tub. Last year the Navy Secretary's instructions to local Reserve public affairs companies told them:

If the news is devoid of Navy activity, call the media and ask the simple question, "Where is the Navy news today?"

But the news media were not alone in receiving the Navy's favors. In the last 2 years, 188 VIP's from throughout the country have enjoyed the Navy's hospitality on 13 cruises, most of them destined for Hawaii. The occupations listed for the guests ranged from sheep rancher, to steel magnate, to labor leader. One guest, Bertrand Harding, then director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, apparently liked his September 1968 trip to Hawaii on the U.S.S. *Coral Sea* so much he went back again in March of this year aboard another aircraft carrier. I think it would be safe to assume that the guests received a thorough exposure to the Navy's power potential—and requirements—en route to and at Pearl Harbor under the most favorable circumstances.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to continue for an additional 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in a somewhat similar public relations category, the Navy each year invites a varied list of civilians to attend a global strategy discussion at the Naval War College. Again, as in the case of news media and VIP cruises, Naval Reserve Public Affairs companies are expected to nominate for invitation "outstanding leaders of the area." The list for the 1968 meeting is a varied one, ranging from the board chairman of Washington's Woodward and Lothrop department store to the president of the Defense Department-financed Hudson Institute. But the flavor of the invitation list is distinctly that of a board meeting of the military-industrial complex. Some of the defense contractors represented were: Raytheon, Litton Industries, Curtis-Wright, North American Rockwell, Sikorsky, Lockheed, Bendix, Sperry Rand, General Electric, Aerojet-General Western Electric, Martin Marietta, and so on. Thus, I imagine that the Navy War College's message on the importance of seapower falls on somewhat sympathetic ears.

I ask unanimous consent that the lists of guests of the Navy and participants in the global strategy discussion be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXHIBIT IV

LISTS OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY CRUISE GUESTS (MEDIA)

Enclosed are lists of civilian news media representatives who have participated in a Navy cruise since 1967. These cruises for media representatives are administered in the same fashion as the Secretary of the Navy Guest Cruise Program at no additional cost to the government. Guests provide their own transportation to the port of embarkation and pay for all meals and incidentals during the afloat and ashore phases of the cruise.

GUEST LIST FOR U.S.S. NEW JERSEY, SEPTEMBER 5–9, 1968

Mr. Jeremy Dole, Senior Editor, Readers Digest, Pleasantville, New York.

Mr. William Grayson, Executive Vice President, Johnson Publishing Co. (Ebony, Jet), New York, New York.

Mr. John P. McGoff, President, PANAX Corp., East Lansing, Michigan.

Mr. Cruise Palmer, Managing Editor, Kansas City Star, Kansas City, Missouri.

Mr. Maurice Webster, Vice President (Development), Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, New York.

Mr. Roland Dopson, Assistant Managing Editor, Miami Herald, Miami, Florida.

Mr. John McCambridge, Vice President, The Minneapolis Star & Tribune Co., Minneapolis, Minnesota.

Mr. Bruce Myers, Managing Editor, The Corvallis Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oregon.

Mr. Thomas H. Thompson, Editor, Amarillo Globe-Times, Amarillo, Texas.

GUEST LIST FOR MEDIA CRUISE TO PEARL ONBOARD ENTERPRISE, JANUARY 3–10, 1968

A. L. Alford, Jr., General Manager, Lewiston Morning Tribune, P.O. Box 602, Lewiston, Idaho 83501.

Michael Dann, Senior Vice President, Programs, CBS Network Division, Columbia Broadcasting Systems, Inc., 51 West 52nd Street, New York, New York 10019.

William Dwight, President, Holyoke Transcript, Telegram Publishing Company, 180 High Street, Holyoke, Massachusetts 01040.

Harry Hoth, President, Pikes Peak Broadcasting Company, 399 South Eighth Street, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80901.

Henry B. Jameson, Publisher, Abilene Reflector-Chronicle, P.O. Box 238, Abilene, Kansas 67410.

Robert Lemon, Regional Vice President, NBC, Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Illinois 60654.

Walter McKinney, General Manager, Hillsboro Argus, P.O. Box 29, Hillsboro, Oregon 97123.

Richard G. Steel, Publisher, Telegram and Gazette, 20 Franklin Street, Worcester, Massachusetts 01608.

George A. Whitney, General Manager, KFMB–TV, 1405 5th Avenue, San Diego, Cal. 9210.

Matt Gople, Copy Editor, Kansas City Star, Kansas City, Missouri 64108.

Carlton Beal, BTA Oil Producers, 104 South Pecos, Midland, Texas 79701.

John C. Dowd, Sr., President, John C. Dowd, Inc. 212 Park Square Bldg., Boston, Massachusetts 02116.

Jack H. Harris, Executive Director, Virginia Beach Sun, P.O. Box 657, Virginia Beach, Virginia 23451.

Robert C. Ingalls, Publisher, Corvallis Gazette-Times, Corvallis, Oregon 97330.

Gerald T. Latham, General Manager, Medford Mail-Tribune, Medford, Oregon 97501.

Varl W. Schoss, Executive Vice President, Desert Sun Publishing Co., 611 South Palm Canyon Drive, Palm Springs, California 92262.

Jackson W. Tarver, President, Atlanta Newspapers Inc., 10 Forsyth Street, Atlanta. Georgia 30303.

CORAL SEA CRUISE FROM ALAMEDA, CALIFORNIA TO PEARL HARBOR, HAWAII ON JULY 23—AUGUST 3, 1967

1. Mr. James Bassett, The Los Angeles Times, Times Mirror Square, Los Angeles, California 90053, 213–625–2345.

2. Mr. Cass Canfield, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Harper & Row Publishers, 49 East 33rd Street, New York, New York 10016 212–889–7500.

3. Mr. Kenneth L. Fox, Associate Editor, Editorial Department, The Kansas City Star, 1729 Green Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64108 816–HA1–1200.

4. Mr. Ian K. Harrower, Program and Production Manager, WWJ–TV, 622 Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Michigan 48226 313–222–2000.

5. Mr. Harry Hill, Assistant Managing Editor, Milwaukee Journal, 333 W. State Street, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 50203 444–271–6000.

6. Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, The Richmond News Leader, 905 G. Street, S.E., Washington, D.C. 20003 202–547–6454.

7. Mr. Thatcher Longstreth, Greater Philadelphia Chamber of Commerce, 121 S. Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107 215–PE5–9320.

8. Mr. Frank Price, Producer, Universal Studio, Universal City, California 91608 213–985–4321.

9. Mr. Lloyd Sigmon, Executive Vice President, Golden West Broadcasters, 5800 Sunset Boulevard, Hollywood, California 90028 213–469–5341.

10. Mr. Richard L. Strout, Christian Science Monitor, 1293 National Press Building, Washington, D.C. 20004 202–RE7–7555.

11. Mr. Bruce Washburn, Program Director, KVOO–TV, 3701 South Peoria Street, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74105 918–RI2–5561.

12. Mr. Warren Wright, Program Manager, WFBM–TV, 1330 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Indiana 46202 317–635–9326.

EXHIBIT V

VIP AND OTHER SPECIAL ORIENTATION CRUISES

FIRST FLEET CRUISE ONBOARD KITTY HAWK, OCTOBER 7–11, 1968

Principals

1. Louis A. Beecherl, Jr., Chairman of the Board & President, Texas Oil and Gas Corp., Dallas, Texas.

2. Charles M. Beeghly, Chairman of the Board, Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

3. William K. Coors, President, Adolph Coors, Co., Golden, Colorado.

4. George S. Craft, Chairman of the Board, Trust Co. of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia.

5. Alexander G. Hardy, Chairman of the Board, Aviation Employees Corp., Bethesda, Maryland.

6. Walton M. Jarman, President, General Shoe Corp., Nashville, Tennessee.

7. Paul F. Lorenz, Vice President (Marketing), Ford Motor Co, Dearborn, Michigan.

8. Lorin L. Moench, Sheep Rancher, Salt Lake City, Utah.

9. John R. Moore, Executive Vice President, North American Aviation, El Segundo, California.

10. James Dennis North, Vice President (Marketing), General Food Corp., White Plains, New York.

11. Mosses J. Newsom, Executive Editor, Afro-American Newspapers, Baltimore, Maryland.

12. Commissioner Kenneth E. Raschke, Commissioner of North Dakota Board of Higher Education, Bismarck, North Dakota.

13. Dr. Marvin Schorr, President, Technical Operations, Inc., Burlington, Massachusetts.

14. Roy Siemiller, President, International Association of Machinists, Des Plains, Illinois.

15. Richard E. Terrell, Vice President (Frigidaire), General Motors Corp., Detroit, Michigan.

PEARL HARBOR CRUISE ONBOARD RANGER, 26 OCT.–1 NOV. 1968

Principals

1. Dr. W. Montague Cobb, M.D., Editor, Journal of the National Medical Association, Washington, D.C.

2. Charles W. Engelhard, Chairman of the Board, Engelhard Minerals & Chemicals Corp., Newark, New Jersey.

3. John D. Gray, President, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Illinois.

4. Walter Haas, Jr., President, Levi Strauss, San Francisco, California.

5. Henry W. Jones, Vice President (Employee & PR), Atlantic Richfield Co., Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

6. Stephen F. Keating, President, Honeywell, Inc., Minneapolis, Minnesota.

7. Harding L. Lawrence, President, Braniff Airways, Inc., Dallas, Texas.

8. Dr. Laurel Loftsgard, President, North Dakota State University, Fargo, North Dakota.

9. Sanford N. McDonnell, President, McDonnell Aircraft Co., St. Louis, Missouri.

10. John B. Naughton, Vice President, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Michigan.

11. Rudolph A. Peterson, President, Bank of America, San Francisco, California.

12. Walter P. Reuther, President, Automobile, Aerospace & Agricultural Implement Workers of America, Detroit, Michigan.

13. George M. Steinbrenner, President, The American Ship Building Co., Lorain, Ohio.

14. George H. Weyerhaeuser, President, Weyerhaeuser Co., Tacoma, Washington.

15. Samuel H. Wolcott, Jr., Director, Big Sandy Co., Boston, Massachusetts.

GUEST LIST FOR JULY 15–19 FIRST FLEET SECRETARY OF THE NAVY CRUISE, 1968

1. Mr. Norman S. Altman, Partner, Krooth and Altman, 1001 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

2. Dr. John S. Atwater, Senior Partner, Internal Medicine Group of Atlanta, Suite 207, Doctors Building, 478 Peachtree St., Atlanta, Georgia 30308.

3. Mr. N. Preston Breed, Senior Vice President, State Street Bank and Trust Company, 225 Franklin Street, Boston, Mass. 02110.

4. Dr. John E. Champion, President, Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida 32306.

5. Mr. David Cochran, Manager, Engine Field Operations, Defense Programs Division, General Electric Company, 777 14th Street N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

6. Dr. William Duhamel, Vice President, Duhamel Broadcast Enterprises, P.O. Box 1752, Rapid City, S.D. 57702.

7. Mr. Frederick Farrar, Chairman of the Board, First National Bank, Pueblo, Colo.

8. Mr. Lamartine G. Hardman, Jr., President, Harmony Grove Mills Inc., Commerce, Georgia 30529.

9. Mr. Vivian T. Kidd, President, Global Moving and Storage Company, 15 South Spokane Street, Seattle, Washington 98134.

10. Mr. A. Ray McChord, Vice President, Texas Instruments Inc., 13500 North Central Expressway, Dallas, Texas 75231.

11. Mr. Cruse W. Moss, Executive Vice President, Kaiser Jeep Company, 940 North Cove Blvd., Toledo, Ohio 43601.

13. Mr. Charles J. Redmon, President, Intercoastal Aircraft Inc., 8167 Perimeter Road, Seattle, Washington 98108.

14. Dr. Jeston T. Tatum, President, Mississippi State Heart Fund, Rush Medical Group, Meridian, Mississippi 39301.

15. Mr. David F. Williams, Methods and Standards Manager, General Telephone and Electronics Service Corp., 730 Third Ave., New York, New York 10017.

COMMANDANT FIRST FLEET SECRETARY OF NAVY GUEST, FEBRUARY 9–14, 1969 IN SAN DIEGO

Mr. Burke D. Adams, Vice President, Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc., 1720 Peachtree Road N.W., Atlanta, Georgia 30309.

Mr. Cameron Argetsinger, Executive Director, Watkins Glen Grand Prix Corp., Watkins Glen, New York, N.Y. 14891.

Mr. John Henry Campbell, President, The Mutual Building and Loan, Association of Las Cruces, 510 South Main. Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001.

Mr. H. Dave Collins, H. D. Collins Gas & Oil Co., 304 Philtower Building, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74103.

Mr. Albert J. Forte, Owner, A. J. Forte Associates, 1816 Jefferson Place N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. Fred Harris, Owner, Nevada Ranch Service, Box 871, Elko, Nevada 89801.

Mr. Frank Hattori, President, Hattori Realty, 1314 South Jackson St., Seattle, Washington 98144.

Mr. Oliver H. Hughes, President, Citizens National Bank and Trust Co., Emporia, Kansas 66801.

Mr. Pierce Lively, Partner, Lively & Rodes (Attorneys at Law), 120 North Third St., Danville, Kentucky 40422.

Mr. Frank R. Stevenson, President, Vermont Marble Company, 61 Main St., Proctor, Vermont 05765.

Mr. Pat Taggart, Publisher & President, Newspapers, Inc., 900 Franklin Ave., Waco, Texas 76703.

FIRST FLEET CRUISE, SEPTEMBER 1969

Dr. Conrad Briner, Professor & Chairman, Graduate Faculty in Education, Claremont Graduate School, Harper 200, Claremont, California 91711.

Mr. Robert S. Davis, President, R. L. Bryan Co., P.O. Box 368, Columbia, South Carolina 29402.

Mr. John C. Holley, Vice President, Director of Sales, Holley Carburetor Co., 11955 East Nine Mile Road, Warren, Michigan 48089.

Mr. Hugh H. Crawford, Executive Secretary, Optimist International, 4494 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri 63108.

Mr. Frank Venner, President, Venner Associates, Inc., 109 West 38th Street, New York, N.Y. 10018.

Dr. Merk Hobson, Chancellor, University of Nebraska, Room 308, Administration Bldg., Lincoln, Nebraska 68500.

Mr. Drew Hartnett, Attorney, Planters Bank Arcade, Salina, Kansas 67410.

Mr. George Nessebrode, Vice President, Southeastern Public Services Corporation, 800 West 49th St., John Hancock Bldg., Kansas City, Mo. 64112.

Mr. Joseph D. MiTigue, General Manager, Northwestern Mutual Life Insurance, 1968 Johnson Drive, Shawnee Mission, Kansas 66205.

Mr. Aton Brabik, Principal Marine Surveyor, 350 West Jackson Bldg., Chicago, Illinois 60606.

Dr. David E. Molyneaux, Pastor, First Presbyterian Church, 746 South Saginaw Street, Flint, Michigan 48502.

Mr. Robert Rhodes, Commissioner, Motor Vehicle Department, Concord, New Hampshire 03301.

Mr. Robert Maitour, Vice President, A. G. Spalding & Brothers, Inc., Meadow Street, Chicoppe, Massachusetts 01013.

LIST OF GUESTS PARTICIPATING IN SECRETARY OF NAVY GUEST CRUISE ABOARD U.S.S. CONSTELLATION TO PEARL HARBOR, MAY 28–JUNE 7, 1969

1. Mr. Neilson Brown, Vice Chairman of the Board, Selective Life Insurance Company, 830 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona.

2. Mr. Randell Cooper, Executive Director, Chicago Central Area Committee, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois.

3. Mr. William Crook, Director, VISTA, 1111 18th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C.

4. Mr. Charles Dolston, President, Delta Air Lines, Atlanta, Georgia.

5. Mr. William Foshay, Senior Partner, Sullivan and Cromwell, New York, N.Y.

6. The Honorable Howard P. Jones, Dean, East-West Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii.

7. Mr. Paul King, Director, Program Developments, CBS Television City, 7800 Beverly Boulevard, Los Angeles, California.

8. Mr. John N. Leedom, President, Wholesale Electronics Supply, Dallas, Texas.

9. Mr. Guy Main, Executive Vice President, Midwest Television, Inc., Champaign, Illinois.

10. Mr. John P. Maloney, Corporate Research Director, The Readers Digest, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

11. Mr. Frederick Moore, Peat, Marwick, Mitchell and Company, Suite 1500, 11 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Illinois.

12. Mr. Clifford M. Roberts, Jr., Vice President, Cargill Company, Cargill Building, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

13. Mr. Guy Stillman, Past President, Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy, 300 West Osborn Road, Phoenix, Arizona.

14. Mr. Arthur W. Vienna, President, California Spring Company, 8401 East Slauson, Pico River, California.

LIST OF GUESTS PARTICIPATING IN SECRETARY OF THE NAVY GUEST CRUISE ABOARD U.S.S. RANGER TO PEARL HARBOR, OCTOBER 31–NOVEMBER 2, 1968

1. Dr. W. Montague Cobb, Editor, Journal of the National Medical Association, 1219 Girard Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20009.

2. Mr. Sam F. Davis, President, Tampa Ship Repair & Drydock Co., P.O. Box 1277, Tampa, Florida 33601.

3. Mr. G. I. Kogelschatz, Vice President, Columbia Ribbon & Carbon MFGR Co., 600 Broadmoor, Blytheville, Arkansas 72315.

4. Mr. John A. Kuneau, Vice President, Grey Advertising, Inc., 777 Third Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

5. Dr. Laurel Loftsgard, President, North Dakota State University, State College Station, Fargo, North Dakota 58102.

7. Mr. R. B. O'Rielly, President, O'Rielly Motor Company, 6100 East Broadway, Tucson, Arizona 85711.

8. Mr. Sherrill A. Parsons, President, Counselors-To-Management, Inc., 843 Mason Street, San Francisco, California 94108.

9. Chief Justice William C. Perry, Supreme Court of Oregon, Supreme Court Building, Salem, Oregon 97310.

10. Mr. Louis A. Petri, 615 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, California 94111.

11. Mr. Gene E. Roark, President, Husky Oil Company, P.O. Box 380, Cody, Wyoming 82414.

12. Dr. William G. Shepherd, Vice President Academics, University of Minnesota, 213 Morrill Hall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455.

13. Mr. Harold Wandesford, Vice President, Title Insurance and Trust Co., 309 South Third, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104.

15. Mr. Samuel H. Wolcott Jr., President, Consolidated Investment Trust, 35 Congress Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.

LIST OF GUESTS PARTICIPATING IN SECNAV GUEST CRUISE ABOARD U.S.S. CORAL SEA TO PEARL HARBOR, SEPTEMBER 11–14, 1968

1. Mr. Harold L. Coons, Advertising Manager, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., 7000 South Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61607.

2. Mr. Joe M. Dealey, President, A. H. Belo Corp, Dallas, Tex. 75222. (Newspaper publishing.)

3. Mr. Jeremy Dole, Senior Editor, The Readers Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y. 10570.

4. Mr. Lewis W. Dymond, Chairman and President, Frontier Airlines, Inc., 5900 East 39th Avenue, Denver, Colorado 80207.

5. Mr. Bertrand M. Harding, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

6. Mr. Frank M. Hunt, Secretary-Treasurer, Hunt Brothers, Inc. Box 631, Lake Wales, Fla. (Citrus fruit producers and shippers).

7. Mr. Brooks J. Keogh, Past President, National Cattlemen's Assn., Keene, North Dakota 58847.

8. Honorable Gerald S. Levin, Presiding Judge, Superior Court, State of California, 1080 Chestnut Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94102.

9. Mr. F. A. Mechling, Executive Vice President, A. L. Mechling Barge Lines, Inc., 51 North DesPlaines Street, Joliet, Ill. 60431.

10. Mr. William G. Mennen, Jr., Executive Vice President, The Mennen Company, Morristown, N.J.

11. Mr. Albert A. Morey, Chairman of the Board, Marsh & McLennan, Inc., 231 S. LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill. 60604.

12. Dr. Prezell R. Robinson, Ed. D, President, St. Augustine's College, Raleigh, N.C. 27610.

13. Mr. Walton B. Sommer, Chairman and President, Keystone Steel & Wire Co., 7000 South Adams Street, Peoria, Ill. 61607.

14. Mr. James W. Steckel, President, Torco Termite & Pest Control 113–115 W. Rich Street, Columbus, Ohio 42315.

15. Mr. Andrew Wick, President, Wick Construction Co., 720 North Street, Seattle, Washington 98103.

16. Mr. Morris B. Zale, Chairman of the Board, Zale Corporation, 512 South Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75202. (Retail jewelers.)

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY GUEST CRUISE U.S.S. "ORISKANY" (CVA–34) APRIL 15–26, 1969

1. Mr. John A. Blum, Senior Vice President, Macy's Inc., Herald Square, New York, N.Y. 10001.

2. Mr. Francis X. Carroll, President, Virginia Iron, Coal & Coke Co., 325 W. Campbell Ave., Roanoke, Virginia 24011.

3. Mr. Carson Cowherd, President, Town & Country Estates, 4601 Madison Avenue, Kansas City, Missouri 64112.

4. Mr. E. Thomas Drennan, President, Sioux City & New Orelans, Barge Lines, Inc., 7745 Carondelet, Clayton, Missouri 63105.

5. Dr. Alfred C. Emery, Provost, University of Utah, 202 Park Building, Salt Lake City, Utah 84112.

6. Mr. John P. Guerin, Jr., Managing Partner, J. P. Guerin & Company, 618 South Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90014.

7. Mr. G. J. Hoselton, Executive Vice President, Metz Baking Company, 1500 U.S. Highway 75, Sioux City, Iowa 51105.

8. Mr. Phillip C. Kidd, Jr., President, First National Bank & Trust Co., 116 S. Peters, Norman, Oklahoma 73069.

9. Dr. Edward Craig Mazique, Past President, National Medical Association, 180 Ninth St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

10. Mr. Stephen G. Moore, Executive Vice President, Howard National Bank & Trust Co., 111 Main S., Burlington, Vermont 05401.

11. Mr. J. W. Morton, Estimator, T. L. James & Co., P.O. Box 0, Ruston, Louisiana 71270.

12. Dr. Joseph A. Norton, Partner, Radiology Associates, Suite 101, 500 South University, Donaghey Building, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201.

13. Rabbi Levi A. Olan, D.D., Temple Emanu El, 850 Hillcrest Ave., Dallas, Texas 75225.

14. Mr. Carl L. Shelton, Owner, Sheltons Jewelers, P.O. Box 387, Lake Wales, Florida 33853.

15. Mr. Edward J. Walsh, Jr., Investments, 318 A. North Euclid Ave., St. Louis, Missouri 63108.

LIST OF GUESTS PARTICIPATING IN SECRETARY OF THE NAVY GUEST CRUISE ABOARD USS "ENTERPRISE" CVA(N)–65 TO PEARL HARBOR, JANUARY 11–15, 1969

1. Mr. Joseph F. Bon Tempo, President, Joseph F. Bon Tempo and Associates, P.O. Box 111, Rochester, Pennsylvania 15074.

2. Mr. Marvin E. Burke, President, Sportcaster Company, 160 S. Jackson Street, Seattle, Washington 98104.

3. Mr. Ben H. Eaton, Executive Vice President, Dean, Witter and Company, 632 S. Spring Street, Los Angeles, California 90014.

4. Dr. Neal H. Ingram, DDS, 520 Stimson Building, Seattle, Washington 98101.

5. Mr. Otis Lamson, President, Lamson Products Company, 1128 Popler Place South, Seattle, Washington 98144.

6. Mr. Edward R. Larson, President, Bob Larson Real Estate, Incorporated, 26 East Haskell Street, Winnemucca, Nevada 98445.

7. Mr. Louis Levy, Executive Assistant, Henry Crown and Company,, 300 W. Washington Street, Chicago, Illinois 60606.

8. LTJG Michael Kasun, Public Affairs Officer, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet.

9. CDR H.E. Padgett, Public Affairs Officer, West Coast.

10. Mr. Jack Paller, Director and Executive Vice President, Monarch Enterprises Corp. 3117 Hopkinson House, Washington Square South, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

11. Mr. Ernest P. Powlesland, President, Better Homes Realty and Investment Company, 10532 Greenwood Avenue North, Seattle, Washington 98133.

12. Mr. Edgar J. Quinn, Publications Supervisor, New York Telephone Company, 140 West Street, New York, New York 10007.

13. Mr. Morris Schwab, Treasurer, D & H Distribution Company, 2525 North 7th Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

14. Mr. Wade Terrell, President Texas Chamber of Commerce, Managers Association, McAllen Chamber of Commerce, McAllen, Texas 78501.

15. Mr. Paul Trousdale, Chairman of the Board, Trousdale Construction Company, 650 N. Sepulveda Boulevard, Los Angeles, California 90049.

LIST OF GUESTS PARTICIPATING IN SECRETARY OF THE NAVY GUEST CRUISE ABOARD U.S.S. BON HOMME RICHARD (CVA–31) TO PEARL HARBOR, MARCH 18–27, 1969

1. Mr. George Cates, 2114 Southwick Dr., Houston, Texas 77055.

2. Mr. John E. Corette, Chairman of the Board, Montana Power Company, 40 East Broadway, Butte, Montana 59701.

3. Mr. Gordon Ellis, President, Fairmount Food Company, 3201 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebraska 68101.

4. Mr. Nelson W. Freeman, President, Tenneco, Inc., Tennessee Building, Houston, Texas 77002.

5. Mr. Nelson H. Futch, Vice President & Promotion, HMH Publishing Company, 919 North Michigan Ave., Chicago, Illinois 60611.

6. Mr. Ben Hill Griffin, Jr., President, Ben Hill Griffin, Inc., P.O. Box 368, Frostproof, Florida 33843.

7. Mr. Bertrand M. Harding, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity, 1200 19th Street N.W., Washington D.C. 20036.

8. Mr. Jerome S. Hardy, Publisher, Life Magazine, Rockefeller Center, New York, New York 10020.

9. Mr. Joseph M. Long, President, Long's Drug Stores, Inc., 5238 Claremont Avenue, Oakland, California 94618.

10. Mr. Douglas W. Love, President, Utah-Idaho Sugar Company, P.O. Box 2010, Salt Lake City, Utah 84110.

11. Donald R. Mallett, PH. D., Vice President, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47906.

12. Mr. Hans Massaquoi, Assistant Managing Editor, Ebony Magazine, 1820 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60616.

13. Mr. John B. Naughton, Vice President, Ford Motor Company, Rotunda And Southfield, Dearborn, Michigan 48124.

14. Alvin Thomas, PH. D., President, Prairie View A&M College, Prairie View, Texas 77445.

15. Mr. John Trottier, Director, North Dakota Turkey Federation, P.O. Box 392, Devils Lake, North Dakota 58301.

ACCEPTANCES FOR RANGER CRUISE TO PEARL, NOVEMBER 4–13, 1967

Mr. James O'Donald, President, First National Bank, Wheeling, West Virginia 26003.

Mr. Edward Aborn, President, TENCO Company (Beverages), Box 15, Linden, New Jersey 07036.

Mr. Charles S. Lowry, President, South Puerto Rico Sugar Company, 5 Hanover Square, New York, New York 10004.

Mr. Charles W. Aiken, President and Founder, Boys Home of the South, Box 1904–226 Pendleton Street, Greenville, South Carolina 29601.

Mr. Gale B. Aydelott, President, Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, 1531 Stout Street, Denver, Colorado 02802.

Mr. William R. Crook, Director, VISTA, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Dr. Ernest E. Sechler, Executive Officer, Firestone Flight Sciences Laboratory, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California 91109.

Mr. Howard Chase, Chairman, Howard Chase Associates (Management Consultant & Pub. Rel. Firm), 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, New York 10013.

Mr. Howard P. Jones, Dean—East-West Center, University of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822.

Mr. George L. Green, Vice President/General Manager, Pullman-Standard (Railway freight & pass. cars & parts), 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Illinois 60604.

Mr. James P. Newell, President, Trailer Train Company (Supplies flat cars for transp. of hwy. trailers), 1819 Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103.

Mr. Valdemar Knudsen, Poipu Ranch Company, 2443 Makiki Heights Drive, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Mr. Trygve S. Vik, Vik Construction Company (Comm. & Industrial Bldg. contractors), 160 Madison Avenue, Eugene, Oregon 97402.

Mr. Walter Hogan, California Blowpipe & Steel Company (Sheet metal & steel fabrication), First and Coley Streets, Escalon, California 95320.

Mr. Fred Bailey, Barfield Industries, Inc. (Military weapons systems), 4730 Encino Avenue, Encino, California 91316.

Mr. William R. Breuner, John Breuner Company (Retail home furnishings), 2201 Broadway, Oakland, California.

Mr. Ned P. Clyde, President, Woodward, Clyde, Sherard & Assoc. (Soil engineers & foundations consultants), 2811 Aeline Street, Oakland, California 94608.

Mr. George S. Hawn (Investment business and Independent oil operator), 200 Hawn Building, Corpus Christi, Texas 78401.

Mr. Anthony J. Labarba, President, American Wine & Importing Company, 2937 South Haskell Avenue, Dallas, Texas 75223.

Mr. Frank S. Canio, President, First National Bank of Woodsboro (Also, managing partner of La Roosa Ranch in Texas), Woodsboro, Texas 78393.

LIST OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY GUEST CRUISE IN U.S.S. "CONSTELLATION" (CVA–64), SAN DIEGO TO PEARL HARBOR, APRIL 29–MAY 8, 1968

Mr. William P. Clements, Jr., President, Southeastern Drilling, Inc., First National Bank Building, Dallas, Texas 75202.

Mr. Richard S. Colley, P.O. Box 2807, Corpus Christi, Texas 78403.

Mr. Henry A. Dudley, McNutt, Dudley and Easterwood Co., Barr Building, Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mr. Neal Gilliatt, Chairman, Interpublic, Inc., 1271 Avenue of the Americas, Rockefeller Center, New York, New York 10020.

Mr. Harold H. Helm, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Chemical Bank New York Trust Company, 277 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10017.

Mr. George P. Jenkins, Chairman, Finance Committee, Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., 1 Madison Avenue, New York, New York 10010.

Mr. Louis F. Laun, President, Celenese Fibers Marketing Co., 522 Fifth Avenue, Manhattan, New York 10036.

Mr. Herman Lemke, President, Lemke and Company, Room 206, 714 Ala Moana Boulevard, Honolulu, Hawaii 96814.

Dr. Herbert D. Longenecker, President, Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana 70118.

Mr. Charles D. Lowry, President and Chief Executive Officer, South Puerto Rico Sugar Company, 5 Hanover Square, New York, New York 10004.

Mr. Ivor D. Sims, Executive Vice President and Director, Bethlehem Steel Corporation, 701 E. Third Street, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 18015.

Mr. Andrew W. Tarkington, President, Continental Oil Company, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020.

Mr. Louis L. Ward, Chairman and President, Russell Stover Candies, Inc., 1221 Baltimore, Kansas City, Missouri 64105.

The Very Reverend Monsignor Vincent Yzermans, Director, Bureau of Information, National Catholic Welfare Conference, 1312 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

EXHIBIT VI

NAVAL WAR COLLEGE, GLOBAL STRATEGY DISCUSSION, 1968, CIVILIAN PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Charles F. Adams, Chm. Raytheon Co., 141 Spring St., Lexington, Mass. 02173.

Prof. James C. Aller, Operations Evaluation GP., Office of the CNO–OPO3EG, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., 20350.

John C. Allred, Ph. D., Vice Pres., Dean of Faculties, Univ. of Houston, Houston, Texas 77004.

Mr. Alton D. Anderson, Pres., Amecom Div., Litton Ind. Inc. 1140 East-West H'wy., Silver Springs, Maryland 20910.

Mr. Manuel R. Angulo, Partner, Curtis, Mallet-Prevost, Colt & Mosle, 63 Wall St., New York, N.Y., 1000.

Mr. John C. Ausland, Dir. Comb. Policy Office of Politico-Military Affairs, Dept. of State, Washington, D.C. 20520.

Radm. R. W. Bates, USN, Ret., 12 Mt. Vernon St., Newport, Rhode Island 02840.

Mr. Carlton Beal, BTA Oil Producers, 104 South Pecos, Midland, Texas 70704.

Louis Berger, Ph.D., Pres. Louis Berger, Inc., 177 Oakwood Ave., East Orange, N.J. 07012.

Mr. T. Roland Berner, Chmn. & Pres., Curtis Wright Corp., 1 Passaic St., Woodridge, New Jersey 07075.

George I. Blankstein, Ph.D., Prof. of Political Science, Northwestern Univ., Evanston, Illinois 60201.

Mr. Thos. E. Blount, Sr. Rep., A&S Group-N. Am. Rockwell Corp. Inter., 11006 Ralston Rd., Rockville, Maryland 20852.

Mr. C. W. Borklund, Pub. Armed Forces Mgmt., 1001 Vermont Ave., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Mr. Herbert Stanton Brown, Jr., Chief of Adv. Plng., Sikorsky Acft. Div. United Acft. Corp., Stratford, Conn. 06497.

Dr. S. H. Browne, Director of Planning, Wash. Area, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., 900 17th St. N.W., Wash. D.C.

Mr. Paul F. Bubendey, Senior VPres, Intl. Chem. Bank, N.Y. Trust Co., 20 Pine St., N.Y., N.Y. 10015.

Dr. H. Busignies, Sr. Vice Pres. & Chief Scientist, Int. Tel & Tel Corp., 320 Park Ave., N.Y., N.Y. 10022.

The Hon. David Chavez, Jr., Chief Justice, Supreme Court of New Mexico, Supreme Court Bldg., Santa Fe, New Mexico 87501.

The Hon. W. E. Chilton, III, Publ., the Charleston Gazette, the State Newspaper, Charleston, W. Va. 25330.

Adm. Joseph J. Clark, USN (Ret), Chmn, Hegeman-Harris Co., Inc., 1 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y. 10020.

Mr. Emilio G. Collado, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York 10020.

Mr. Daniel E. Conway, Pres., American Bakery & Conf. Workers, Intnl. Union, AFL–CIO, 1120 Conn. Ave., Wash. D.C. 20036.

Mr. Ransom M. Cook, Chmn of Bd., Wells Fargo Bank, 464 California St., San Francisco, Calif. 94120.

Mr. Harold Bryan Crosby, Pres., Univ. of West Florida, Pensacola, Florida 32504.

Mr. Wm. M. Crowe, Publisher, Dos Palos Star, P.O. Box 97, Dos Palos, Calif. 93620.

Mr. Howard G. Cushing, the Ledges, Ocean Ave., Newport, R.I. 02840.

William C. Decker, LL.D, Director, Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y. 14830.

Mr. Chas. S. Dewey, Jr., 111 East 59th St., New York, N.Y. 10022.

Mr Henry B Dewey, Partner, Bowditch, Gowetz & Lane, 340 Main St, Worcester, Mass. 01608.

John S. Dickey, LL.D. President, Dartmouth College, Hanover, N.H. 03755.

The Rev. Edward J. Duncan, S.T.D. Dir., Newman Found., Univ. of Ill., 604 East Armory Ave, Champaign, Ill.

Rear Adm. Henry E. Eccles, USN, RET., 101 Washington St., Newport, R.I. 02840.

Mr. Oscar B. Ferebee, Jr., V. Pres., Goodman-Seegar-Hogan Residential Sales Corp., 4139 Granby St., Norfolk, Va. 23509.

Malcolm P. Ferguson, D.SC., c/o *Bendix* Corp., 1104 Fisher Bldg., Detroit, Mich., 48202.

Mr. Walter Fitch, III, 519 Ocean Blvd., Coronado, Calif. 92118.

The Honorable Dulany Foster, Chief Judge, Supreme Ct. Bench, Baltimore City, Court House, Baltimore, Md. 21212.

Mr. Richard B. Foster, Spec. Asst. for Natl. Sec. Res., Stanford Res. Inst., 1000 Connecticut Ave. N.W., Wash., D.C. 20036.

Carl A. Frische, Ph.D., Vice Pres., Sperry Rand Corp., Great Neck, Long Island, N.Y. 11020.

Mr. Robert A. Fuhrman, Vice Pres., Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., P.O. Box 504, Sunnyvale, Calif. 94088.

Philip Gamble, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, Univ. of Mass., Amherst, Mass. 01002.

Mr. Henry Gemmill, Assoc. Ed., Wall Street

Journal, 1015 14th St., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Capt. Leonard F. Genz, USNR, Vice Pres. & Sec., Gen. Foods Corp., White Plains, New York 10605.

Mr. William A. Gillen, Pres., Ins. Workers Intl. Union, AFL–CIO, 1027 12th St., N.W., Washintgon, DC. 20006.

Mr. Henry W. Gottfried, Jr, Mgr., Contract Devel, Clevite Corp., Ordnance Div., 1629 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20006.

Mr. Elmer S. Groo, Vice Pres., IBM World Trade Corp., Subs., Intl. Bus. Mach. Corp. 821 United Nat. Plaza, N.Y. 10017.

Maj. Gen. H. S. Hansell, Jr., USAF-Ret., Consultant, General Electric Co., 777 14th St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Ernest W. Hartung, Ph.D., Pres., Univ. of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho 83844.

Bgen. R. W. Hayward, USMC-Ret., Aerojet-General Corp., 1120 Conn. Ave. N.W., Wash. D.C. 20036

Mr. George H. Hearn, Comm., Federal Maritime Comm., 1321 H St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20573.

Ray L. Heffner, Ph. D., President, Brown Univ., Providence, R.I. 02912.

Mr. Edward Hidalgo, Cahill, Gordon, Sonnett, Reindel & Ohl, 52 Ave. Des Champs, Elysees, Paris, France.

Mr. Wm. P. Hobby, Jr.,, Pres. & Exec. Editor, Houston Post Co., 2410 Polk, Houston, Tex., 77001.

Maj. Gen. Leonard Holland, Adjutant General, State of R.I. Prov. Plantations, 1051 N. Main St., Providence, R.I., 02901.

Mr. Forrest E. Houston, Instr., Lab. M.I.T., 49 Albany St., Cambridge, Mass. 02139.

C. C. Humphreys, Ph. D., Pres. Memphis State Univ., Southern Ave., Memphis, Tenn. 38111.

Mr. G. Carleton Hunt, Pres. Deluxe Lab. Inc., 850 Tenth Ave., New York, N.Y. 10019.

Mr. Delmar Wm. Karger, Prof. & Dean Sch. of Mngt., Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y. 12180.

B. C. Keeney, Ph. D., Chmn. Natl. End. Humanities, 1800 G. St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20506.

The Honorable George F. Kennan, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, N.J. 08540.

Dr. Stephen D. Kertesz, Prof. of Govt. & Intnl. Studies, Univ. of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind. 46556.

Peter King, Ph. D., Deputy & Chief Scientist, Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C. 20390.

Mr. George Kisling, Pres. & Exec. Off. Retail Clerks Union, 1288–265 N. Fresno St., Fresno, California 93701.

Mr. James W. Knowles, Dir. Research, Jt. Ec. Comm., U.S. Congress, U.S. Capitol, Washington, D.C. 20002.

The Hon. Bert T. Kobayashi, Attorney Gen., State of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813.

Mr. John A. Lang, Jr., Admin. Asst. to Sec. of Air Force, Washington, D.C. 20330.

Mr. William B. Lanier, Milt. Editor, Longbeach Indep. Press Telegram, P.O. Box 230, Long Beach, California 90801.

Ernest Warren Lefever, Ph.D., Sr. Fel. For. Pol., Brookings Inst., 1775 Mass. Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. Alvin Lothrop Luttrell, Ch. Bd., Woodward & Lothrop, 11th & F & G Sts. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20013.

Mr. William P. Maddox Ph.D., Consul General Retired, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn, New York 11205.

Mr. Irwin Maier, Pres., The Journal Co., Journal Square, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53201.

Mr. Cecil Dalton May, Cecil D. May Law Offices, 308 Broad St., New Bern, North Carolina 28560.

Mr. W. Clarke S. Mays, Jr., Pres. & Chief Exec. Officer, Mays Mfg. Co., P.O. Box 328, Warwick, Rhode Island 02887.

Mr. S. M. McAshan Jr., Chmn. of Bd., Clayton & Co. Inc., Tennessee Bldg., Houston, Texas 77002.

Mr. Robert McDonald, Pres. Univac Div. Sperry Rand Corp., P.O. Box 8100, Phil., Penn. 19104.

Radm. G. McLintock, USMM, Supt. U.S. Merchant Marine Acdmy., Kings Point, Long Island, New York. 11024.

Radm. States Mead, USNR, Pres. Int. Dept. Head Off., Chase Manhattan Bank, 1 Chase Manhattan Plaza, N.Y., N.Y. 10015.

Mr. M. Budd Mittleman, V. Pres. Dev. Armour Pharm. Co., 401 North Wabash, Chicago, Illinois. 60611.

Mr. H. S. Morgan, Partner, Morgan Stanley & Co., 140 Broadway, New York, New York. 10005.

Mr. Granville A. Morse, Ch. Bd. Industrial Electronics Assoc. Inc., 312 Royal Palm Way, Palm Beach, Florida. 33482.

Mr. John Hallett Mulliken, Jr., Pent. Corp. Time Mag. Wash. Bureau, 1120 Conn. Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. T. J. Murrin, Grp.V.P.A.D.&M. West. Elec. Corp., 3 Gateway Center, Box 2278, Pittsburgh, Penn. 19523.

Mr. C. Aubrey Nicklas, Dir. Military Sales, Eskimo Pie, Div. of Reynolds Metal Co., Box 1536, Richmond, Va. 23212.

Luke, Ralph O. Cone, Ph.D., Grp. Leader Penn Salt Chem. Corp. 900 1st. Ave., King of Prussia, Penn. 19406.

Mr. Patrick J. Ogden, Jr., Partner, Ogden, Coyle & Voltz, 1820 Jefferson Place, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. Edward A. O'Neill, Vice Pres. Ins. C.I.T. Fin. Corp., 650 Madison Ave., New York, New York. 10022.

LCol. P. D. Orcutt, USAFR–Ret, 42 Bowdoin St., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

Mr. Benjamin Parran, Mngp. Adv. Syst. & Req. Operations, General Elec. Co., P.O. Box 1122, Syracuse, New York 13201.

Mr. James R. Patton, Jr., Manag. Part., Patton, Blow-1200 17th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Mr. P. William Perdriau, Group Vice Pres., B. F. Goodrich Co., 500 South Main St., Akron, Ohio 44311.

Mr. Bertram Lucius Perkins, Exec. Vice Pres., Morrison-Knudsen Co., P.O. Box 450, Boise, Idaho 83701.

Reginald H. Phelps, Ph.D., Assoc. Dean, Grad. Sch. Art & Sciences, Harvard Univ., 827 Holyoke Cntr., Cambridge, Mass. 02138.

W. H. Pickering, Ph.D., Dir. Jet Propulsion Lab., 4800 Oak Grove Drive, Pasadena, Calif. 91103.

Rafael Pico., Ph.D., Vice Chmn of Bd., Banco Popular, De Puerto Rico, Box 2703, GPO San Juan, Puerto Rico 00936.

The Hon. John C. Pool, Asst. Prof. Lec. Pol. Sci. Intl. Affairs at G.W. Univ., 20290, N.W. Wash., D.C. 20006.

Mr. Wm. Parsons Porter, II, Sales Admin., G.E. Co., Min. Lamp Div., 219 East 42nd St., New York, New York 10017.

Mr. L. Edgar Prina, Copley News Service, 1629 K St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 2006.

Dr. Edward W. Proctor, Deputy, Directorate for Intell., Central Intelligence Agency, 2430 E. St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20505.

James F. Reagan, Ph.D., Vice Pres.-Missiles-N. Amer. Av. Inc., 4300 East 5th. Ave., Columbus, Ohio 43216.

Mr. John F. Rice, Dir., Mark & Pro. Sup., Bendix Corp., Elec. Div., 11600 Sherman Way, North Hollywood, Calif. 91605.

H. W. Ritchey, Ph.D., Pres., Thiokol Chem. Corp., Bristol, Pennsylvania 19007.

Mr. James S. Rockefeller, Ch. Bd., First Natl. City Bank, 399 Park Ave., New York, N.Y. 10015.

Isadore G. Schaffer, D.D.S., 77 Catherine St., Newport, Rhode Island 02840.

Mr. Herbert H. Schiff, Pres., Shoe Corp. of America, 35 North 4th. St., Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Dr. Edward H. Seymour, Dir. of Adv. Tech., Thiokol Chemical Corp., Bristol, Penn. 19007.

Mr. William Shea, Shea, Gallop, Climenko & Gould, 330 Madison Ave., New York, New York 10017.

Mr. Max Singer, President, Hudson Institute, Quaker Ridge Rd., Croton-on-Hudson, New York 10520.

Mr. Raymond Slaney, Asst. Dir.-Plan. & Cont.-TRW Systems Gp., One Space Park, Redondo Beach, Calif. 90278.

Mr. John Slinkman, Editor, Navy Times, 475 School St. SW., Wash., D.C.

Mr. John J. Slocum, Off. of Policy and Res., USIA, 1675 34th St. NW., Washington, D.C. 20007.

Mr. George E. Smith, 07970, Vice Pres. and Gen. Mgr. Martin Marietta Corp., P.O. Box 5837, Orlando, Florida 32805.

Robert Strausz-Hupe, Ph.D., 01236, Dir. for Pol. Research, Inst., Univ. of Penn. Rm. 102–133, South 36th St., Phila., Pa. 19104.

Mr. Theodore C. Sturtevant, 07685, 101 Indian Ave., Middletown, Rhode Island 02843.

Maurice F. Tauber, Ph.D. 08176, Melvil Dewey, Prof. Sch. of Lib. Sev., Columbia Univ., Broadway and West 116th St., N.Y., N.Y. 10027.

Mr. R. W. Tharrinton, 07191, Vice. Pres. Gen. Mgr. Boeing Co., Vertrol Div. Mail Stop P3101–01, Morton, Penn. 19070.

The Rev. Canon, D. W. Tildesley, St. Michael's Episcopal Church, 399 Hope St., Bristol, R.I. 02809.

Mr. Filo H. Turner, Jr., Pensacola Buggy Works, Intendenica St., Pensacola, Florida 32501.

Mr. F. Hamilton Veach, 07987, West Reg. V. Pres. and Dir., Montgomery Ward & Co., 2825 East 14th St., Oakland, Calif. 94616.

Maj. Gen. C. F. Von Kann, USA-Ret-Vice Pres. Operations and Eng. of America, 1000 Conn. Ave., N.W. Wash., D.C.

Mr. Jones Webb, Webb & Fowler Law Firm, P.O. Box 27, Lawrenceville, Georgia 30245.

Mr. Wm. Hall Wendel, Sr., 14302, Pres. Carborundum Co., P.O. Box 337, Niagara Falls, New York, N.Y.

Mr. Haydon Williams, Ph.D., Pres. The Asia Foundation, 550 Kearney St. 01557, San Francisco, Calif., 94103.

Mr. Claude Witze, Sr. Ed. Air Force & Space Digest, 1750 Penn. Ave. N.W., Wash., D.C. 20006.

Mr. Morris B. Zale, Chmn, Zale Corp., 512 South Akard St., Dallas, Texas 75202.

Mr. William E. Zisch, Vice Chmn. of Bd. Aerojet-Gen. Corp., 9100 East Flair Dr., El Monte, California 91731.

GLOBAL STRATEGY DISCUSSION 1968–69, FLAG OFFICERS

RAdm. Jackson D. Arnold, USN, Vice Chief, Nav. Material, Hqs, Naval Material Command, Navy Dept., Wash., D.C. 20360.

VAdm. F. L. Ashworth, USN, Dep. CINCLANTFLT & Ch. Staff, CINCLANT-CINCLANTFLT-CINCWESLANT, Norfolk, Virginia 23511.

RAdm. Evan P. Aurand, USN, R. Long Range Obj. Grp. OPNav, Navy Dept., Wash., D.C. 20305.

RAdm. Roy S. Benson, USN, Commandant, First Naval Dist., 495 Summer St., Boston, Mass. 02110.

BGen. W. H. Birdsong, Jr., USA, Chief, Joint War Games Agency, Office of the Joint Ch. of Stf., Washington, D.C. 20301.

RAdm. E. E. Christensen, USN, Ch. NavAir-TechTrng, Naval Air Station, Memphis, Tennessee 38115.

MGen. Don Darrow, USAF, Chief of Staff, TAC, Langley AFB, Virginia 23365.

RAdm. Arthur B. Engel, USCG, Supt., USCG Academy, New London, Conn. 06320.

VAdm. Noel A. M. Gayler, USN, Dep. Dir. Joint Strategic Target Planning Staff, Offutt AFB, Nebraska 68113.

BGen. M. J. L. Greene, USA, DepComdt, USA War College, Carlisle Barracks, Penn. 17013.

RAdm. D. H. Guinn, USN, ChNavAir Base Trng, NAS, Pensacola, Florida 32508.

RAdm. P. A. Holmberg, USN, Asst Cmdr for Research & Tech., Naval Air Systems Command, Bailey's Crossroads, Va. 22041.

Vadm A. McB. Jackson, Jr., USN, Vice Chmn, U.S. Delegation, UN, Mil Staff Comm-Comeastseafron, 90 Church St., N.Y., N.Y. 10007.

Radm Means Johnston, Jr., USN, Comcrudesflot 10, FPO New York 09501.

Radm Shelton H. Kinney, USN, Comcrudesflot 11, FPO San Francisco 96601.

Radm Harry C. Mason, USN, Vice Cmdr Navelecsyscom, Bailey's Crossroads, Virginia. 22041.

Radm Forsyth Massey, USN, Cmdr Fleet Air Quonset, NAS, Quonset Point, R.I. 02819.

Radm Douglas C. Plate, USN, Comcrudesflot 2, FPO New York 09501.

Bgen William O. Quirey, USA, Dir. of Studies, Off. of Asst. Vice Chief of Staff, USA, Washington, D.C. 20310.

Lt. Gen. R. K. Rottet, USMC, Dept. Ch. of Staff for Plns & Prog, Hqs. U.S. Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. 20380.

Bgen M. P. Ryan, USMC, Dir Command & Staff College, Marine Corps Dev&Ed Command, Quantico, Virginia 21134.

Radm Ben W. Sarver, USN, Comsernforlant, Norfolk, Virginia 23511.

Radm F. H. Schneider, Jr., USN, Dir Strategic Plans Div Opnav, Navy Dept. Wash., D.C. 20350.

Radm Clyde J. Van Arsdall, Jr., USN, Commcrudesatlflt, Newport, Rhode Island 02840.

Radm J. P. Weinel, USN, Commander, Carrier Division 3, FPO San Francisco 96601.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Each of the armed services maintains a vast inventory of motion pictures for internal training purposes—and for indoctrinating the public on the merits of their particular service. The Navy's catalog of films available for public use lists some 850 subjects—ranging from "Why Vietnam," a historically false, blatant piece of propaganda in support of a discredited policy, to "Hand Dishwashing and General Scullery Practices." Last year, 12 new films, produced at a cost of $294,000, were released to the public. The narrators of some of the films listed are the top stars of television and the movies—Chet Huntley, Henry Fonda, Jack Webb, Glenn Ford, Walter Cronkite, and others.

I ask unanimous consent that the lists of Navy films available to the public be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

EXHIBIT VII

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF INFORMATION,
Washington, D.C., January 14, 1969.

CHINFO INSTRUCTION 5728.2B

From: Chief of Information
To: All Ships and Stations (less Marine Corps field addressees not having Navy personnel attached)
Subject: Navy films cleared for public and television showings; revised listing of
Enclosure: (1) List of films cleared for public and television showings
(2) Synopsis of films of general public interest
(3) List of Naval Districts

1. Purpose. To provide an up-to-date list of Navy films cleared for public and television showings, and to present a list of films considered suitable for general public and television showings. It is the purpose of this Instruction to assist local naval film distribution centers, public affairs offices, and recruiting activities to prepare film catalogues which best suit their individual requirements.

2. Cancellation. This instruction cancels and supersedes CHINFO Instruction 5728.2A of 27 September 1967.

3. Definition of terms and symbols:

a. Public Showings: Film screening before any groups other than audiences solely consisting of U.S. military personnel, U.S. Government employees, or U.S. Government contractors or agents with a need to know.

b. Television Showings: Public service film screenings on television.

c. Navy Film Serial Numbers are used to identify all films distributed within the Navy, regardless of their source. For example, in the serial number MN–1000C:

(1) "M" identifies the film as a motion picture. (An "F" would show that it is a filmagraph, a film made by photographing still pictures, drawings, and paintings; "K" would show that it is a kinescope motion picture.)

(2) "N" indicates the film was produced by the Navy, or under a Navy contract; other source abbreviations include "A" for Army, "C" for commercial, "D" for Department of Defense, "G" for other Government agencies, and "H" for Marine Corps.

(3) "1000" is the sequential number assigned to the film by the Naval Air Systems Command.

(4) "C" indicates that the film is part of a series on the same subject, and is the third film in that series.

4. Special Film Categories:

a. Victory at Sea. This series of 26 half-hour films (MN–7308 A–Z) is *not* cleared for public or television showings because of a special agreement made with the National Broadcasting Company at the time the series was produced. However, NBC has given permission for the Navy to show this series internally and before *school groups only.*

b. Medical Films. Requests for medical films not shown in the enclosures (1) and (2) should be referred to the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery (Code 3166).

c. Training Films. All training films cleared for public showing are included in enclosures (1) and (2).

d. General Interest and Information Films. All Navy information, recruiting, and general interest films cleared for public release are listed in enclosures (1) and (2). Those not cleared for television will have "(No TV)" in the description line.

e. Films of Professional Interest. Films listed with "(Professional use only)" following their descriptions are cleared for showing before professional groups only and are not to be shown to the general public.

5. Instructions for Obtaining Films:

a. Films listed in enclosures (1) and (2) may be obtained on a limited free-loan basis from the nearest Naval district Public Affairs Office (see enclosure (3)).

b. Films cleared for sale may be purchased from the DuArt Film Laboratories, Inc., 245 West 55th Street, New York, New York 10019. Requests should be forwarded to the Chief of Information for approval.

L. R. GEIS.

Distribution: SNDL Parts 1 and 2.
Stocked: Supply and Fiscal Depart. (Code 514.32), Naval Station, Washington, D.C.

LIST OF NAVY FILMS CLEARED FOR PUBLIC RELEASE

MN–42A, The Diesel Engine 28-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–42B, The Diesel Engine—Scavenging and Supercharging Diesel Engines 16-min B&W 1943.

MN–43, The Construction of Diesel Engines 15-min B&W 1942.

MN–44A, Diesel Engine Governors—Part 1—Woodward Governors 12 min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–44B, Diesel Engine Governors—GM series 71—Limiting Speed Mechanical Governors 12-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–45A, Diesel Lubrication and Cooling Systems 9-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–45B, Lubrication of the GM–71 series Engines 12-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–46A, Diesel Engine Fuel Systems 40-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–47, Marine Diesel Engines for Power Boats 16-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–83A, Navigation—The Earth 20-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–83B—Charts 18-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–83C, Navigation—Nautical Astronomy 23-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–83D, Navigation—The Astronomical Triangle—Parts 1 & 2 37-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–83E, Navigation—Time—Parts 1, 2 & 3 57-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–83F, Navigation—Star Identification—16-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–83G, Dead Reckoning, Plotting, and Celestial Lines of Position (2 parts) 40-min B&W (No TV).

MN–83H, Navigation—Piloting (Surface)—Parts 1 & 2 33-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–83J, Navigation—Dead Reckoning (Air) 34-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–83U, Navigation—Night Piloting (Surface) 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–83X, Navigation—The Link Sextant (Air) 17-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–83Y, Navigation (Air)—Relative Movement and Interception 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–83Z, Navigation—Relative Movement—Part 2—Out and In Search—Relative Wind 12-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–105B, Deep Sea Diving—The Diving Dress 32-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–105C, Deep Sea Diving—The Technique of Diving 24-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–119L, Weather and Radar 17-min B&W 1953.

MN–201A, Close Order Drill—The Squad 23-min B&W 1942 (No. TV).

MN–201B, Close Order Drill—The Platoon 26-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–201C, Close Order Drill—The Manual of Arms 28-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–202A, Rules of the Nautical Road—The Halifax Incident 26-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–202B, Rules of the Nautical Road—Introduction—Parts 1 & 2 22-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–202C, Rules of The Nautical Road—Lights, Running & Anchor 17-min Color 1942 (No TV).

MN–202D, Rules of the Nautical Road—"City of Rome" Incident 5-min Color 1942 (No TV).

MN–202E, Rules of the Nautical Road—Towing Lights 8-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202F, Rules of the Nautical Road—Lights—Vessels Being Towed 10-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202G, Rules of the Nautical Road—Special Lights 29-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202I, Rules of the Nautical Road—Visual Day Signals 13-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202J, Rules of the Nautical Road—Whistle Signals for Approaching Steam Vessels 17-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202K, Rules of the Nautical Road—Meeting Steam Vessels 17-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202M, Rules of the Nautical Road—Meeting at Night 20-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202N, Rules of the Nautical Road—Overtaking Situation 15-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202Q, Rules of the Nautical Road—The "Varanger"—"Dora Weems" incident 5-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202P, Rules of the Nautical Road—The "Taurus"—"Gulf Trade" Incident 3-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202Q, Rules of the Nautical Road—Overtaking at Night 15-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202R, Rules of the Nautical Road—Crossing Steam Vessels 15-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202T, Rules of the Nautical Road—The "Svea"—"Newport" Incident 5-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202U, Rules of the Nautical Road—Crossing at Night 19-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–202V, Rules of the Nautical Road—Rules in Fog—Parts 1 & 2 16-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202X, Rules of the Nautical Road—Special Circumstances 14-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202Y, Rules of the Nautical Road—The "Beaver"—"Selja" incident 5-min 1943 B&W (No TV).

MN–202Z, Rules of the Nautical Road—Special Steering and Sailing Rules 14-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–202AA, Aids to Navigation—Lighthouses and Lightships 9-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–202AB, Aids to Navigation—Buoys and Beacons 9-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–202AC, Aids to Navigation—How to use Navigational Aids 7-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–209A, Progressive Maintenance Diesel Propulsion Engine Disassembly of the 8–268A Engine 27-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–209B, Progressive Maintenance Diesel Propulsion Engine Reassembly of the 8–268A Engine 36-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–209C, Progressive Maintenance Diesel Propulsion Engine Bench Work—8–268A Engine 16-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–209D, Progressive Maintenance Diesel Propulsion Engine Bearing Removal and Inspection—8–268A Engine 17-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1053, Treatment of Jaw Fractures 25-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–1145, Abandon Ship 32-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1374, First Impressions 21-min B & W 1942 (No TV).

MN–1511N, Care of the Sick and Injured by Hospital Corpsmen—Lumbar Puncture 13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1511R, Care of the Sick and Injured by Hospital Corpsmen—the N.P. Patient 27-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1511S, Care of the Sick and Injured by Hospital Corpsmen—Surgical Dressings 12-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1511V, Care of the Sick and Injured by Hospital Corpsmen—Enemas 20-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1511W, Care of the Sick and Injured by Hospital Corpsmen—Catheterizing the Male Patient 16-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1512D, Advanced Typing—Duplicating and Manuscript 25-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1540A, Radio Technician Training—Capacitance—Parts 1 & 2 15-min each part B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1540B, Radio Technician Training—Inductance—Parts 1 & 2 18-min each part B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1540C, Radio Technician Training—RCL—Resistance, Capacitance—Parts 1 & 2 15-min part 1—21-min part 2 B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1540E, Radio Technician Training—Radio Shop Techniques 37-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1540I, Radio Technician Training—Oscillators 13-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540K, Radio Technician Training—Standing Waves on Transmission lines 23-min B&W (No TV).

MN–1540M, Radio Technician Training—Rectangular Coordinates 13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1540N, Radio Technician Training—Vectors 12-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540O, Radio Technician Training—Periodic Functions 18-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540P, Radio Technician Training—Tube Tester Operation 9-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1540Q, Radio Technician Training—Signal Generator Operation 9-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540R, Radio Technician Training—Audio Oscillator Operation, 9-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540S, Radio Technician Training—Voltohmmeter Operation, 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1540T, Radio Technician Training—Elementary Electricity—Current and Electromotive Force, 11-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540U, Radio Technician Training—Elementary Electricity—Amperes, Volts, and Ohms, 8-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540V, Radio Technician Training—Elementary Electricity—Series and Parallel Circuits, 7-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–1540W, Radio Technician Training—Synchro Systems—Part 1, 15-min 1944 (No TV).

MN–1540X, Radio Technician Training—Synchro Systems—Part 2, 13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1562C, Take a Letter, Please, 21-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1724A, Skeletal Fixation by the Stader Splint—Fracture of the Tibia, 22-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1724B, Skeletal Fixation by the Stader Splint—Fracture of the Oscalsis, 10-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1730A, Elementary Hydraulics—Part 1—Derivation of Pascal's Law, 16-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1730B, Elementary Hydraulics—Part 2—Derivation of Pascal's Law, 16-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1730C, Elementary Hydraulics—Part 1—Application of Pascal's Law, 12-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1730D, Elementary Hydraulics—Part 2—Application of Pascal's Law, 14-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–1792C, The Gyro Compass—The Gyroscope and Gravitation, 12-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1729E, The Gyro Compass—The Compass System, 16-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1921F, To Live in Darkness, 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN1965, Clinical Malaria, 28-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–1966, Sciatic Pain and the Intervertebral Disk, 34-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2104A, The Cathode Ray Tube—How it Works, 15-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2230B, Neurosurgery—Surgical Management of Spinal Cord Injuries 11-min Color 1946 (No TV).

MN–2230E, Neurosurgery—Facial Neuralgia 13-min Color 1946 (No TV).

MN–2246A, Mechanical Refrigeration—How it Works 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2334A, Shipbuilding Skills—Nomenclature of Ships—Fundamental Lines and Sections 20-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2334B, Shipbuilding Skills—Nomenclature of Ships—Location of Decks and compartments 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2335A, Shipbuilding Skills—Ship's Blueprints—Basic 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2337A, Shipbuilding Skills—Pipefitting Removing a Section of Piping Aboard Ship 13-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2337B, Shipbuilding Skills—Pipefitting Making a Wire Template 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2337C, Shipbuilding Skills—Pipefitting Making a Hot Bend 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2337D, Shipbuilding Skills—Pipefitting and Installing a Section of Pipe Aboard Ship 20-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2338A, Shipbuilding—The Shipfitter—Lifting Templates for a Foundation 23-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2338B, Shipbuilding Skills—The Shipfitter—Simple Foundation Part 1 Layout 28-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2338C, Shipbuilding Skills—The Shipfitter—Simple Foundation Part 2 Duplication and Fabrication 16-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2338D, Shipbuilding Skills—The Shipfitter—Simple Foundation Part 3 Assembly & Installation 23-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2339A, Shipbuilding Skills—Sheet Metal Work—Vaned Elbow Layout and Fabrications 29-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2339B, Shipbuilding Skills—Sheet Metal Work—Watertight Covers—Part 1—Layout and Fabrication 13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2339C, Shipbuilding Skills—Sheet Metal Work—Watertight Covers—Part 2—18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2339D, Shipbuilding Skills—Sheet Metal Work—Transition Piece; Square to Round—Layout & Fabrication 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2340A, Shipbuilding Skills—Rigging—Use and Care of Wire Rope 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2340B, Shipbuilding Skills—Rigging—Use and Care of Fibre Rope 20-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–2340C, Shipbuilding Skills—Rigging—Rigid and Swinging Staging 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2340D, Shipbuilding Skills—Rigging—Slinging Load 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2340G, Shipbuilding Skills—Wire Rope Terminal Connections—Parts 1 & 2 31-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2340H, Shipbuilding Skills—Rigging—Blocks 10-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2341A, Shipbuilding Skills—Stern Launching—Fore Poppets & Internal Shoring Construction 26-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2341B, Shipbuilding Skills—Preparation for Sterm Launching—Fitting & Installing Packing 9-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2341C, Shipbuilding Skills—Preparation for Stern Launching—Ground Ways 21-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–2341D, Shipbuilding Skills—Preparation for Stern Launching—Placing Sliding Ways 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2343B, Shipbuilding Skills—Sailmaking—Hatch canopy—Part 1—Measuring and Drawing 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2343C, Shipbuilding Skills—Sailmaking—Hatch canopy—Part 2—Layout 25-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2343D, Shipbuilding Skills—Sailmaking—Hatch canopy—Part 3—Matching and Finishing Off 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2345A, Shipbuilding Skills—Establishing Construction Lines—Part 1—15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2345B, Shipbuilding Skills—Establishing Construction Lines—Part 2 16-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–2346A, Shipbuilding Skills—The Coppersmith—Flaring and Reducing 18-min B&W 1942 (No TV).

MN–2346B, Shipbuilding Skills—The Coppersmith—Working out Branches from a Line 22-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2348A, Shipbuilding Skills—Outside Machinist—Reciprocating Pump—Opening for Inspection 24-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2348B, Shipbuilding Skills—Outside Machinists—Reconditioning a Cylinder with a Portable Boring Bar 36-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2348C, Shipbuilding Skills—Outside Machinist—Milling a Foundation 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2350A, Shipbuilding Skills—Blacksmith Calculating & Bending Rings & Links 21-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2350B, Shipbuilding Skills—The Blacksmith—Calculating and Forging a Deck Socket Wrench 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2351A, Shipbuilding Skills—Preparation for Stern Launching—DD445 Class 25-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2351B, Shipbuilding Skills—Stern Launching—DD445 Class 20-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2352A, Shipbuilding Skills—Preparation for Docking with Keel & Bilge Blocks 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2352B, Shipbuilding Skills—Docking with Keel & Bilge Blocks 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364A, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Disassembly—Part 1 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364B, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Disassembly—Part 2 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364C, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bearing Disassembly and Inspection 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364D, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bearing Reassembly 11-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2364E, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bench Work—Part 1—Cylinder Head & Piston 20-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2364F, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bench Work—Part 2—Inspection of Piston 10-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2364G, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bench Work—Part 3—Reassembly of Piston 10-min. B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2364H, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bench Work—Part 4—Cylinder Head 11-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2364I, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Bench Work—Part 5—Reassembly of Cylinder Head 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364J, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Engine Reassembly Part 1 15-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364K, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Engine Reassembly Part 2 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364L, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Engine Reassembly Part 3 16-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364M, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Fuel System—Part 1—Injector Block Removal and Disassembly 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364N, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Fuel System—Part 2—Injector Block Reconditioning and Reassembly 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364O, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Fuel System—Part 3—Injector Block Replacement and Timing 13-min M&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364P, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Fuel System—Part 4—Fuel Pump Disassembly 14-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2364Q, Cooper Bessemer Diesel Engine Maintenance—Fuel Pump Reconditioning and Reassembly 23-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449A, Optical Craftsmanship—Introduction to Optics 17-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN2449D, Optical Craftsmanship—Rough Grinding with a Curvature Generator Spherical Surfaces 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449E, Optical Craftsmanship—Rough Grinding—Flat Surfaces 30-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449F, Optical Craftsmanship—Rough Grinding with Vertical Surface Grinder 26-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449G, Optical Craftsmanship—Beveling, Grooving, and Rounding 28-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449K, Optical Craftsmanship—Fine Grinding and Polishing—Flat surfaces 30-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449M, Optical Craftsmanship—Inspection Methods—Part 1 28-min B&W 1944 (No. TV).

MN–2449N, Optical Craftsmanship—Inspection Methods—Part 2 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2449O, Optical Craftsmanship—Production Methods 31-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2477A, Eye Surgery—Treatment for Paresis of the Superior Oblique 7-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–2477B, Eye Surgery—Removal of Intraocular Foreign Bodies 20-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2477C, Eye Surgery—Field Management of Eye Injuries 20-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2505, Mechanical Packing Aboard Ship 30-min B&W 1945 (No TV)

MN–2598A, Diesel Engine Governors—Marquette Governor—Part 1—Basic Hydraulic Governor 17-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2598B, Diesel Engine Governors—Marquette Governor—Part 2—Speed Drops 5-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2598C, Diesel Engine Governors—Marquette Hydraulic Governor—Part 3—BMEP Limiter 10-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2598D, Diesel Engine Governors—Marquette Hydraulic Governor—Part 4—Power Head 5-min B&W 1943 (No TV).

MN–2613, Routine X-Ray Procedures 18-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2617, Life Cycle of Endamoeba Histolytica in Dysenteric and Non-dysenteric Amoebiasis 15-min Color 1943 (No TV).

MN–2621A, Radio Operator Training—The Radio Man Fights 7-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2621B, Radio Operator Training—The Technique of Hand Sending 9-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2621C, Radio Operator Training—Rhythm, Speed and Accuracy in Hand Sending 11-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2621D, Radio Operator Training—Transmission Security 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2651, Physical Fitness for WAVES—Make up from the Neck Down 19-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2652B, Physical Fitness Training—Navy Standard Swimming Tests and Abandoning Ship Drills 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2715A, Early Care of Plastic Surgical Cases—Wounds of the Hands 14-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2715B, Early Care of Plastic Surgical Cases—Wounds of the Face & Jaw 20-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–2722A, L.T.A. History—Balloons 26-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2769A, General Motors Diesel Engine—Unit Injector—Maintenance 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–2769B, General Motors Diesel Engine—Unit Injectors—Disassembly & Reassembly Model 27B 18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3425C, Supervision—Developing Cooperation 15-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3428A, Introduction to Combat Fatigue—Patient's Version 31-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3428B, Introduction to Combat Fatigue—Doctor's Version 31-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3428D, Combat Fatigue—Assignment Home 25-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3428E, Combat Fatigue—Insomnia 19-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3429A, Amputations—Part 1—Guillotine Amputations of the Lower Extremity 12-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3429B, Amputations—Part 2—Revision and Reamputations of Lower Extremity 27-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–3429C, Amputations—Part 3—Upper Extremity 16-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3446, The ABC of G 19-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691A, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Inspection and Preparatory Steps 7-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691B, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Removal of Injection Nozzles, Etc. 5-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691C, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Removal of Pistons 22-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691D, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Removal and Replacement of Main Bearings 23-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN-3691E, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P. Replacement of Pistons 20-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691F, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Replacement of Injection Nozzles, Etc. 6-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691G, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Bench Work—Air Start Check Valve, Cylinder Relief Valve and Indicator Cock 13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691H, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P.—Bench Work—Injection Nozzle 10-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691I, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P. Bench Work—Pistons and Rods 17-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691J, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P. Removal of Cylinder Liner 27-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3691K, Fairbanks Morse Diesel Engine Maintenance—Model 38D8, 1/8 O.P. Replacement of Cylinder Liner 27-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3706A, Distilling Plants—Low Pressure Type (Griscom-Russell)—How it works—Part 1—13-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3706B, Distilling Plants—Low Pressure Type (Griscom-Russell)—How it works—Part 2—18-min B&W 1944 (No TV).

MN–3707A, General Motors 12–278A Diesel Engine—Disassembly 31-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707B, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Bearings 10-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707C, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Part 1—Reassembly 23-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707D, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Part 2—Reassembly—Head—27-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707E, General Motors 16–2278A Diesel Engine—Part 1—Bench Work—12-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707F, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Part 2—Bench Work 20-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707G, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Part 3—Bench Work 12-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3707H, General Motors 16–278A Diesel Engine—Part 4—Bench Work 26-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708A, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Disassembly—Cylinder Head Removal 22-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708B, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Disassembly—Piston and Liner Removal 12-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708C, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Disassembly—Bearings 9-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708D, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Reassembly—Installation of Liner and Piston 23-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708 E, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Reassembly—Installation of Cylinder Head 23-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708 F, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Bench Work—Installation of Cylinder Head 23-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708G, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Bench Work—Reconditioning the Fuel Pump 17-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3708H, Progressive Maintenance on the General Motors 12–567A Diesel Engine—Bench Work—Liner and Piston 20-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–3726B, Medicine in Action—Release No. 2—Typhus in Naples 11-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3726C, Medicine in Action—Release No. 3—Breakbone Fever—"Dengue" 8-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3726D, Medicine in Action—Release No. 4—Soft Tissue Wounds 10-min Color 1944 (No TV).

MN–3726F, Medicine in Action—Release No. 6—Trench Foot 11-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–3726H, Medicine in Action—Release No. 8—Head Injury—Report of a Battle Casualty 10-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–4049, Plague Control 21-min Color 1945.

MN–4330A, Rehabilitation—Voyage to Recovery 30-min Color 1945.

MN–4352C, Immediate Maxillary Anterior Acryclic Fixed Bridge—Variations 5-min Color 1945.

MN–4353P, Flight Safety—Hazards in Ground Operation of Jet Aircraft 5-min Color 1950.

MN–4353R, Flight Safety—Bailing Out 9-min Color 1950.

MN–5028, Asiatic Schistosomiasis, 23-min Color 1946.

MN–5041A, Tsutsugamushi — Prevention 27-min B&W 1945.

MN–5311, Physiology of High Altitude Flying 15-min Color 1948.

MN–5321C, For Which We Stand—To Be Held In Honor 21-min B&W 1951 (No TV).

MN–5321G, For Which We Stand—The Golden Moment 23-min B&W 1954.

MN–5328B, Shipboard Training—Learning By Doing 13-min B&W 1949.

MN–5344A, Descriptive Geometry—Finding the Line of Intersection of Two Solids 22-min B&W 1947.

MN–5348C, Navy Photography in Science 27-min Color 1948.

MN–5348D, Navy Photography in Intelligence 18-min B&W 1948.

MN–5369B, Operative Dentistry—Part 2—Preparation of Cavity 10-min Color 1948.

MN–5369C, Operative Dentistry—Part 3—Matrix 6-min Color 1948.

MN–5369D, Operative Dentistry—Part 4—Amalgam Restoration 12-min Color 1948.

MN–5371, Acrylic Jacket Crown Construction 25-min Color 1948 (No TV).

MN–5383, Fundamentals of Photography—The Basic Camera 15-min B&W 1948 (No TV).

MN–5384, Fundamentals of Photography—Elementary Optics in Photograhpy 18-min B&W 1948 (No TV).

MN–5385, Fundamentals of Photography—Light Sensitive Materials 20-min Color 1948 (No TV).

MN–5386, Fundamentals of Photography—Developing the Negative 20-min B&W 1948 (No TV).

MN–5395B, Jets Aboard—Operation of Jet Aircraft Aboard Carriers 27-min B&W 1951.

MN–5396A, Operation of Jet Aircraft Engines 21-min B&W 1949.

MN–5802, Fleet That Came to Stay 20-min B&W 1944.

MN–6124, Seapower in the Pacific 30-min B&W 1946.

MN–6128A, Plastic Surgery of the Hand 12-min Color 1945 (No TV).

MN–6128B, Plastic and Reconstruction Surgery of the Head 34-min Color 1946 (No TV).

MN–6485, Plastic Repair of a Cheek and Lip 10-min B&W 1946 (No TV).

MN–6613A, Integrated Landing Aids Systems—Part 1 23-min Color 1949 (No TV).

MN–6613B, Integrated Landing Aids—Part 2 26-min Color 1949 (No TV).

MN–6658, The Navy and Science 13-min B&W 1951.

MN–6689A, Navy Tank Cleaning Procedures—Maintenance Tank Cleaning—Butterworth Method 31-min B&W 1950.

MN–6689B, Navy Tank Cleaning Procedures—Conversion from Black Oil to Diesel Fuel—Navy Improved Method 24-min B&W 1950.

MN–6689C, Navy Tank Cleaning Procedures—Conversion from Black Oil to Gasoline—Navy Chemical Method 26-min B&W 1950.

MN–6694, Ground Controlled Approach of Aircraft—Operational Procedures 38-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719A, Building Techniques—Foundations and Concrete 26-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719B, Building Techniques—Framing, Floor Joists, and Walls 25-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719C, Building Techniques—Framing, Rafter Principles, and Common Rafters 15-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719D, Building Techniques—Framing; Hip and Valley Rafters 25-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719E, Building Techniques—Interior and Exterior Trim 12-min B&W 1950.

MN–6719F. Building Techniques—Fundamentals of Stair Layout 11-min B&W 1950.

MN–6720, Complete Dentures—Alginate impressions 15-min Color 1951.

MN–6721, Partial Dentures—Biomechanics 15-min Color 1951.

MN–6722, Complicated Exodontia—Introduction 17-min Color 1951.

MN–6723, Dental First Aid 20-min Color 1952.

MN–6725A, Reserve Fleet Activation—Introduction 20-min B&W 1950.

MN–6732A, Naval Steam Turbines—The Steam Cycle 17-min B&W 1951 (No TV).

MN–6732B, Naval Steam Turbines—How Turbines Work 17-min B&W 1951 (No TV)

MN–6732C, Naval Steam Turbines—Turbine Casualties 18-min B&W 1950 (No TV).

FN–6733, Maintenance and Repair of Steam Condensers—Circulating Water Side 23-min B&W 1952.

FN–6734, Bending Oak Techniques, 17-min B&W 1950.

MN–6742B, Day's Work of a Navigator—At Sea 15-min B&W 1951.

MN–6742C, Day's Work of a Navigator—In Pilot Waters 13-min B&W 1950.

MN–6753A, Training Aids—Selection and Planning 16-min B&W 1950.

MN–6753B, Training Aids—Classroom Utilization 15-min B&W 1950.

MN–6753C, Training Aids—Slides, Large Drawings and Transparencies 17-min B&W 1951.

MN–6754, Safety Precautions for Electronics Personnel—Introduction 15-min B&W 1951.

MN–6755A, Hydrographic Surveying Operations of the Navy—Establishing Primary Survey Control Points 20-min Color 1950.

MN–6755B, Hydrographic Surveying Operations of the Navy—Secondary Survey, Control Points and Hydrographic Developments 20-min Color 1950.

MN–6766, Navy Civil Engineers, 15-min B&W 1951.

MN–6773A, Flight Through Instruments—Basic Instrument Flying 22-min B&W 1951.

MN–6817, Operation Crossroads 26-min Color 1949.

MN–6824, Small Boat Disaster Prevention 20-min B&W 1951.

MN–6833B, Military Oceanography—Occupying on Oceangraphic Station 29-min Color 1950.

MN–6839, African Trypansosomiasis (Sleeping Sickness), 16-min Color 1951.

MN–6841, Seabees Can Do Plus 15-min B&W 1950.

MN–6896, An Object Lesson Fire Prevention 20-min B&W 1950.

MN–6914, Visual Flight Rules 21-min Color 1951.

MN–6915A, High Altitude, High Speed, Flight Problems, Physiological Effects 23-min Color 1952.

MN–6919B, Preventive Psychiatry—Role of the Junior Officer—Part I (Professional Use Only).

MN–6825C, Ground Aids to Air Navigation—Ship to Shore 20-min B&W 1951.

MN–6939, Accident Prevention Aboard Ship Lubrication of Electronic Equipment 8-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

FN–6843A, History of the United States Navy-War of Independence (1775–1783) 21-min Color 1952.

FN–6934B, History of the United States Navy—The Naval Wars with France and Tripoli (1798–1805) 26-min Color 1953.

FN–6943C, History of the United States Navy—The War of 1812 20-min Color 1956.

FN–6943D, History of the United States Navy—World Wide Naval Operations in Peace and War (1815–1860) 23-min Color 1956.

FN–6943EF, History of the United States Navy—The Civil War—Parts 1 & 2 19-min Color 1958.

FN–6943G, History of the United States Navy—Navy Decline, the New Navy and the War with Spain (1865–1893) 20-min Color 1958.

MD–6962CG, History of the Korean War 58-min B&W 1958.

MD–6962CH, Story of the Navy Uniform 19-min B&W 1958.

MD–6962CL, Military Assistance in Civil Disaster 35-min B&W 1958.

MD–6962CB, Code, The 29-min B&W 1959.

MD–6962CV, Old Glory 28-min Color 1960.

MD–6962ET, Why Vietnam? 32-min B&W 1965.

MN–6992C, The Naval Establishment—Bureau of Yards and Docks 23-min B&W 1953.

MN–7283, The Fighting Lady Speaks 10-min B&W 1950.

MN–7285B, Materials Handling Equipment Operation—Gantry Truck and Warehouse Cranes 21-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–7306A, Helicopter Orientation—Introduction to Rotary Wing Flight 20-min B&W 1952.

MN–7306B, Helicopter Orientation—Operation of the Single Main Rotary Helicopter 20-min B&W 1952.

MN–7306C, Helicopter Orientation—The Basic Anatomy of the Helicopter 18-min B&W 1952.

MN–7308A–Z, *This series, listed below, is cleared for showings before school groups but not for general public or TV showings.*

MN–7308A, Victory at Sea—Design for War 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308B, Victory at Sea—The Pacific Boils Over 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308C, Victory at Sea—Sealing the Breach 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308D, Victory at Sea—Midway is East 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308E, Victory at Sea—Mediterranean Mosaic 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308F, Victory at Sea—Guadalcanal 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308G, Victory at Sea—Rings Around Rabaul 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308H, Victory at Sea—Mare Nostrum 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308I, Victory at Sea—Sea and Sand 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308J, Victory at Sea—Beneath the Southern Cross 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308K, Victory at Sea—Magnetic North 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308L, Victory at Sea—The Conquest of Micronesia 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308M, Victory at Sea—Melanesian Nightmare 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308N, Victory at Sea—Roman Renaissance (Sicily, Italy) (Southern France) 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308Q, Victory at Sea—D–Day 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308P, Victory at Sea—Killers & the Kill 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308Q, Victory at Sea—The Turkey Shoot 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308R, Victory at Sea—Two if by Sea 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308S, Victory at Sea—The Battle for Leyte 30-min. B&W 1953.

MN–7308T, Victory at Sea—Return of the Allies 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308U, Victory at Sea—Full Fathom Five 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308V, Victory at Sea—The Fate of Europe 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308W, Victory at Sea—Target Suribachi 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308X, Victory at Sea—The Road to Normandy 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308Y, Victory at Sea—Suicide for Glory 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7308Z, Victory at Sea—Design for Peace 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7314, With the Marines—Chosen to Hungnam 24-min B&W 1951.

MN–7319A, The Uniform Code of Military Justice—The Code and You 24-min B&W 1952.

MN–7319C, The Uniform Code of Military Justice—Summary Court Martial 46-min B&W 1952.

MN–7329, Clergymen in Uniform 12-min Color 1952.

MN–7335, Use of Whole Blood, Blood Plasma and Concentrated Serum Albumin (With Special Reference to Shock) 14-min Color 1952 (No TV).

MN–7336. Icebreaker 14-min B&W 1952.

MN–7337A, Hydrography for Charting—Part 1—Position Fixing 11-min Color 1951.

MN–7337B, Hydrography for Charting—Part 2—Sounding and Dragging 10-min Color 1951.

MN–7340, Equilibration of Occlusion 20-min Color 1952.

MN–7360, Interviewing Principles and Techniques 23-min B&W 1951.

MN–7361, Demonstrations in Perception 25-min B&W 1951.

MN–7370, Navy Relief Society 15-min B&W 1951.

MN–7372, Memorial Day 20-min B&W 1952.

MN–7397B, Maintaining the HUP Helicopter—Rotor Systems and Related Controls 16-min B&W 1952.

MN–7398A, Flight Training—Before you Fly 13-min B&W 1953.

MN–7398B, Flight Training—Takeoffs, Approaches and Landings 14-min B&W 1953.

MN–7398C, Flight Training—Crosswind Approaches, Landings and Takeoffs 8-min B&W 1953.

MN–7398D, Flight Training—Emergencies 9-min B&W 1953.

MN—7398E, Flight Training—Small Fields 10-min B&W 1953.

MN–7398F, Flight Training—Wingovers and Chandelles 12-min B&W 1953.

MN–7398G, Flight Training—The Wingover Roll 10-min B&W 1954.

MN–7398H, Flight Training—The Barrel Roll 9-min B&W 1954.

MN–7398I Flight Training—Fundamentals of Formation Flying 3 and 4 Plane 24-min B&W 1953.

MN–7400, Dear Boss 25-min B&W 1952.

MN–7407A, Marine Gas Turbine Engine—Principles of Operation 18-min Color 1952.

MN–7407B, Marine Gas Turbine Engine—Trouble Shooting 16-min Color 1954.

MN–7407C, Marine Gas Turbine Engine—The Solar T–45 Engine 23-min Color 1960.

MN–7407D, Marine Gas Turbine Engine—The Boeing 502–10C Engine 22-min Color 1960.

MN–7409A, Aerology (Thunderstorms)—Part 1—Formation and Structure of Thunderstorms 15-min B&W 1953.

MN–7409B, Aerology (Thunderstorms)—Part 2—Flight Techniques With Respect to Thunderstorms 15-min B&W 1953.

MN–7410A, Shipboard Helicopter Operations—Landing and Takeoffs at Sea 8-min Color 1954.

MN–7410B, Shipboard Helicopter Operations-Functions 7-min Color 1954.

MN–7411A, Landbased Helicopter Operations—Functions 10-min B&W 1953.

MN–7411B, Landbased Helicopter Operations—Precautions 11-min B&W 1953.

MN–7413, Waves At Work 17-min Color 1953.

MN–7419A, Ships, Men and Ice 18-min Color 1953.

MN–7419B, Operations in Sea-Ice—Identification of Sea-Ice 13-min Color 1953.

MN–7419C, Operations in Sea-Ice—Convoy Operations in Sea-Ice 22-min Color 1954.

MN–7424, Who's Too Old? 15-min B&W 1952.

MN–7437, Armed Forces Information Film No. 41—About Rumors 14-min Color 1953.

MN–7438, Building Construction—Advanced Base Type 20-min B&W 1952.

MN–7439, Cruising the Northern Seas 12-min Color 1953.

MN–7445, Ready for Sea 15-min B&W 1952.

MN–7459A, Command of the Seas—Arctic 15-min Color 1952.

MN–7459B, Command of the Seas—Pacific 15-min Color 1952.

MN–7459C, Command of the Seas—Atlantic 17-min Color 1952.

MN–7459D, Command of the Seas—United States 17-min Color 1952.

MN–7460B, Electronic Functional Modules, 17-min Color 1960.

MN–7461A, Hand Dishwashing and General Scullery Practices 10-min B&W 1953.

MN–7467A, TT–47/UG Teletypewriter—General Principles and Operation 16-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

FN–7467B, TT–47/UG Teletypwriter—Installation and Performance Tests 14-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

FN–7467C, TT–47/UG Teletypewriter—Preventive Maintenance 5-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

FN–7468, Laboratory Technique for Darkfield Microscopy 16-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–7469, Cricothyroidotomy 9-min Color 1953 (No TV).

MN–7470, Penetrating Wounds of the Abdomen 13-min Color 1953 (No TV).

MN–7477, Sucking Wounds of the Chest 14-min Color 1953 (No TV).

MN–7478, Ski Jump II 22-min Color 1953.

MN–7479, Naval Shipyards Serve the Fleet 13-min Color 1953.

MN–7488A, Advance Base Waterfront Construction—Timber Piers 17-min B&W 1953.

MN–7489A, Water Purification—Introduction 10-min Color 1953.

MN–7489B, Water Purification—Diatomite Filter System Installation, Operation and Maintenance 12-min Color 1953.

MN–7489C, Water Purification—Vapor Compression Distillation 14-min Color 1953.

MN–7498A, Industrial Hygiene and Safety—Breathe and Live 18-min Color 1953 (No TV).

MN–7499A, Combat Psychiatry—The Battalion Medical Officer 36-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7499B, Combat Psychiatry—the Division Psychiatrist 29-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7831A, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part I—An Introduction to Hand Tools 10-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831B, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 2—Basic Layout Tools 6-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831C, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 3—Hacksaws 5-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831D, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 4—Files and Filing 5-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831E, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 5—Twist Drills 6-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831F, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 6—Metal Cutting Chisels 4-min B&W 1954.

MN–7831G, Care and Use of Hand Tools—Part 7—Threading Taps and Dies 14-min B&W 1954.

MN–7832A, The Military Sea Transportation Service—Introduction 18-min B&W 1953.

MN–7832B, The Military Sea Transportation Service—Troop Transportation 19-min 1955 B&W.

MN–7832C, The Military Sea Transportation Service—Cabin Passengers 19-min B&W 1955.

MN–7834 Floating Fortress 14-min B&W 1952.

MN–7835A, Lifeboats under Gravity Davits—Launching Boats 25-min B&W 1954.

MN–7835B, Lifeboats under Gravity Davits—Recovering Boats 14-min B&W 1954.

MN–7837, The Engineered Performance Standards Program 16-mm B&W 1953.

MN–7838, Seapower for Freedom 30-min B&W 1953.

MN–7855A, This is the Code—Absence Offenses 10-min B&W 1953.

MN–7855B, This is the Code—Disrespect, Disobedience and Improper Performance of Duty 15-min B&W 1953.

MN–7855C, This is the Code—Conduct before the Enemy 10-min B&W 1953.

MN–7855D, This is the Code—Crimes Against Persons and Property 17-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–7855E, This is the Code—Procedural Articles 15-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–7855F, This is the Code—General Criminal Articles 8-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–7861A, Boiler Repair—Water Side—Introduction 9-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7861B, Boiler Repair—Water Side—Removing Boiler Tubes 10-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7861C, Boiler Repair—Water Side—Replacing Boiler Tubes 7-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7861D, Boiler Repair—Water Side—Closing the Boiler 9-Min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7862A, Boiler Repairs—Fire Side—Building Walls and Floors 13-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7862B, Boiler Repairs—Fire Side—Installing Plastic Fire Brick 7-Min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7862C, Boiler Repairs—Fire Side—Installing Plastic Chrome Ore 5-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7862D, Boiler Repairs—Fire Side—High Temperature Castable Refractories 14-min B&W 1954 (No TV).

MN–7893, Fighter Photo-Eyes of the Fleet 26-min Color 1953.

MN–7894A, Atmospheric Stability and Instability—Existing Temperature Distribution 15-min Color 1953.

MN–7894B, Atmospheric Stability and Instability—Adiabatic Process 13-min Color 1953.

MN–7894C, Atmospheric Stability and Instabilty—Thermal Convection 10-min Color 1953.

MN–7894D, Atmospheric Stability and Instability—Stability and the Weather 8-min Color 1953.

MN–7929A, Naval Medical Research—A Survey—Part I 25-min Color 1955.

MN–7929B, Naval Medical Research—A Survey—Part 2 25-min. Color 1955.

MN–7930, Aseptic Procedure in Oral Surgery 18-min Color 1955 (No TV).

MN–7946, Importance of Military Packaging 8-min B&W 1953.

MN–7969, The Story of Naval Aviation 27-min B&W 1954.

MN–7977A, Carbide Woodworking Tools—Care and Grinding 13-min B&W 1954.

MN–7977B, Carbide Woodworking Tools—How to Use 15-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984C, ABC warfare Defense Ashore-Detection of Contaminated Areas in Biological and Chemical Warfare 13-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984D, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Protective Clothing for Decontamination Personnel 11-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984E, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Biological Warfare Decontamination: Personnel 9-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984F, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Biological Warfare Decontamination: Interiors 6-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984G, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Biological and Chemical Decontamination: Exteriors 13-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984H, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Biological Warfare Decontamination: Personal Equipment 8-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984I, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Chemical Warfare Decontamination: Personnel 13-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984J, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Survey of Disaster 12-min B&W 1955.

MN–7984K, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Rescue Operations; lifting devices, shoring 16-min B&W 1954.

MN–7984L, ABC Warfare Defense Ashore—Rescue Operations; Rigging, Breaching Walls, Tunneling 17-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016A, Basic Electricity—The Electron Theory 5-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016B, Basic Electricity—How Magnets Produce Electricity 3-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016C, Basic Electricity—Current Flow—What it is 3-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016D, Basic Electricity—Electromagnets 2-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016E, Basic Electricity—Basic DC Meter Movement 3-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016F, Basic Electricity—What Causes Current Flow: EMF 3-min B&W 1954.

MN–8016G, Basic Electricity—What Controls Current Flow—Resistance 3-min B&W 1954.

MN–8018A, Basic Electricity—Inductance in AC Circuits 7-min B&W 1959

MN–8018B, Basic Electricity—Capacitance in AC Circuits 5-min B&W 1959.

MN–8018C, Basic Electricity—AC Series Circuits 4-min B&W 1959.

MN–8018D, Basic Electricity—AC Parallel Circuits 5-min B&W 1959.

MN–8050, Functional Teaching in Electricity and Electronics 16-min B&W 1953.

MN–8076A, Crane Operations—Floating Cranes 16-min B&W 1955.

MH–8076B, Crane Operations—Safety Precautions 14-min B&W 1955.

MN–8078, The Seventh Fleet 12-min B&W 1957.

MN–8079, Service to the Fleet 14-min B&W 1955.

MN–8084, Standardization 17-min B&W 1955 (No TV).

MN–8084B, Standardization—Engineering Planning 13-min Color 1959.

MN–8087, USS Forrestal (CVA–59) 21-min B&W 1955.

MN–8091, Waiting on Table at Sea.

MN–8103, Origins of the Motion Picture 20-min B&W 1955.

FN–8112, Public Information Objectives of the Navy 14-min Color 1956.

MN–8131A, Public Works and Public Utilities—Controlled Maintenance 20-min B&W 1956.

MN–8131D, Public Works and Public Utilities—Part IV—Work Improvement in Maintenance 18-min Color 1960.

MN–8131E, Public Works and Public Utilities 20-min Color 1960.

MN–8131F, Public Works and Public Utilities—Painting Structures Ashore 20-min Color 1960.

MN–8131G, Public Works and Public Utilities—Fuel Storage Tank Cleaning 32-min B&W 1960.

FN–8135, History of the U.S. Navy Supply Corps 14-min Color 1955.

MN–8137, HSS Automatic Stabilization Equipment 17-min B&W 1956.

MN–8167A, Wood Preservation—Inspection for Wood Destroying Organisms 19-min Color 1956.

MN–8167B, Wood Preservation—Control of Wood Destroying Organisms 24-min Color 1956.

MN–8167C, Wood Preservation—Effects of Marine Organisms 20-min Color 1959.

MN–8182, First Aid for Bleeding 20-min Color 1957.

MN–8184A, First Aid for Fractures—Introduction 14-min Color 1955.

MN–8184B, First Aid for Fractures—Skull, Spine and Pelvis 10-min Color 1955.

MN–8184C, First Aid for Fractures—The Triangular Arm Splint 6-min Color 1955.

MN–8184D, First Aid for Fractures—The Universal Leg Splint 4-min Color 1956.

MN–8184E, First Aid for Fractures—The Thomas Leg Splint 8-min Color 1956.

MN–1886, First Aid for Heat Stroke and Heat Exhaustion 19-min Color 1957.

MN–8187A, First Aid Handling and Transporting of the Injured-Introduction 13-min B&W 1956.

MN–8187B, First Aid Handling and Transporting of the Injured—Mastering Basic Techniques 26-min B&W 1956.

MN–8187C, First Aid Handling and Transporting of the Injured—Lifelines, Improvised Stretchers and Carriers 12-min B&W 1956.

MN–8188A, First Aid for All Hands—Introduction 12-min B&W 1958 (No TV).

MN–8188B, First Aid for All Hands—Asphyxia 14-min B&W 1958 (No TV).

MN–8188C, First Aid for All Hands—Bleeding 14-min B&W 1956 (No TV).

MN–8188D, First Aid for All Hands—Fractures 24-min B&W 1958 (No TV).

MN–8188E, First Aid for All Hands—Burns 11-min B&W 1958 (No TV).

MN–8188F, First Aid for All Hands—Handling and Transportation 12-min B&W 1958 (No TV).

MN–8209, Conservation Planning for National Security 20-min Color 1956.

MN–8211A, Vital Signs—Part 1—Cardinal Symptoms 19-min B&W 1956.

MN–8211B, Vital Signs—Part 2—Taking Temperature, Pulse and Respiration 20-min B&W 1956.

MN–8211C, Vital Signs—Part 3—Taking Blood Pressure 11-min B&W 1956.

MN–8224, Heart of the Navy 13-min B&W 1956.

MN–8238A, Shipboard Inspection by Medical Department Personnel—Water Supply 21-min B&W 1958.

MN–8238B, Shipboard Inspection by Medical Department Personnel—Living and Working Spaces 20-min B&W 1958.

MN–8238C, Shipboard Inspection by Medical Department Personnel—Food Storage 13-min B&W 1958.

MN–8238D, Shipboard Inspection by Medical Department Personnel—Food Preparation 26-min B&W 1958.

MN–8238E, Shipboard Inspection by Medical Department Personnel—Food Serving 13-min B&W 1958.

MN–8246, Color Vision Deficiency—Definition and Evaluation 20–min B&W 1957.

MN–8264A, Vapor Compression Distilling Units—How They Work 22-min B&W 1958.

MN–8264B, Vapor Compression Distilling Units—Chemical 10-min B&W 1958.

MN–8265, The Medical Officer Aboard Ship 19-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MN–8267, Navy Men 28-min B&W 1956.

FN–8300, History of the U.S. Navy Hydrographic Office 16-min Color 1955.

MN–8328, The Navy Frogmen 28-min B&W 1957.

MN–8330A, Fire Prevention—The Nature of Fire 13-min Color 1958.

MN–8330B, Fire Prevention—Know Your Fire Hazards 18-min Color 1958.

MN–8339, Hurricane Hunters 14-min B&W 1956.

MN–8344, Admiral Burke Takes Command 12-min B&W 1955.

MN–8387, Damage Control—Civilian Manned Ships 20-min B&W 1957.

MC–8393A, Navy Log—The Pirate and the Pledge 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393D, Navy Log—Home is the Sailor 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393E, Navy Log—Blue Angels 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393F, Navy Log—The Sky Pilot 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393G, Navy Log—Operation Three-in-one 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393H, Navy Log—The Family Specials 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393I, Navy Log—Captain's Choice 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393M, Navy Log—The Pollywog of YOSU 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393P, Navy Log—Caution and Courage 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393R, Navy Log—Operation Typewriter 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393S, Navy Log—The Gimmick 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393T, Navy Log—Demos the Greek 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393X, Navy Log—The Helium Umbrella 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393Z, Navy Log—The Fatal Crest 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393AF, Navy Log—Rocks Break Scissors 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393AL, Navy Log—The Long Weekend 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393AM, Navy Log—LST–799 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393AU, Navy Log—Formosa 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BF, Navy Log—Operation Hideout 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BG, Navy Log—Nightmare 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BH, Navy Log—Nautilus 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BI, Navy Log—The Star 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BJ, Navy Log—Tazzoli 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MC–8393BK, Navy Log—Lady and the Atom 29-min B&W 1957 (No TV).

MN–8406, "MD USN" 43-min B&W 1957.

MN–8409, European Cruise 28-min Color 1956.

MN–8414A, Naval Aviation—A Personal History—The Weapon is Conceived 30-min B&W 1961.

MN–8414B, Naval Aviation—A Personal History—The Weapon is Tested 28-min B&W 1960.

MN–8414C, Naval Aviation—A Personal History—The Weapon is developed 29-min B&W 1962.

MN–8479A, Transistors—P–N Junction Fundamentals 11-min B&W 1967.

MN–8479B, Transistors—Triode Fundamentals 10-min B&W 1957.

MN–8479C, Transistors—Minority Carriers 10-min B&W 1959.

MN–8479D, Transistors—Low Frequency Amplifiers 10-min B&W 1958.

MN–8479E, Transistors—High Frequency Operation Amplifiers and Oscillators 14-min B&W 1959.

MN–8479F, Transistors—Switching 14-min B&W 1959.

MN–8479G, Transistors—Servicing Techniques 17-min B&W 1960.

MN–8480A, Ground Controlled Approach Equipment—Sitting 11-min B&W 1958.

MN8480B, Ground Controlled Approach Equipment—Alignment of AN/CPN–4A 13-min B&W 1958.

MN–8488, Value Engineering—More Ships for Less Money 13-min Color 1957.

MN–8489A, Piping Fabrication for Shipboard High Temperature Steam Systems—Introduction 13-min B&W 1958.

MN–8489B, Piping Fabrication for Shipboard High Temperature Systems (Steam) Bending and Installing 10-min B&W 1958.

MN–8489C, Piping Fabrication for Shipboard High Temperature Steam System—Welding 13-min B&W 1958.

MN–8500, Operation Deepfreeze I 22-min Color 1957.

MN–8509, Your Navy School of Music 13½-min B&W 1957.

FN–8511, Challenge in Naval Research 31-min Color 1957.

MN–8538, Sea Power—Supply, the Lifeblood of Seapower 15-min Color 1959.

MN–8546, NATO Seapower for Peach 28-min B&W 1957.

MN–8564A3, Navy Wings of Gold 28-min Color 1966.

MN–8566A, Endodontics Diagnosis and Case Selection 13-min Color 1958.

MN–8566B, Endodontics—Preparation of the Root Canal 16-min Color 1958.

MN–8566C, Endodontics—Filling the Root Canal 14-min Color 1958.

MN–8567, The Navy Dental Corps 27-min Color 1959.

MN–8568A, Military Immunization—General Procedures 23-min B&W 1959.

MN–8568B, Military Immunization—Smallpox Vaccination 12-min Color 1959.

MN–8576A, Basic Nursing—Making an Unoccupied Bed 14-min B&W 1957.

MN–8576B, Basic Nursing Care—Making a Recovery Bed 9-min B&W 1957.

MN–8576C, Basic Nursing Care—Making the Occupied Bed 15-min B&W 1957.

MN–8576D, Basic Nursing Care—The Bed Bath 18-min B&W 1957.

MN–8576E, Basic Nursing Care—Intravenous Administration of Fluids 18-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576F, Basic Nursing Care—Preoperative Care 16-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576G, Basic Nursing Care—Postoperative Care 14-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576H, Basic Nursing Care—Eye Treatments 13-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576I, Basic Nursing Care—Ear, Nose and Throat 14-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576J, Basic Nursing Care—Oral Administration of Medications 13-min B&W 1959.

MN–8576K, Basic Nursing Care—Isolation Techniques 24-min B&W 1960 (No TV).

MN–8592, Theory of the Lead-Acid Storage Battery 25-min B&W 1959.

MN–8594A, Direct Generators—Theory of Operation 16-min B&W 1959.

MN–8594B, Direct Current Motors—Theory of Operation 10-min B&W 1959.

MN–8597A, Reinforced Plastics—Introduction 20-min B&W 1957.

MN–8597B, Reinforced Plastics—Inspection and Quality Control 20-min B&W 1957.

MN–8597C, Reinforced Plastics—Repair of Single Skin Failures 18-min B&W 1957.

MN–8610, Ship Design for Tomorrow 25-min Color 1959.

MN–8613, The U.S. Naval Test Pilot School 13-min Color 1959.

MN–8614, Electromagnetic Cathode Ray Tube-Theory of Operation 20-min B&W 1958.

MN–8617, Slow-speed Flight Characteristics of Swept-wing Aircraft 18-min B&W 1957.

MN–8639, Safety-on-the-job at Sea 16-min B&W 1957.

MN–8647A, MSTS Arctic Operations 19-min Color 1958.

MN–8647B, Arctic Shipping—MSTS Arctic Operations 31-min Color 1958.

MN–8659, Mrs. United States Navy 4-min B&W 1957.

MN–8665A, Seabees in the Antarctic—Base Construction and Equipment Operation 19-min Color 1958.

MN–8679, The Growler Story 22-min Color 1958.

MN–8681A, Environmental Factors Affecting Reliability of Electronic Equipment 17-min B&W 1956 (No TV).

MN–8681B, Vibration Problems in the Design of Shipboard Electronic Equipment 19-min B&W 1956 (No TV).

MN–8697, MSTS Arctic Operations—1956 46-min Color 1957.

MN–8707, Stay in School and Graduate 14-min Color 1958.

MN–8725, Management Improvement—Its Your Business 26-min Color 1959.

MN–8749A, Medical Aspects of Diving (Part I) 28-min Color 1962 (No TV).

MN–8749B, Medical Aspects of Diving (Part 2) 28-min Color 1962 (No TV).

MN–8751A, The Navy Goes to Church—Thine is the Power 20-min B&W 1958.

MN–8751B, The Navy Goes to Church—Rig for Church 20-min B&W 1960.

MN–8759, Buoyant Ascent 15-min Color 1957.

MN–8760A, Helicopter Rescue at Sea 21-min Color 1959.

MN–8770A, Reliability—Fundamental Concepts—Part 1 30-min Color 1961.

MN–8770B, Reliability—Fundamental Concepts—Part 2 27-min Color 1961.

MN–8770C, Reliability—Statistical Concepts 25-min Color 1961.

MN–8770D, Reliability Engineering—Reliability Testing 30-min Color 1961.

MN–8770E, Reliability Testing 28-min Color 1962.

MN–8771A, International Naval Review 14½-min Color 1958.

MN–8775, Air Operations in the Antarctic 16-min Color 1960.

MN–8794, Navy Wives 27-min Color 1959.

MN–8800, The U.S. Naval Civil Engineering Laboratory 17-min Color 1959.

MN–8807, Civil Engineers of the Navy 18-min B&W 1959 (No TV).

MN–8812A, Turboprop/Turboshaft Engines: Introduction 13-min Color 1959.

MN–8817A, Aircraft Familiarization—T2J–1 Buckeye Aircraft Systems 13-min Color 1960.

MN–8817B, Aircraft Familiarization—T2J–1 Buckeye Emergency Procedures 10-min Color 1960.

MN–8817C, Aircraft Familiarization—T2J–1 Buckeye Operating Procedures 22-min Color 1960.

MN–8817D, Aircraft Familiarization—T2J–1 Buckeye Field Carrier Landing Procedures 11-min Color 1960.

MN–8817E, Aircraft Familiarization—T2J–1 Buckeye Carrier Procedures 10-min Color 1960.

MN–8829L, Effective Naval Leadership—Naval Heritage—Part 2—The Farragut Story 27-min Color 1962.

MN–8848, Missiles of the Navy 19-min Color 1958.

MN–8857, Introduction to Underwater Sound 19-min B&W 1959.

MC–8863, Navy's Blue Angels 29-min Color 1958 (No TV).

MN–8864, Security Through Seapower 11-min Color 1958.

MN–8865, The Naval Research Laboratory Reactor 21-min Color 1959.

FN–8874, The Statistical Design of Experiments (Fundamental Concepts) 20 min Color 1960.

MN–8879, The Pacific Missile Range 14½-min Color 1960.

FN–8909, Danger—Stacked Deck Carrier OPS 20 min Color 1960.

MN–8913, The Dental Assistant: Operative (Professional Use Only).

MN–8917, Low Level Air Navigation 22-min Color 1960.

MN–8923, Radiological Defense in Civilian Manned Ships 25-min B&W 1960.

MN–8936, USS NAUTILUS—Operation Sunshine 14-min Color 1959.

MH–8940, The Salute 15-min B&W 1960.

MN–8942, Portrait of Antarctica, 28-min Color 1961.

MN–8951, Tuberculin Testing 10-min Color 1959 (No TV).

MN–8953, Five Ladders to the Bridge 28-min Color 1961.

MN–8958, Search for Silence 15-min B&W 1960.

MN–8965, Prevention of Heat Casualties 24-min Color 1960.

MN–8969A, Digital Computer Techniques—Introduction 20-min Color 1962.

MN–8969B, Digital Computer Techniques—Computer Logic 20-min Color 1962.

MN–8969C, Digital Computer Techniques—Logic Symbology 15-min Color 1962.

MN–8969E2, Digital Computer Techniques—Logic Element Circuits 18-min Color 1962.

MN–8969D, Digital Computer Techniques—Computer Units 24-min Color 1962.

MN–8969F, Digital Computer Techniques—Programming 14-min Color 1962.

MN–8970, Seapower 14-min Color 1959.

MN–8981, Denison Hydraulic Pumps and Motors, Disassembly and Reassembly 24-min B&W 1961.

MN–8982, Summer Incident—Lebanon crisis—27-min Color 1959.

MN–8984N, Navy Screen Highlights Oct–March 14-min B&W 1963.

MN–8984O, Navy Screen Highlights Apr–Jun 14-min B&W 1963.

MN–8984P, Navy Screen Highlights Jul–Sep 14-min B&W 1963.

MN–8984Q, Navy Screen Highlights Aug–Dec 14-min B&W 1963.

MN–8984R, Navy Screen Highlights Jan–Mar 14-min B&W 1964.

MN–8984S, Navy Screen Highlights Apr–Jun 14-min B&W 1964.

MN–8984T, Navy Screen Highlights, Jul–Sep 14-min B&W 1964.

MN–8984U, Navy Screen Highlights—Assault at Huelva 14-min Color 1965.

MN–8984V, Navy Screen Highlights—Twice a Citizen 14-min Color 1965.

MN–8984W, Navy Screen Highlights—Strike From the Sea 14-min Color 1966.

MN–8984X, Navy Screen Highlights—Vietnam: The Navy Ashore 14-min Color 1966.

MN–8984Y, Navy Screen Highlights—Search and Rescue—Vietnam (1968) 15-min Color.

MN–8990, 115 Volts—Deadly Shipmate 19-min Color 1960.

MC–8997, Jet Carrier 28-min B&W 1959 (No TV).

MN–9026, U.S. Navy Armored Life Jacket 7-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–9031, U.S. Navy Report—Away Boarders 19-min B&W 1945.

MN–9032, Floating Drydocks—The Combat Dock for Fleet Repairs 40-min B&W 1945.

MN–9042, Floating Drydocks—Careening the YFD–6 15-min B&W 1946.

MN–9045, Fury in the Pacific 20-min B&W 1945 (No TV).

MN–9153, Naval Chapels in the Pacific 12-min Color 1948.

MN–9165, Naval Ordnance Laboratory—The N-O-L Story 20-min Color 1951.

MN–9180A, Shipboard Vibrations—Part 1—Fundamental Principles of Vibrating Systems (Single Mass) 22-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–9180B, Shipboard Vibrations—Part 2—Multi-Mass Systems 21-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–9180C, Shipboard Vibrations—Part 3—Vibration—Excitation and Response 17-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–9180D, Shipboard Vibrations—Part 4—Service Problems and Field Investigation 13-min B&W 1953 (No TV).

MN–9183, Cold Weather Seabee 14-min B&W 1950.

MN–9198, Swimming for Survival 17-min B&W 1954.

MN–9225A, Nursing Service in the Navy—The Nursing Service Supervisor 21-min B&W 1954.

MN-9225B, Nursing Service in the Navy—The Chief of Nursing Service 11-min B&W 1954.

MN-9225C, Nursing Service in the Navy—The Ward Nurse 16-min B&W 1954.

MN-9229, Naval Aviation and You 24-min Color 1954.

MN-9237A, Mechanical Operation of the Model 28 Teletypewriter-Keyboard Transmitting Mechanism 12-min B&W 1954.

MN-9237B, Mechanical Operation of the Model 28 Teletypewriter—Automatic Typer Selecting Mechanism 11-min B&W 1954.

MN-9237C, Mechanical Operation of the Model 28 Teletypewriter—Type Box Positioning Mechanism 18-mm B&W 1954.

MN-9237D, Mechanical Operation of the Model 28 Teletypewriter—Function Mechanism 13-min B&W 1954.

MN-9243, The Chaplain Comes Aboard 15-min Color 1954.

MN-9272, Carrier Action off Korea 13-min B&W 1954.

MN-9294, Take 'Er Down Submarine History 13-min B&W 1954.

MN-9302B, Rules of the Road—International—Vessels Crossing—Daytime 21-min Color 1956.

MN-9302C, Rules of the Road—International—Vessels Overtaking—Daytime 19-min Color 1955.

MN-9302D, Rules of the Road—International—Special Daytime Situations 11-min Color 1955.

MN-9302G, Rules of the Road—International—Restricted Visibility Situations 17-min Color 1955.

MN-9315, Flying in a Pressure Cabin 20-min Color 1954.

MN-9318A, Medical Aspects of High Intensity Noise—General Effects 20-min B&W 1956 (No TV).

MN-9318C, Medical Aspects of High Intensity Noise—Ear Defense 20-min B&W 1955 (No TV).

MN-9319A, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Triangular Bandage—Head 1-min 18-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319B, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Triangular Bandage—Chest or Back 1-min 19-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319C, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Triangular Bandage—Shoulder 1-min 32-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319D, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Triangular Bandage—Hip 47-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319E, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Triangular Bandage—Foot 50-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319F, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Foot and Ankle 1-min 47-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319G, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Palm of Hand 53-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319H, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Back of Hand 1-min 45-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319I, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Finger 1-min 38-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319J, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Eyes 48-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319K, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Jaw (Barton) 1-min 6-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319L, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Jaw (Modified Barton) 1-min 1-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319M, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Hip (Spica) 1-min 4-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319N, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Shoulder 1-min 10-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319O, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Spiral Reverse Arm 1-min 20-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9319P, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Figure Eight Elbow 1-min B&W 1953.

MN-9319Q, Bandaging for Hospital Corpsman—Roller Bandage—Recurrent Head 2-min 37-sec B&W 1953.

MN-9346, The Rubber Dam in Dentistry 18-min Color 1955.

MN-9375A, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Hematological Technique—Collecting Blood Samples 7-min Color 1954. (No TV).

MN-9375B, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Hematological Techniques for Charging the Hemocytometer 6-min Color 1954 (No TV).

MN-9375C, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Serological Technique Venipuncture 7-min Color 1954 (No TV).

MN-9375D, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Histopathological Technique—Processing a Gross Specimen 10-min Color 1954 (No TV).

MN-9375E, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Chemical Techniques—Measurement of Total Iron in Whole Blood—Preparation of Reagents 13-min Color 1955.

MN-9375F, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Measurement of Total Iron in Whole Blood—Preparation of a Calibration Curve 12-min Color 1955.

MN-9375G, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Measurement of Total Iron in Whole Blood—Estimation of Iron 14-min Color 1955.

MN-9375H, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Oxyhemoglobin Method for Measuring Hemoglobin 5-min Color 1955.

MN-9375J, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Basic Techniques of Pipetting 5-min Color 1957.

MN-9375K, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Transfer Pipets 3-min Color 1955.

MN-9375L, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Blow-out Pipets 2-min Color 1957.

MN-9375M, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Special Pipets 5-min Color 1955.

MN-9375N, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Pipettors 5-min Color 1957.

MN-9375O, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Burettes 8-min Color 1955.

MN-9375P, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Volumetric Flasks 4-min Color 1955.

MN-9375Q, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Folding a Filter Paper 3-min Color 1956.

MN-9375R, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Protein-free Filtrate (Folin-Wu Method) 5-min Color 1956.

MN-9375S, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Protein-free Filtrate (Somogyi Method) 4-min Color 1956.

MN-9375T, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Protein-free Filtrate (Tungstic Acid Method) 5-min Color 1956.

MN-9375U, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Estimation of Blood Glucose (Folin-Wu and Somogyi Methods) 12-min Color 1956.

MN-9375V, Medical Laboratory Techniques—Estimation of Blood Glucose (Sunderman-Fuller) 5-min Color 1956.

MN-9376, Complete Dentures—Remount Procedures 20-min Color 1956.

MN-9400B, Man and the FBM 28-min Color 1960.

MH-9409, Leatherneck Ambassadors 15-min Color 1961.

MH-9411, Aerodynamics—Fundamentals of Roll-Divergence 122-min B&W 1960.

MN-9419, Radiation Protection in Nuclear Medicine (Professional Use Only).

MN-9422, Hurricane Hunters 21-min B&W 1961.

FN-9433A, Principles of Paperwork Management 13-min Color 1960.

FN-9433B, Principles of Paperwork Management—Moving the Mail 14-min Color 1960.

FN-9433C, Principles of Paperwork Management—Better Correspondence Management 11-min Color 1960.

FN-9433D, Principles of Paperwork Management—Managing Your Forms 17-min Color 1960.

FN-9433E, Principles of Paperwork Management—Managing Your Reports 11-min Color 1961.

FN-9433F, Principles of Paperwork Management—Records Disposal 15-min Color 1961.

MN-9439, Silent Sentinel Polaris Missile Program 14-min Color 1960.

MN-9442, Polaris To Poseidon 14-min Color 1966.

MN-9443, The Unknown Fleet MSTS Operations 19-min Color 1963.

MN-9454, Beneath Navy Wings 28-min Color 1961.

MN-9460, The Supply Manager's Dilemma 19-min Color 1960.

MN-9480A, Vision in Military Aviation: Sense of Sight 24½ min Color 1962.

MN-9480B, Vision in Military Aviation: Illusions 32-min Color 1963.

MN-9483, Mr. Push-a-Button 28-min Color 1961.

MN-9487A, Meteorology—Ice Formation on Aircraft (1961) 21-min Color.

MN-9487B, Meteorology—Fog and Low Ceiling Clouds—Ground Fog and Advection Fog (1961) 23-min Color.

MN-9487C, Meteorology—Fog and Low Ceiling Clouds—Upslope Fog and Frontal Fog 9-Min Color 1961.

MN-9487D, Meteorology—The Cold Front 14-Min Color 1961.

MN-9487E, Meteorology—The Warm Front 17-Min Color 1961.

MN-9515, Ready for Sea 28-Min Color 1961.

MN-9539, Vertical Assault 16-min Color 1960.

MN-9541, Naval Preparatory School 12-min Color 1962.

MN-9546B, SELF—The Mobile Airfield 14-min Color 1961.

MH-9552, Force in Readiness 28-min Color 1961.

MC-9556A3, Ring of Valor-Story of Midshipmen 29-min Color 1966.

MC-9561, Year of Polaris 55-min B&W 1960 (No TV).

MN-9587, Yankee Do-Attack Carrier Operations 28-min Color 1962.

MN-9594, The Second Seat—Naval Aviation Officer 29-min Color 1964.

MN-9606, Pacific Frontier 28-min Color 1964.

MC-9607, Operation Top Gun—Naval Air Weapons Meet—15-min Color 1960.

MC-9613, Beyond Magellan—USS Triton Submerged Trip Around World 28-min Color 1961.

MC-9614, Sub Killers — Anti-Submarine Operations 28-min B&W 1960 (No TV).

MN-9616, Aircraft Pressure Refueling 8-min Color 1962 (No TV).

MC-9631, Hot Run—Navy Research 29-min Color 1961.

MN-9633, The Story of Naval Aviation, 1911–1961 27-min B&W 1961.

MN-9665, Introduction to Environmental Engineering 22-min Color 1962.

MN-9666, Removable Partial Dentures: The Wax-up (Professional Use Only).

MN-9667, Waiting for the Robert E. Lee—Submarine Operations 28-min Color 1963.

MN-9680, Adventures in Inner Space 28-min Color 1965.

MN-9688, A Salute to Arleigh Burke 22-min B&W 1962.

MN-9692, The Dental Assistant: Outpatient Surgery (Professional Use Only).

MN-9704A, PERT Milestone System 27-min Color 1962.

MN-9704B, PERT Cost 29-min Color 1964.

MN-9726, Greyhounds of the Sea—Destroyer History and Operations 26-min B&W 1967.

MN-9730, Who Needs You, Buchanan—Destroyer Operations 28-min Color 1964.

MN-9756, Polaris, Blue and Gold-Op. Polaris Submarines 10-min Color 1962.

MC–9777, Detect and Destroy-Anti-Submarine Operations 14-min Color 1962.

MN–9783, Cold War Call-up—The Navy's Selected Reserve 28-min B&W 1962.

MN–9789, Project Lana—Bendix Air Races 7-min Color 1961.

MN–9797, An Answer (Visit of President Kennedy to Fleet) 28-min Color 1962.

MN–9835, Oceanography—Science for Survival 42-min Color 1964.

MN–9835A2, Oceanography — Science for Survival (Short Version) 27-min Color 1964.

MG–9874, John Glenn Story 28-min Color 1963.

MN–9907, Seapower 28-min Color 1964.

MC–9925, Polaris Submarine: Journal of an Undersea Voyage 56-min Color 1963 (No TV).

MC–9927, Power for Continent Seven Antarctica 30-min Color 1963.

MN–9928, United States Arriving—President Kennedy's visit to Pacific Fleet 28-min Color 1963.

MC–9934, Story of a Carrier Pilot 28-min B&W 1963 (No TV).

MC–9937, Biography of Admiral Nimitz 28-min B&W 1963 (No TV).

MC–9938, Goblin on the Doorstep—Documentary on ASW 28-min Color 1963.

MA–9944, Salute to the Navy (History) 28-min B&W 1962.

MN–9960, Mechanical Impedance: Concepts Applicable to Ship Silencing 28-min B&W 1966.

MN–10006B, Partners at Sea—Unitas Operations—28-min Color 1966.

MN–10019, Seapower-Plymouth Rock to Polaris 28-min Color 1965.

MN–10021, Challenge of the Seas (Oceanography) 1963.

MN–10046, Operative Dentistry 38-min Color 1966.

MN–10063, Careers in Oceanography 28-min Color 1966.

MN–10064, Water Masses of the Ocean 46-min Color 1967.

MN–10066A, Oceanographer of the Navy Reports 28-min Color 1965 (No TV).

MN–10068, Campus to Command OCS Training 28-min Color 1966.

KN–10079, Project Definition Phase 33-min B&W 1964.

MN–10100, SEALAB I (Oceanography) 28-min Color 1965.

MN–10100B, SEALAB II (Oceanography) 28-min Color 1966.

MN–10101, The Nuclear Navy 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10105, Why Calibrate (Navy Calibration Program) 16-min Color 1966.

MN–10117, It Started With Muybridge (Photography) 12½-min Color 1962.

MN–10145, Mission: Oceanography 28-min Color 1966.

MN–10152, A Time-lapse-Photographic Study of Antarctic Icefloes and Currents 22-min Color 1962.

MC–10153, The Missile Navy 26-min Color 1964.

MN–10161, Poultry Cookery 21-min Color 1965.

MN–10167, Oceanographic Prediction Systems 30-min Color 1967.

MC–10191, Mission Mediterranean (US Sixth Fleet) 28-min Color 1964.

MN–10193A, Hydrographic Survey Operations: Hydrographic Control and Sounding Operations 17-min Color 1967.

MN–10193C, Hydrographic Survey Operations· Hydrographic Control and Sounding Operations 17-min Color 1967.

MN–10198, Hygiene for Men 19-min Color 1967.

MN–10199, The Dolphins That Joined the Navy (Research) 27-min Color 1964.

MN–10203, Modern Geodetic Surveying (1967) 18-min Color.

MN–10220B, Nursing Care: Evening and Morning Care 15-min Color 1967 (Professional Use Only).

MN–10220C, Nursing Care: The Diabetic Patient 28-min Color 1967 (Professional Use Only).

MN–10220D, Nursing Care: The Cardiac Patient 23-min Color 1967 (Professional Use Only).

MN–10226, Land the Landing Force 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10227, The Submariners 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10228, Face of a Nation (Carrier Operations) 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10232A, Dash—History and Development of ASW during World War I and II 30-min Color 1965.

MN–10232A3, Dash (Antisubmarine) 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10236, The Lonely Warriors (UDT & Seal Team Operations) 28-min Color 1967.

MC–10269, Mark (U.S. Naval Academy) 28-min Color 1965.

MN–10276, American Navy in Vietnam 26-min Color 1967.

MN–10314, Footprints in the Sea (Oceanography) 26-min Color 1966.

MN–10316, Come Sail With Me (Technical Training for Navy Missile Technicians) 27-min Color 1966.

MN–10317, Nature of Sea Water (Oceanography) 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10330, Weaponeers of the Deep (Submarine Training) 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10334, The Junction Transister (Transisters & Diode Action. Electron Flow.) 28–min Color 1967.

MN–10359, Seafood Cookery 20-min Color 1966.

MN–10363, Oceanographic Research With the Cousteau Diving Saucer 26-min Color 1966.

MN–10356E, Seapower—Traditions Old—Traditions New 28-min Color 1968.

MC–10376, Ready on Arrival (Carrier Operations) 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10387, Small Boat Navy (Role of Small Boats in Vietnam) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10388, Gentle Hand, The (Naval Medical Corps) 28-min Color 1968.

MC–10392, To Catch a Shadow (ASW Operations) 28-min Color 1966.

MN–10393, Seabee Teams 30-min Color 1966.

MC–10414, First in Command (Story of a Navy Captain) 28-min Color 1968.

MC–10415, Fifty Years After (History of Naval Air Reserve) 29-min Color 1966.

MN–10428, The Hospital Ship—An Appreciation 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10438, River Patrol (South Vietnam Delta Operations) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10466, Mission of Point Mugu—Weapons That Work 28-min Color 1967.

MN–10490, Beans, Bullets and Black Oil (Replenishment at Sea Operations) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10493, Eye of the Dragon (Navy Advisors in Vietnam) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10494, A Trip to Where (Drug Abuse) 50-min Color 1968.

MN–10507, LSD (Drug Abuse) 37-min Color 1967 (Short version is 28-min).

MN–10519, American Dreadnaught, The (USS New Jersey Returned to Duty) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10552, The Quiet Warrior (Story of Naval Air Reserve—Week-end Warriors) 28-min Color 1968.

MN–10581, Spirit of Freedom (American History with the U.S. Navy Band) 28-min Color 1968.

SYNOPSIS OF FILMS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST

This enclosure lists alphabetically and describes Navy films recommended for public information purposes.

Adventures in Inner Space, MN–9680, 28-min., Color, 1965: The life and training of a nuclear submariner from recruitment through assignment.

American Dreadnaught, The, MN–10519, 28-min., Color, 1968: A nostalgic presentation of the return of the battleship New Jersey to active duty with the U.S. fleet. Martin Gabel narrates.

American Navy in Vietnam, MN–10276, 28-min., Color, 1967: Narrated by Chet Huntley, this film illustrates the Navy's commitments in Vietnam including bombing and missile strikes, a river assault landing, and civic action.

An Answer, MN–9797, 28-min., Color, 1962: President Kennedy visits the Second Fleet and 2nd Marine Division to view exercises involving air, sea, and amphibious operations.

A Trip to Where, MN–10494, 50-min., Color, 1968: This film illustrates the harmful effects of the misuse of drugs such as barbiturates, amphetamines, marijuna and LSD.

Beans, Bullets and Black Oil, 28-min., Color, 1968, MN–10490: Narrated by Henry Fonda, this film shows the highlights of replenishment at sea while the ships maintain their duties on the line. The supply line from American producers to Navy consumers is traced with illustration of ship-to-ship and helicopter transfer of goods at sea.

Beyond Magellan, MC–9613, 28-min., Color, 1961: A documentary of the submerged round-the-world cruise of the nuclear submarine Triton.

Biography of Admiral Nimitz, MC–9937, 28-min, B&W, 1963: Documentary of the life of Fleet Admiral Chester W. Nimitz. Includes dramatic action footage from World War II. Produced by Wolper Productions for their TV series "Biography." (No TV).

Campus to Command, MN–10068, 28-min, Color., 1966: The story of Officer Candidate School.

Careers in Oceanography, MN–10063, 28-min.: A documentary presentation to encourage college students to plan careers in oceanography. The film presents the challenge and adventure of oceanography and its vital importance to defense and to the economy.

Carrier Action Off Korea, MN–9272, 13-min., B&W, 1954: Illustrates the effectiveness and importance of naval aviation to the Korean War.

Code, The, MD–6962CM, 29-min., B&W, 1959: Narrated by Jack Webb, this visual presentation of the U.S. Fighting Man's Code covers the main themes of surrender, capture, escape, and conduct as a prisoner of war.

Cold War Call-Up—The Navy's Selected Reserve, MN–9783, 28-min., B&W, 1962: A documentary on members of the Navy's Selected Reserve who were recalled to active duty in connection with the Berlin Crisis. Covers many of their activities while on active duty from October 1961 to August 1962.

Come Sail With Me, MN–10316, 27½-min., Color, 1966: The Navy's Missile Technician is followed from boot camp to billet on board a modern missile ship. Excellent color photography and launching of Tartar, Terrier, and Talos missiles highlight this informative film.

Dash, MN–10232A3, 30-min., Color, 1965: A history of antisubmarine weapons, featuring the Dash drone helicopter.

Detect and Destroy, MC–9777, 14-min., Color, 1962: Shows the evaluation given an SH–3A (HSS–2) helicopter by the Navy before its introduction into the Fleet. Depicts aircraft trials at the U.S. Naval Air Test Center, Patuxent River, Md.

Dolphins That Joined the Navy, The, MN–10199, 26½-min., Color, 1964: Glenn Ford is the on-camera narrator for this film which shows the Navy's extensive research with dolphins and discusses future applications of the researchers' findings.

Eye of the Dragon, MN–10493, 28-min., Color, 1968: The story of the American Navy Advisors to Vietnamese junk forces told in a panoramic style using a montage of sequences, native music and the Kipling theme of "East is East" and "West is West".

Face of a Nation, MN–10228, 28-min., Color, 1967: Illustrates the role Navy men on at-

tack carriers play in keeping the peace around the world.

Fifty Years After, MC–10415, 29-min., Color, 1966: Commemorates the 50th Anniversary of the Navy Air Reserve by telling the story of the original Yale unit. Documentary produced by WCBS–TV, New York. (TV by CHINFO permission only.)

Fighting Lady Speaks, The MN–7283, 10-min., B&W, 1950: Dramatizes a typical day's activities aboard an aircraft carrier off Korea in 1950. Includes combat scenes of Navy fighters and bombers on missions over Korea.

First in Command, MN–10414, 28-min., Color, 1968: A realistic view of the authority and responsibilities of the Commanding Officer of a Navy ship. Narrated by Richard Boone, the film documents the Captain's role on the bridge, in the wardroom, on the mess deck, at Captain's Mast, and at General Quarters.

Fleet That Came To Stay, The, MN–5802, 22-min., B&W, 1945: Dramatic combat scenes from the Okinawa campaign. The pre-invasion shore bombardment and Kamikaze attacks on our ships off Okinawa are shown.

Floating Fortress, MN–7834, 14-min., B&W, 1952: Tells the story of the battleship's mission in Korea. Includes scenes of life aboard ship.

Footprints in the Sea, MN–10314, 26-min., Color, 1966: An exciting report on the latest deep submersible maneuverable craft being tested and used by the Navy. Over 50 percent of the film is made up of new underwater photography, including scenes of SouCoupe, Deep Jeep, Morey, and CURV.

Force In Readiness, MH–9552, 28-min., Color, 1961: Shows the Navy-Marine Corps team in operation, featuring the value of trained manpower, while pointing up the many modern weapons available to the team.

Fury in the Pacific, MN–9045, 20-min, B&W, 1945: Dramatic pictures filmed during invasion of Palau Islands. Bombardment by Fleet, landing of Marines, and the struggle to oust the Japanese from Bloody Nose Ridge are portrayed in grim realism. (No TV)

Gentle Hand, The, MN–10388, 28-min. Color, 1968: This is the story of American Navy Surgeons giving medical aid and instructions to South Vietnamese patriots in the picturesque village of Rach Gia, Republic of Vietnam.

Goblin on the Doorstep, MC–9938, 28-min., Color, 1963: Antisubmarine warfare, equipment and techniques are explained in this excellent film. Shows how the hunter-killer group works as a team to combat an enemy submarine.

Greyhounds of the Sea, MN–9726, 26-min., B&W, 1967: Narrated by Jack Webb, this film documents the development of the destroyer from the earliest types through to modern nuclear missile destroyers.

Growler Story, The, MN–8679, 22-min., Color, 1958: This is the story of one of the most famed acts of heroism of WWII. A vivid account of the submarine USS Growler's departure from Pearl Harbor on war patrol, climaxed by Commander Gilmore's last command from his submarine's embattled bridge. John Ford directed this dramatic film.

Heart of the Navy, MN–8224, 13-min., B&W, 1956: Shows how the Navy provided help in the Berlin Blockade, the winter storms of January 1949, the earthquakes in the Greek Ionian Islands of August 1953, the Vietnam Evacuation of August 1954, the Mexico flood of October 1954 and to Korean Orphans in 1953.

History of the Korean War, MD–6962CG, 58-min., B&W, 1958: Documentary film recounts Korean war events from the first gunfire on June 25, 1950 to the armistice on July 27, 1953. Provides a firsthand look at combat troops and their equipment, terrain, and problems of weather and supply.

Hospital Ship, The—An Appreciation, MN–10428, 28-min., Color, 1968: The story of the hospital ship and its role in treating and caring for Americans and Vietnamese people suffering from disease and injuries resulting from the conflict.

Hot Run, MC–9631, 29-min., Color, 1961: Shows how one of the nation's young amateur rocketeers is encouraged and guided by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Company and the U.S. Navy in the research, development and firing of a successful missile.

Hurricane Hunters, MN–9422, 21-min., B&W, 1961:

Shows the mission and operating techniques of the "Hurricane Hunters" of Airborne Early Warning Squadron Four. Shows how the squadron's planes seek out tropical disturbances and fly through them to determine their behavior.

Jet Carrier, MC–8997, 28-min., B&W, 1960: Narrated by Walter Cronkite, this CBS film shows the mission of the modern carrier task force. Air operations aboard the USS Saratoga are shown (No TV)

Land the Landing Force, MN–10226, 28-min. Color, 1967: An overall view of the history and tactical deployment of Amphibious forces.

Lonely Warriors, The, MN–10236, 28-min., B&W, 1967: Dramatic action film depicting the many fascinating jobs of Navy underwater demolition teams, as they perform reconnaissance missions and plant explosives to clear enemy beaches for amphibious landings.

LSD, MN–10507, 37-min., Color, 1967 (Short Version is 28-min.): This film features Walter Miner, LCDR, MC, outlining how LSD was discovered, the dangers of its misuse, and its effects on the brain and body.

Man and the FBM, MN–9400B, 28-in., Color, 1960: The story of the Polaris Fleet Ballistic Missile submarine and of the recruitment and training of the personnel who operate the Navy's Polaris weapons system.

Man in the Sea (Story of SEALAB II.) MN–10100B, 28-min., Color, 1966: Film story of Sea Lab II experiment under the sea in 1965. Features outstanding underwater photography inside Sea Lab and in the sea around the vehicle.

Mark, MC–10269, 28-min., Color, 1965: A new concept in Navy information-recruiting films with all music sound track. Follows a young boy on a tour of the Naval Academy. In addition to the fine sound track, there is dramatic original photography of historic Annapolis, Md.

Missile Navy, MC–10153, 28-min, color, 1964: About the history of rocket and missile development in the Navy. It illustrates every type in some phase of development and demonstrates operational aspects of present day missiles in the Fleet. The film includes excellent historical and new photography and is narrated by Chet Huntley.

Mission Mediterranean, MC–10191, 28½-min, color, 1964: About the U.S. Sixth Fleet and its operations in the Mediterranean area. The film details the various missions of the Fleet and illustrates how various naval operations, including amphibious assaults, would be employed in an actual war situation.

Mission: Oceanography, MN–10145, 28-min, color, 1966: A dramatic history of the development of oceanography as a science and its importance to the mission of the Navy today.

Mr. Push-A-Button, MN–9483, 28-min, color, 1961: Shows the importance of the individual man in this day of automatic equipment and so-called "push-button" warfare.

Naval Aviation—a Personal History—the Weapon Is Conceived, MN–8414A, 30-min, B&W, 1961: Depicts the development of Naval Aviation from its inception up to World War I. Pioneers of naval aviation discuss their problems in getting aircraft recognized as a useful weapon in naval warfare.

Naval Aviation—a Personal History—the Weapon Is Tested, MN–8414B, 29-min, B&W, 1962: Contains a series of interviews and pioneers of naval aviation, and shows the development of naval aviation during the period 1918–1930.

Naval Preparatory School, MN–9541, 12-min, color, 1962: This documentary film on the Naval Preparatory School in Bainbridge, Md., depicts the instructional program and extracurricular activities at the school, which prepares enlisted men for entrance to the Naval Academy.

Navy Frogman, The, MN–8328, 28-min., B&W, 1957: This documentary includes the rigorous training and "Hell Week" at Little Creek, Va. Includes scenes of an underwater training tank and of advanced training at St. Thomas, Virgin Islands. Many underwater scenes are included.

Navy Screen Highlights—Assault at Huelva, MN–8984U, 14-min., Color, 1964: Marine landing, "Operation Steel Pike" at Huelva, Spain.

Navy Screen Highlights—Twice a Citizen, MN–8984V, 14-min., B&W, 1965: Reserve training and duty in the active Navy.

Navy Screen Highlights—Strike From the Sea, MN–8984W, 14-min., Color, 1966: First Navy report on operations off the coast of Vietnam since bombing of North Vietnam began. Shows Navy gunfire support missions, carrier strikes over North Vietnam, Operation "Market Time" and amphibious warfare.

Navy Screen Highlights—Vietnam; The Navy Ashore, MN–8984X, 14-min., Color, 1966: Illustration of Navy civil assistance programs on Vietnam.

Navy Screen Highlights—Search and Rescue, MN–8984Y, 14-min., Color, 1968: Depicts the role played by ships and aircraft of the Navy's search and rescue forces in authentic photography of a rescue of a downed pilot near enemy-held territory.

Navy Wings of Gold, MN–8564A2, 28-min., Color, 1966: Story of the Navy pilot from early training where he earns his Navy air "wings" to become a combat pilot on a carrier on the line.

Nuclear Navy, The, MN–10101, 28-min., Color, 1967: Story of the Navy's development of nuclear power and its application in long-range submarines and the growing nuclear surface force. Narrated by Frank Blair.

Oceanographer of the Navy Reports, MN–10066A, 28-min, Color, 1965: Report on the latest developments in the field of oceanography.

Oceanography—Science for Survival, MN–9835, 42-min., Color, 1964.

Oceanography—Science for Survival, MN–9835A2, 28-min., Color, 1964: Shows the roles of the Navy within the framework of the Interagency Committee on Oceanography's numerous projects on oceanography.

Old Glory, MD–6962CV, 28-min., Color, 1960: Describes the evolution of the American flag from 1607 to the new 50-star flag of 1960.

Pacific Frontier, MN–9606, 28½-min., Color, 1965: Depicts naval operations throughout the Pacific area. This film, narrated by Alexander Scourby, shows every aspect of Pacific and Seventh Fleet Operations from ASW to goodwill activities ashore and includes Navy activity in Vietnam. The film contains excellent photography and a fine original music score.

Pacific Missile Range, The, MN–8879, 14½-min., Color, 1960: Shows the operation and mission of the Navy-operated Pacific Missile Range at Point Mugu, California.

Partners at Sea, MN–10006B, 28-min., Color, 1966: Story of Unitas VI—ASW exercise with Latin American Countries.

Polaris, Blue and Gold, MN–9756, 10-min., 1962: Film takes the audience aboard a typical Polaris submarine and shows the vital role each man plays in its operation.

Polaris Submarine: Journal of an Undersea Voyage, MC–9925, 56-min., Color 1963: Martin Agronsky and an NBC camera crew accompany USS George Washington on a patrol in Atlantic waters and observe a Polaris test firing. Produced by NBC, this is an outstanding documentary presentation of life on board a typical Fleet Ballistic Missile submarine. (No TV).

Polaris to Poseidon, MN–9442, 14½-min., Color, 1966: A colorful story of one of the Navy's major contributions to world peace, the Polaris missile submarine and the men who operate her. You're taken on a quick trip to see the men train to be Polaris Submariners, then into the submarine itself with the crew for a practice launch with all the tension of the real thing. The film is an insight to what makes the man and his powerful machine tick.

Portrait of Antarctica, MN–8942, 28-min, Color, 1962: Film of the Navy's support of scientific efforts being conducted in the Antarctic during Operation Deepfreeze. Shows logistic support operations, scientific surveys, and activities of the traverse and wintering over parties on the icebound continent.

Power for Continent Seven, MC–9927, 30-min, Color, 1963: Depicts the scientific effort in the Antarctic, the installation of the nuclear power unit, and the Navy's work in support of the national Antarctic research effort.

Quiet Warrior, The, MN–10552, 28-min, Color, 1968: The story of a Naval Air Reserve Squadron and how these reservist-citizens keep in readiness by training on weekends.

Ready for Sea, MN–9515, 29-min, Color, 1966: Story of the preparation of Navy supply officers through OCS and the Naval Supply Officer School at Athens, Georgia, ending with shipboard assignments showing the application of their training.

Ready on Arrival, MC–10376, 28-min, Color, 1967: Portrays life aboard an attack aircraft carrier as its crew trains for and then conducts air strikes off the coast of Vietnam; with stirring scenes of flight deck operations. Produced by Grumman Aircraft Company.

Ring of Valor, MC–9556A3, 29-min., Color, 1963: Depicts the life of a Midshipman in his four years at the Naval Academy. Explains the meaning of his graduation ring as a symbol of the responsibility he will assume as a naval officer. Shows the academic, military, athletic, and social life at the academy.

River Patrol, MN–10438, 28-min., Color, 1968: The story of one aspect of the American Navy's operations in the Mekong Delta, South Vietnam.

Salute to the Navy, MA–9944, 28-min., B&W, 1962: Produced as a sequence in the Army TV series, "The Big Picture," this film reviews the role of the Navy and Marine Corps. It shows the role of the Navy fighting ships from "Old Ironsides" through today's nuclear powered combatants. Scenes from WWII show shore bombardments, amphibious landings, carrier strikes, and Kamikaze attacks on our ships off Okinawa, Naval operations in Korea are also shown.

Seabees Can Do Plus, MN–6841, 15-min., B&W, 1950: Depicts the work performed by the Seabees in World War II.

Seabee Teams, MN–10393, 30-min., Color, 1966: Story of Navy "STAT" teams training Vietnamese to build roads, homes, and schools in South Vietnam.

Sealab I, MN–10100, 28-min., Color, 1965: Navy's exploratory attempt to apply laboratory studies of man's ability to live and work in an artificial atmosphere at a depth of 200 feet for prolonged periods.

Seapower, MN–9907, 28-min., Color, 1964: Film is produced by Warner Brothers and narrated by Glenn Ford. Illustrates the tasks and mission of the Navy in protecting the sea lanes and the security of the free world. It shows how a strong Navy should stress our Nation's reliance on maritime trade and the necessity for development of the wealth of undersea resources. Seapower realistically portrays the practical application of versatile naval strength in contributing to the solution of the 1962 Cuban Crisis.

Seapower in the Pacific, MN–6124, 30-min, B&W, 1946: Points up the vital part played by United States seapower in World War II. Covers loss of our ships at Pearl Harbor, the steady growth of the Fleet, widening of our sea lanes, the liberation of Manila, and the final victory.

Seapower—Plymouth Rock to Polaris, MN–10019, 28-min, Color, 1965: Shows the history and growth of American naval power and its importance.

Second Seat, The, MN–9594, Color, 1964: Shows the training and actual work of the Naval Air Observer. There is much excellent aerial photography.

Service to the Fleet, MN–8079, 14-min, B&W, 1955: Edward R. Murrow describes how the fighting fleet is supplied for continuous operations at sea by the Service Forces.

Small Boat Navy, MN–10387, 28-min, Color, 1968: Raymond Burr narrates this up-to-date report on the operations of the U.S. Navy's small boats in Vietnam. Uniquely designed to meet the challenges of riverine and coastal warfare, these boats along with helicopters are depicted on coastal or river patrols under enemy fire or spearheading invasions in enemy held river territory.

Spirit of Freedom, MN–10581, 28-min, Color, 1968: With opening and closing on screen narration by Senator Everett Dirksen, this film depicts the heritage of our freedom with colorful music and song by the U.S. Navy Band and Sea Chanters.

Stay in School and Graduate, MN–8707, 14-min, Color, 1958: This film demonstrates to prospective enlistees the importance of having a high school diploma, and shows the opportunities offered by the Navy to graduates.

Story of a Carrier Pilot, MC–9934, 28-min., B&W, 1963: Follows a young naval aviator through qualifications in F4B Phantoms, ending with his squadron on board the USS *Ranger*. Excellent documentation of one individual's mental and physical reactions as he prepares to qualify in this record-breaking, carrier-based aircraft (No TV).

Story of Naval Aviation, The, MN–9633, 27-min., B&W, 1961: The development of U.S. Naval aviation is traced from its earliest days to its modern day role as the primary striking weapon of the fleet. The first Trans-Atlantic flight and the first U.S. carrier landing are also depicted.

Story of the Navy Uniform, The, MD–6962CH, 19-min., B&W, 1958: Story of the evolution of the U.S. Navy enlisted man's uniform from "Jack Tars to White Hats."

Sub Killers, MC–9614, 28-min., B&W, 1960: Walter Cronkite narrates the story of an antisubmarine task force. Produced by CBS for the "20th Century" series, this fast-moving film shows the hunter-killer group in a coordinated anti-submarine attack (No TV).

Submarines, The, MN–10227, 28-min., Color, 1967: Story of the men who qualify to operate the modern nuclear attack submarines; their specialized skills, duties, and responsibilities which keep them prepared to battle another submarine, anytime, under any condition.

Summer Incident, MN–8982, 27-min., Color, 1959: Using the Lebanon crisis as an example, this film emphasizes the importance of being able to react quickly to continuous world crises and small war situations. Shows the important role played by the Navy and Marine Corps in supporting the foreign policy of the United States. The SIXTH Fleet is featured in this film.

Tak'er Down, MN–9294, 13-min., B&W, 1954: A brief history of the U.S. submarines from 1900 until 1954. Includes the launching and commissioning of USS NAUTILUS, the Navy's first nuclear powered ship.

To Catch a Shadow, MC–10392, 28-min., Color, 1967: Demonstrates the antisubmarine warfare capabilities of the Navy's modern hunter-killer force. Produced by Lockheed California Company. (NO TV)

United States Arriving, MN–9928, 28-min., Color, 1963: Follows the visit, in June 1963, of John F. Kennedy, late President of the United States, to the First Fleet, Point Mugu, NOTS China Lake, and the Marine Corps Recruit Depot, San Diego. This film is an outstanding narrative of the historic relationship between the President's Fleet visit and the history and traditions of the Sea Services.

U.S. Naval Test Pilot School, The, MN–8613, 13-min., Color, 1959: Follows a test pilot through the school at the Patuxent River Naval Air Station, showing the school's academic and flying curriculum.

USS *Forrestal* (CVA–59), MN–8087, 21min., B&W, 1955: A documentary on the construction of a modern aircraft carrier. Shows building phases from keel laying to sea trials and final commissioning.

USS *Nautilus*—Operation Sunshine, MN–8936, 14-min., Color, 1959: Shows events leading up to and the actual polar passage of the nuclear submarine USS *Nautilus*. Concludes with the triumphant arrival of SSN–571 in New York.

Water Masses of the Ocean, MN–10064, 45-min., Color, 1967: A scientific film study of the locations and dynamic movements of the major water masses of the oceans.

Weaponeers of the Deep, MN–10330, 28-min., Color, 1967: To acquaint members of selected civic organizations and personnel at Navy recruit training centers with the educational and career opportunities of serving as an FBM weaponeer in the Polaris submarine fleet.

Why Vietnam, MD–6962ET, 32-min., B&W, 1965: Outlines U.S. Policy as stated by President Johnson. Also appearing in the film are Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara.

Yankee Do, MN–9587, 28-min., Color, 1962: Illustrates the importance of the attack carrier as the backbone of the fast carrier task force as seen through the eyes of a Canadian Naval Aviator. Shows how the men of the Navy maintain and operate these carriers.

Year of the Polaris, MC–9561, 55-min., B&W, 1960: Story of the development of the Polaris weapons system and the Fleet Ballistic Missile submarine. Narrated by Edward R. Murrow, this CBS-produced film includes extensive interiors and exteriors of the USS George Washington, and includes Polaris missile firing. (No TV).

TO OBTAIN NAVY FILMS

Requests for the loan of Navy motion pictures should be addressed to the Commandant of the appropriate Naval District, Attn: Public Affairs Officer, as listed below:

First Naval District, 495 Summer Street, Boston, Massachusetts 02000.

Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Vermont.

Third Naval District, 90 Church Street, New York, New York 10007.

Connecticut, New Jersey (northern half), and New York.

Fourth Naval District, U.S. Naval Base, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19112.

Delaware, New Jersey (southern half), Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

Fifth Naval District, U.S. Naval Base, Norfolk, Virginia 23511.

Kentucky, Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia.

Sixth Naval District, U.S. Naval Base, Charleston, South Carolina 29408.

Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

Eighth Naval District, U.S. Naval Base, New Orleans, Louisiana 70140.

Arkansas, Louisiana, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas.

Ninth Naval District, U.S. Naval Training Center, Bldg. L, Great Lakes, Illinois 60088.

Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin, and Wyoming.

Eleventh Naval District, 937 Harbor Drive, San Diego, California 92130.

Arizona, and California (southern half).

Twelfth Naval District, Building 450, Treasure Island, San Francisco, California 94130.

California (northern half), Nevada, and Utah.

Thirteenth Naval District, U.S. Naval Station, Seattle, Washington 98115.

Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington.

Fourteenth Naval District, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii 96818.

Hawaii.

Seventeenth Naval District, Kodiak, Alaska 99615.

Alaska.

Naval District Washington, Building 200, Navy Yard Annex, U.S. Naval Station, Washington, D.C. 20390.

District of Columbia.

EXHIBIT VIII.—NAVY FILMS COMPLETED IN FISCAL YEAR 1969 RELEASED TO THE PUBLIC

Title	Length (minutes)	Prints	Cost
Flight to the South Pole (MN-10489)	28½	263	$10,000
Spirit of Freedom (MN-10581)	28½	241	15,000
The American Dreadnought (MN-10519)	28½	221	45,000
Navy Bobsledders (MN-10672)	14½	158	5,000
First in Command (MN-10414)	28½	450	63,987
Christmas in the Navy (MN-10532)	28½	450	69,274
Seapower	20	30	20,600
A Piece of the Action	15	30	21,744
The Navy Team	10	30	14,300
A Tradition in Music (MN-10679)	28½	142	10,000
Men With Green Faces (MN-10585)	28½	240	15,000
Yuletide Reflections (MN-10696)	14½	169	4,000

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, at least 240 prints of each films, the number depending on public demand, are readily available for public use at naval offices throughout the country. All Navy units are expected to promote the public showing of Navy films. "Experience has shown," the Navy stated, "that many films in the Naval District film libraries are in constant demand by private citizens and civilian organizations. Additionally, most television stations served by the three branch offices regularly schedule Navy information films in their public service spots." Two recent Navy films on the drug problem, "LSD," and "Trip to Nowhere" have been seen by 75 million people, the Navy estimated.

I question whether it is a proper function of the armed services to prepare and promote public circulation of films on the drug problem, or on the foreign policy of this country. I thought that public information on the drug problem was a responsibility of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Department of Justice. And that, if the public was to be indoctrinated on foreign policy issues at all, the Department of State was the proper agency to do it.

Mr. President, I do not want my remarks to be construed as condemnation of the personnel of the Navy Department who plan and carry out these programs to mold public attitudes to the Navy point of view. They are only doing what they are told to do and what is to be expected of all supporters of an organization, plan, or idea, commanding ample financial resources and unrestrained by superior authority. It should come as no surprise to Congress that the public affairs budget for the Department of Defense has gone up 1,000 percent in the 10 years since the congressional limitation on public relations spending was dropped. Parkinson's law operates most effectively in a vacuum. The Navy public affairs organization has only been doing what comes naturally—trying to win public support for the Navy which, in turn, will be reflected in congressional support for the "modern ships, aircraft, and equipment" referred to in the Secretary of the Navy's 1969 public affairs plan.

But there is something basically unwise and undemocratic about a system which taxes the public to finance a propaganda campaign aimed at persuading the same taxpayers that they must spend more tax dollars to subvert their independent judgment. I am reminded of W. C. Fields' admonition: "Never give a sucker an even break." With the three services and the Department of Defense, and their allies in industry, academia, and labor, all working at convincing the taxpayer that he must shell out more for military purposes, John Q. Public does not stand a chance—unless his representatives in Congress bring the public relations apparatus under control. Only Congress can give the public an even break. I hope it will take steps to do so this session.

Mr. President, this concludes my second statement on this subject. Thursday, I will discuss the public relations activities of the Air Force.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the time for the transaction of routine morning business has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time for the transaction of routine morning business be extended by an additional 20 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time for the transaction of routine morning business will be extended, by unanimous consent, for an additional 20 minutes.

ABOMINABLE ATROCITY AT MY LAI

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is evident to me that Lt. Col. Reid Kennedy, who has been designated by the commanding officer at Fort Benning, Ga., to serve as military judge in the court martial of 1st Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., in his so-called ruling threatening former GI's who were in our Armed Forces in Vietnam at the time of the slaughter of hundreds of women, children, babies, and old men at My Lai is acting much too big for his britches.

It is true that he is a lieutenant colonel in our Armed Forces. In my opinion, that is a high rank. He is deserving of my respect. It happens that I have served as a private in our Army in the time of war. Also, in March of 1946 following 37 months service, most of that time in North Africa and Italy, I was discharged as a lieutenant colonel. In 1943 while with the 5th Army in Naples directly following the day of liberation, October 1, 1943, I served as the sole trial judge presiding over numerous cases wherein Italian civilians were charged with intercepting electricity from the Fifth Army. I also heard a number of cases involving various offenses from military curfew violations to serious crimes. Also, later in Rome and in the Anzio beachhead I served as one of three military judges presiding over spy cases.

No one, but no one, Mr. President, termed me a judge because of this service. Yet, in this Chamber and in the newspapers time and again we read of some pronouncement of Lieutenant Colonel Kennedy at Fort Benning referring to him as Judge Kennedy. For example, this so-called judge who evidently is ignorant of the criminal laws of our country has directed that officials of news media must not talk with and therefore must not quote witnesses who at the time of the My Lai massacre were in the Army and witnessed the murders or participated in them. "Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed that he is grown so great?" This lieutenant colonel even issued a statement, "I am confident you will find that witnesses will not be contacted further by any responsible news agency."

This so-called judge is only a military court judge in the two separate murder cases wherein Lt. William L. Calley, Jr., will be tried by court martial.

Mr. President, Paul Meadlo, a native of my neighboring State, Indiana, was a GI who was present as a member of the platoon under the command of Lieutenant Calley and of the company commanded by Capt. Ernest Medina. Paul Meadlo has been honorably discharged from our Armed Forces. He is a civilian. He is back home in Indiana with his wife. They have two little children now. Paul Meadlo states that after talking with his wife and with his father he felt he had to purge his mind of the horror he had participated in. He has made a complete and frank statement of the facts he witnessed at the time some hundreds of Vietnamese old men, women, children, and babies living in the hamlet of Mylai were methodically murdered.

Regardless of what may be stated by anyone in this Chamber or in the other body or by this military judge at Fort Benning, who may be an execellent lieutenant colonel but appears to be a poor lawyer, I know as he should know that he has no authority whatever over Paul Meadlo or any of the other men who were in the Army at the time of the massacre but who are now out of the Army.

Mr. President, I have served, as I stated, as a military judge in spy and other cases in World War II. The fact is that before World War II in private life I was chief criminal prosecuting attorney of Cuyahoga County, Ohio. As such I prosecuted over the years many, many felony cases including more than 100

homicide cases. Then, as a trial lawyer following World War II, I have defended many men and women charged with first degree murder and other crimes. Incidentally, Mr. President, I have been president of two bar associations.

I know that the United States has no extradition treaty with the Government of South Vietnam. I know that Paul Meadlo and other former GI's now in civilian life in our country not only cannot be extradited to Vietnam and placed on trial for murder, but they cannot be placed on trial in the United States for murder or any other offense relating to the horrible murderous atrocities perpetrated by our officers and soldiers at Mylai as the venue of the crime was in South Vietnam. This so-called judge who is a lieutenant colonel at Fort Benning is too big for his britches. He has no authority whatever over news media nor over former GI's who are now civilians. He has the effrontery to make a claim that he could exercise jurisdiction and try civilians. Of course, that is absurd. Were he to take any action of this sort, any U.S. judge of the district where the former GI lived would certainly enjoin this lieutenant colonel and put him in his proper place immediately upon the request of the lawyer representing the former GI.

Ronald Haeberle, of Cleveland, Ohio, then a sergeant, and an Army public information staff member attached to C Company, 1st Battalion, 20th Infantry Regiment, 11th Light Infantry Brigade, was with the troops at Mylai. With his own color camera and with the camera provided by the Army he took numerous pictures of this atrocity. Ronald Haeberle, a fine young man, is now an industrial supervisor for a company in my home city, Cleveland. Before accepting this important position he was drafted in 1966 at a time when he was completing his third year at Ohio University. He has since graduated from that university. His assignment in Vietnam was as a combat photographer. He went on numerous combat missions. He states that what he saw in the little village of Mylai on March 16, 1968, was forever imprinted on his memory. No doubt this lieutenant colonel who some of our colleagues have tried to dignify by terming him judge is aggravated because Ronald Haeberle stated:

> I intend to tell my story because there is a greater truth here which must be told.

The pictures he took of GI's who had the hamlet known as Mylai surrounded were sickening to Secretary of the Army Resor and to members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, many of whom are combat veterans who saw the slides and listened to the testimony of Secretary of the Army Resor.

In his description of this horrible atrocity Ronald Haeberle has stated:

> There was a little boy walking toward us in a daze. He'd been shot in the arm and leg. He wasn't crying or making any noise. The GI fired three shots into the child. The first knocked him back, the second shot lifted him into the air. The third shot put him down and the body fluids came out. The GI simply . . . walked away.

Vernardo Simpson, another former GI, now a civilian, who was present at the massacre, stated:

> We went out that morning and our platoon was the second platoon in. We had orders to search and destroy everything and we came upon the huts and if there was anything in there, well, we was to destroy it and everything. As I came up there was a woman, a man and a child, running away toward the huts, So I told them to stop in their language and everything, and then they didn't, and I had orders to shoot them down and I did this. I shot them, the lady and the little boy. The little boy was about 2 years old. I was following a direct order and if I didn't do this, with that order, when I get back, I could stand court martial for not following a direct order. Afterward our platoon sergeant told us not to mention this thing, what went on and everything. That was all. I guess he had orders from somewhere else.

Charles Gruver, a 24-year-old former GI recently honorably discharged from the Army, stated:

> Everything and everybody was wiped out . . . men, women . . . children . . . Only the chickens were left alive . . . We'd never been ordered to wipe out everybody before. Most of the guys didn't dig it at all. When it was all over, they were almost sick.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have no objection, provided the morning hour is extended by that time because I also have a statement to make.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I shall not take more than 2 minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended by 3 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the period for the transaction of routine morning business will be extended by 3 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Charles Gruver said that just before the attack was launched, he heard a single pistol shot behind a tree and went over to investigate. He reported:

> A guy had deliberately shot himself in the foot.
>
> He told me he just couldn't take it—the attack on the village. He said, "I gotta get out. I can't stand this."

Mr. President, I saw a picture of the incident. That young veteran from Tulsa, Okla., is now in civilian life. He is no longer in the armed services. Let this so-called judge try to shut him up or try to arrest him and there will be some lawyer from Oklahoma before a Federal judge there, and they will stop this arrogant fellow from Fort Benning who does not understand the law although he is to be a trial officer in a court-martial.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "Tulsa Veteran Recalls Song My."

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

TULSA VETERAN RECALLS SONG MY

TULSA, OKLA.—"Everything and everybody was wiped out . . . men, women . . . children . . . Only the chickens were left alive."

Thus did an Oklahoma Vietnam veteran describe in an interview yesterday the alleged massacre at the Vietnamese village of Song My on March 16, 1968.

Charles Gruver, 24, of Tulsa, said his outfit, C Company, 20th Infantry Regiment, was told the village was a Viet Cong stronghold and was ordered to destroy it completely.

The Army has charged 1st Lt. William L. Calley Jr., 26, of Waynesville, N.C., with "the premeditated murder of approximately 100 Vietnamese civilians."

"We'd never been ordered to wipe out everybody before," he said. "Most of the guys didn't dig it at all. When it was all over, they were almost sick."

"In the last week or so we'd lost about half our company to snipers and mine fields, and the guys were really fired up when we started the attack. As we entered, we drew fire from some of the huts, and then a lot of the guys sort of went crazy."

Gruver was a private first class and carried an M79 grenade launcher.

"I walked through the village after it was all over . . . all around were bodies of women and children, all shot up."

Gruver said that just before the attack was launched, he heard a single pistol shot behind a tree and went over to investigate.

"A guy had deliberately shot himself in the foot," he said.

"He told me he just couldn't take it—the attack on the village. He said, 'I gotta get out. I can't stand this.'"

Gruver said there was no doubt in his mind that the village was a stronghold of units of the North Vietnamese regular army.

"We confiscated several weapons and took a few prisoners," he said, "and later they found an underground military hospital in the village."

The prisoners were the only persons left alive in the village, he stated.

Gruver said Lt. Calley was intensely disliked by the men because he "did a few unnecessary things."

He said he doubted that Lt. Calley would be prosecuted in the case. "They can't blame him for the whole thing. He got our orders from Capt. Ernest Medina, the company commander."

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this Lt. Col. Reid Kennedy should read the sixth amendment to the Constitution of our country and then cool off a whole lot. Amendment VI provides:

> In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the Assistance of Counsel for his defence.

This lieutenant colonel may be ignorant of the fact that the United States has no extradition treaty whatever with the government of South Vietnam. Furthermore, he should know there is no real judge, let alone the law officer in a court martial, who can overrule the guarantees given to Americans in the fifth amendment of our Constitution which provides that:

No person shall be held to answer for a capital, or otherwise infamous crime, unless on a presentment or indictment of a Grand Jury, except in cases arising in the land or naval forces . . . when in actual service in time of War.

CREEPING EXPROPRIATION

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in the past several months many of us here in the Senate have been shocked and deeply concerned over the highhanded methods of our neighbors to the South in expropriating U.S. property located in their countries. Much has been written about the expropriation of U.S. businesses located in Bolivia and Peru. Today, however, I would like to advise the Senate of the little-known and little-publicized actions of our closest neighbor, the Republic of Mexico, in its dealings with American sulfur interests located in that country. Mexico, unlike its South American neighbors, has not marched in and publicly taken over American property. Mexico's approach is much more subtle but just as devastating to American interests and could be characterized as "creeping expropriation."

A little more than 4 years ago, I made a speech on the floor of the Senate and recounted to this body certain facts about what the Mexican Government was doing to an American company, Gulf Sulphur Corp., in regard to its operations in Mexico. At that time the Mexican Government was using its power to so control the exportation of sulfur as to effectively make it infeasible for them to continue their sulfur operations there. The apparent reason for this action was to force Gulf Sulphur and another American company, Pan American Sulphur, out of business in Mexico. Possibly as a result of my speech the Mexican Government relaxed its export quota system and the American companies continued in business. However, since that time, there have been continued attempts on the part of the Mexican Government to Mexicanize sulfur operations under the guise of protecting natural resources. I, of course, can understand any country's desire to protect its resources, but it should not be done at the expense of American companies who have expended millions of dollars in the development of these resources.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as a result of substantial and illegal pressures by the Mexican Government which began early this year, Gulf Sulphur, which is now Gulf Resources and Chemical Corp., was forced to go along with this Mexicanization and after long and expensive negotiations arranged for a sale of its Mexican subsidiary to Mexican nationals for approximately $24,000,000. According to what Gulf Resources had been led to believe this was exactly what the Mexican Government desired. In fact, the Mexican Government on several occasions has expressed its approval of the sale. Now we are told that the Government of Mexico is not satisfied and has refused to approve the sale. There appears to be no valid reason for this attitude of the Mexican Government other than the fact that it wants Gulf Resources out of Mexico and does not want it to receive fair compensation for the properties which it leaves there. In other words, we have here an attempt to confiscate property without direct intervention as the following facts will clearly show.

About 2 years ago, Gulf Resources' largest competitor in Mexico, Pan American Sulphur, was Mexicanized. Sitting on the board of that new Mexican company are high-ranking officials of the Mexican Government, including the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Patriminio. These people know that if the Mexican Government can prevent a sale by Gulf Resources at this time, the price will drop and its Mexican operations can be Mexicanized for a price far less than their true value. At that time, the Mexican Government can sit back and say, "We did not expropriate; we did not confiscate; we bought the company. We are not like Peru and Bolivia."

By doing business this way Mexico may feel that the United States will continue to look upon it as a "good" neighbor. However, the situation which I have just described does not bear out this facade and it is high time that our Government stops sitting back and allowing those countries which we have financially assisted in our trade and aid policies to expropriate American properties, irrespective of whether that expropriation is done by force of arms or by the subtle method of refusing to negotiate in good faith.

As in 1964, I intend to inquire of the State Department whether this neoconfiscation to which I have referred comes within the Hickenlooper amendment. Also, as I stated then on the floor of the Senate, I intend to take whatever action necessary to demonstrate that people who engage in this kind of irresponsible conduct will have reason to regret it. This includes the use of my best efforts as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee to insure that those nations that confiscate our investments will not sell the United States sugar at premium prices. We should and must be able to make certain that Americans who have made good-faith investments based upon the encouragement of their own Government and the recipient nation will not have their investments stolen directly or indirectly.

Mr. President, along this line and in support of my argument, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles which appeared in the Wall Street Journal on November 13, 1969, and December 1, 1969.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 13, 1969]

GULF RESOURCES SAYS MEXICO IS ATTEMPTING TO GRAB PROPERTIES—EXECUTIVE CONTENDS AUTHORITIES ARE BLOCKING CONCERN'S EFFORTS TO SELL ITS SULPHUR SUBSIDIARY

HOUSTON—Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp. charged that the Mexican government is attempting to confiscate the company's sulphur properties in Mexico.

Robert H. Allen, Gulf Resources president, told Houston financial analysts that Mexican authorities are blocking all efforts of the company to sell its sulphur subsidiary and that if continued restrictions are imposed on the sulphur operations, Gulf Resources will seek redress in Mexico's courts.

The company previously agreed to sell its Mexican sulphur operations to a Mexican corporation. Inversiones Azufreras S.A.

Despite repeated attempts, Gulf Resources has had "practically no communication with the Mexican government" for more than nine months, Mr. Allen said, adding: "There are no indications now that the Mexican government intends to permit us to close the sale of our properties there, and rather than Mexicanization there are now indications that what amounts to confiscation is now being considered."

MARKETING POSTURE DESTROYED

Because of pressures and restrictions previously imposed on the sulphur unit, Mr. Allen continued, "Our marketing posture in the sulphur market has been destroyed. We've lost most of our quality customers." As a result, he said, operating losses in sulphur have depressed earnings for Gulf Resources this year.

But, he added, "regardless of developments in Mexico in 1970, we will have a considerable increase in earnings per share" for Gulf Resources. Improvements are expected in earnings of other operations of the company, including Lithium Corp. of America and Bunker Hill Co. "There is every indication that earnings from other than sulphur will be improved by substantial margins in 1970; we see extremely attractive growth for the future without the sulphur operation," Mr. Allen said.

In another development yesterday, Gulf Resources said it agreed in principle to acquire C&K Coal Co., Clarion, Pa., for common stock valued at more than $6 million.

The proposal calls for Gulf Resources to exchange 500,000 to 560,000 common shares for all outstanding stock of C&K, which is closely held. The exact number would depend on the average closing price of Gulf Resources common on the New York Stock Exchange for a period yet to be determined. It closed yesterday at $12.50, down $1.625.

The transaction is subject to the approval of a definitive agreement by C&K holders and Gulf Resources directors. C&K owns coal reserves of about 18 million tons in west central Pennsylvania.

As previously reported, Gulf Resources had a 63% decline in operating net income in the first nine months, to $1.6 million, or 26 cents a share, from year-earlier operating profit of $4.4 million, or $1.01 a share. For the nine months, the company reported a loss of $515,900 from the sulphur operations; in 1968, those operations resulted in a net gain of $1.8 million.

CLOSING DATE DELAYED

Last August, Gulf Resources signed a purchase agreement with Inversiones Azufreras for the sale by Sept. 2 of its sulphur operations for $24 million in cash and notes. Earlier this week, Gulf Resources disclosed that the closing date of the sale had been delayed to Dec. 1 because a number of rulings pertinent to the completion of the transaction hadn't been received from several Mexican government ministries.

In his talk to Houston analysts, Mr. Allen charged that several of the Mexican officials whose approval is needed are stockholders and directors of another Mexican group that owns two-thirds of Azufrera Panamericana S.A., an affiliate of Pan American Sulphur Co. Their aim, he suggested, is to force Gulf Resources into a distress sale of its sulphur properties, which then would be combined with those of Azufrera Panamericana.

Gulf Resources wouldn't object to such a combination if it were to receive an adequate price for its sulphur subsidiary, Mr. Allen said. In fact, he added, Gulf Resources has been approached on several occasions by Mexican representatives of Azufrera Panamericana. "Each time we told them that we were interested," he said.

PRODUCTION RESTRICTIONS

Gulf Resources' troubles in Mexico date back to early this year, shortly after it had been granted, in December, a license to export 416,000 tons of sulphur in 1970. But in January, the company was notified by the Mexican government that production would be restricted to 250,000 tons in 1969 and that 150,000 tons of that amount would have to be sold to consumers in Mexico.

Because of these factors, Mr. Allen said, Gulf Resources produced only 176,000 tons in the first nine months and sold only 141,000 tons. In the first nine months of 1968, Gulf Resources produced 238,000 tons of sulphur selling 192,000 tons.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Dec. 1, 1969]

GULF RESOURCES TO HALT SULPHUR OPERATIONS IN MEXICO IN 1970; PLANNED SALE TERMINATED

HOUSTON.—Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp. will suspend sulphur operations in Mexico after Jan. 1.

Robert H. Allen, president, said the move is being made because the Mexican government won't grant "the necessary rulings and assurances required to permit the proposed purchase of Gulf Resources' Mexican subsidiaries by Inversiones Azufreras S.A."

Mr. Allen added that Nacional Financiera S.A., the Mexican government development bank, has informed the intended purchaser of the Gulf Resources properties that the rulings wouldn't be forthcoming. As a result, he said, Inversiones Azufreras has given Gulf Resources notice of termination of the purchase agreement signed last August, which called for closing of the transaction today.

Inversiones Azufreras, a company formed for the acquisition of the Gulf Resources properties, is associated with a diversified financial and industrial group headed by Alberto Bailleres of Mexico City.

PRESSURES TO "MEXICANIZE"

Gulf Resources was going to sell the properties to the Mexican group because of pressures to "Mexicanize." Mr. Allen said the restrictions imposed on sulphur production and sales beginning last January "were clearly intended to encourage Mexicanization."

In Mexico City, sources close to the government disputed Mr. Allen's charges that the Mexican government was responsible for canceling the planned sale. They claimed that Gulf Resources is seeking to blame Mexican government officials for its failure to negotiate the sale of its surphur properties under favorable terms.

Industry sources in Mexico City added that the continuing depressed state of sulphur demand and prices was a factor in making the Inversiones Azufreras group less anxious to complete the purchase of the Gulf Resources properties.

The Mexico City sources also said Nacional Financiera had been asked to act as the guarantor of the purchase. The development bank refused to do this unless the purchase terms and conditions were of a nature that "would satisfy the standards used by any responsible bank," one observer said.

In his announcement of the pending closedown of operations in Mexico, Mr. Allen said that at the time the agreement for sale of Gulf Resources' properties was signed he had been informed that Nacional Financiera would receive approximately 40% of the stock in Inversiones Azufreras on completion of the transaction.

Mr. Allen continued that restrictions imposed last January by the Mexican government on Gulf Resources' production and sales of sulphur had resulted in a severe economic loss to Gulf Resources. As a result, he added, "Gulf has been unable to protect its position in the sulphur market."

He said also that because of this and falling sulphur prices the company could only expect higher losses in the future if sulphur operations were continued. "Operation of the sulphur subsidiaries at their current level requires the expenditure of approximately $500,000" a month which must be provided "through sale of sulphur or through advances from Gulf," Mr. Allen said.

INVESTMENT TO BE PROTECTED

In view of the Mexican government's refusal to issue rulings that would enable the sale to take place, Mr. Allen said, the company couldn't permit the operations in Mexico to continue to affect profit and interfere with Gulf Resources' growth in the U.S.

Although operations will be suspended, "All steps required to keep the concession agreement in force and to protect the company's investment in Mexico will be taken," Mr. Allen said.

He added that Gulf Resources will provide a reserve by an extraordinary charge to income during 1969 to cover the estimated costs of termination pay required under Mexican laws, of closing the facilities and of maintaining the facilities in idle condition for the next several years. The charge, he said, will be shown as an increase in the loss of sulphur operations for 1969. Costs incurred in future years as a result of suspension of operations will be charged to the reserve and won't affect earnings of Gulf Resources, he added.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in order to complete the history of this matter, it might be well to reprint in the RECORD at this time the speech I made on May 14, 1965, about the proposed outrage at that time which I believe was headed off as a result of that speech. I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

THE OUTRAGE IN MEXICO

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, with the crisis which arose in the Dominican Republic, it may very well be that many of my colleagues and other American citizens may have overlooked the recent action taken by another Latin American neighbor, Mexico, respecting American sulfur interests. Under what appears to be the pretext of protecting its natural resources in the form of sulfur reserves, the Mexican Government has announced that it will limit exports under a formula which very well may prevent the two American companies operating in Mexico—Gulf Sulphur Corp. and Pan American Sulphur Co.—from exporting sulfur produced there. This action on the part of the Mexican Government is tantamount to expropriation since Mexico is unable to consume sulfur in quantities nearly sufficient to make it financially feasible for Pan American and Gulf Sulphur to continue their mining operations.

This being the case, the only alternative would be for these American-owned companies to make some arrangement to sell or otherwise dispose of their investment in Mexico. Since American investors certainly would not risk putting dollars into an industry which has been deprived of its basic markets, the only alternative would seem to be a forced sale to the Mexican Government or to local nationals selected by Mexico. Although the Mexican Government probably will argue that they have not taken over the sulfur industry, the fact remains that what they are doing will have that result, the only difference being that it will be shrouded in a veil of respectability under the name of conservation. Instead of directly taking over the American sulfur interests, Mexico is simply forcing them out of business.

As has been advocated in the Senate before, it is high time that the American Government take some steps toward preventing the loss of American dollars abroad through expropriation, especially in the case of those countries to whom we give great sums in economic aid. Mexico is one of those countries. Why should we, as a country, support the economic program of a nation which in turn imposes economic sanctions against our citizens? In the case of the American sulfur industry in Mexico, we are not talking about so-called robber barons who have exploited for huge profits the resources and people of an underprivileged or economically depressed nation. If this were the situation there might be some merit, or at least an excuse, for forcing out American industry. However, let us look at the facts with respect to one of the companies which may stand to lose its entire investment in Mexico. Gulf Sulphur Corp. is a relatively small company which completed construction of mine facilities early in 1956 at a cost of $10 million and began operations in May of that year. The company employs 500 people, only 17 of whom are U.S. citizens. Most of these employees work in Salinas, which is a town of 3,500 people, located in the semi-tropical State of Vera Cruz. Before the sulfur company came to Salinas, the people depended upon river water in its unpurified state for drinking and cooking, but they are now receiving potable water from the mining operations. The nearest hospital was an hour and a half away by boat, but the mining company now maintains a well-equipped hospital with two doctors and four nurses who treat the villagers. The company gave to the union to which its employees belong a school that the town theretofore had been unable to afford. Four years ago only 45 pupils were enrolled in the school's 6 grades, while today there are 375 attending a modern 10-classroom school, well staffed with qualified teachers. In addition, its students who wish to continue their education through high school at a distant town are provided transportation expenses and through a full scholarship program some students will go on to one of Mexico's colleges or universities. Gulf Sulphur Corp. also has a project underway for building 118 houses and a large community building in Salinas, which will cost approximately $260,000. This project, of course, will have to be abandoned in the event that it must give up its operations due to the action of the Mexican Government.

What I have outlined here clearly shows that this company, rather than trying to exploit the citizens of Mexico, has given to them benefits far and above those which could be provided by their own government. This is not a case of an American company reaping the riches of a depressed country by using low labor costs to extract its natural resources solely for the personal gain of its investors. Since 1956, expenditures by Gulf

Sulphur Corp. in Mexico, in the form of royalties, taxes, salaries, wages, profitsharing, medical, and social benefits to employees, and other expenses have totaled approximately 600 million pesos. Currently 80 percent of each peso generated from sulfur sales is being left in Mexico. The balance, or 20 percent of each peso, has been used to pay freight on sulfur shipments from Mexico, construct liquid sulful terminals in the United States, service debt created in the United States, and for general and administrative costs. To date, the stockholders of the company have not been paid dividends.

The tragedy of this irresponsible action of the Mexican Government, therefore, lies not only with the loss of investment by American citizens, but also by the loss of jobs and benefits to the Mexican citizens, as well as the destruction of advantages accruing to the Mexican nation itself.

It may also be asked: Just who are these American investors who stand to lose their money. In the case of Gulf Sulphur Corp., there are about 5,000 stockholders, all of whom are U.S. citizens with the exception of 18 who are Mexican nationals, and most of whom can ill afford such a loss. Actually, these shareholders have already suffered a substantial decrease in their stock's value as a result of the announcement by the Government of Mexico of its intent to limit exports of sulfur. On April 25, 1965, when Mexico made its announcement, Gulf Sulphur stock was selling on the American Stock Exchange at $12.50 a share, and it is presently selling for around $7. It takes no economic expert to see that a great deal of harm has already been done.

It is, of course, not within the power of the Congress of the United States to prevent the Government of Mexico from taking such action as it may desire with respect to its internal affairs, but it is within our power to see that any government which by means of expropriation of American property or economic sanctions having the same effect, is not subsidized by us in these efforts. That is exactly what we do when we send millions of dollars to these countries in an attempt to help build up their economy and they in turn confiscate U.S. investments, undermining the Alliance for Progress, and scaring American capital away from all of Latin America. When we help friendly governments to improve the conditions of their people, we should make it law that our help stops the moment their officials start robbing us.

Several years ago I was successful in persuading the Foreign Relations Committee to accept an amendment forbidding foreign aid to nations that confiscate American investments. Subsequently the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] perfected my proposal to make it apply to schemes of this nature which are, in fact, a subtle form of confiscation, although the prompter of the steal pretends otherwise. The perfected legislation has come to be known as the Hickenlooper amendment.

I am, therefore, inquiring of the State Department whether the neoconfiscation to which I have referred comes within the Hickenlooper amendment. If not, then I intend to offer an amendment to the foreign aid bill to see that foreign aid is denied to perpetrators of this sort of steal.

It was the efforts of the junior Senator from Louisiana which were responsible for amending the language in the Sugar Act, to make certain that the United States would not pay a bonus for sugar to countries which are in the process of confiscating American investments. The amendment to that act does not have the refinements of the Hickenlooper amendment, so that act may need an additional amendment. As the Senator who managed the sugar bill in the Senate some years ago, and who has been a constant advocate of sugar legislation for the benefit of both our own sugar producers and our friends abroad, I intend to exert my best efforts to perfect the language I insisted on when the amendment to the Sugar Act was before us, to make certain that nations that confiscate our investments will not sell us sugar at premium prices. If I have anything to say about it, they will not sell us any sugar.

It is only by demonstrating to people who have this kind of scheme in mind that their nations will suffer by such actions that we shall be able to make certain that Americans who in good faith invest their money, on the encouragement both of their own Government and the recipient nation, will have an opportunity to develop resources on a basis which will be good both for us and for those who receive benefits from the investments, without having the investments stolen from them after a company has made a success of them.

Mr. President, along this line, and in support of my argument, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Robbing the Gringo; the Outrage in Mexican Sulphur Turns Back the Clock," published in Barron's National Business & Financial Weekly for May 3, 1965.

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

"ROBBING THE GRINGO—THE OUTRAGE IN MEXICAN SULFUR TURNS BACK THE CLOCK

"Successful investing, as the financial community will cheerfully attest, requires hard work, judgment and nerve. Now and then, however, luck takes a hand in the game. In 'Reminiscences of a Stock Operator,' a fascinating account of Wall Street 50 years ago, the author tells of dropping into his broker's office one Friday morning in the spring of 1906, and, merely on a hunch, selling short several thousand shares of Union Pacific Railroad. Over the weekend came word of the San Francisco earthquake. On the other side of the ledger, brokers still shudder at the fate of their ill-starred colleague who, shortly before the collapse of the fats and oil empire of Tino De Angelis, became a partner in the doomed firm of Ira Haupt & Co. Ten days ago one of the ablest investment advisers in the business fell afoul of fortune. When Pan American Sulfur Co. common, which sold as high as 59 in early April, recently declined to 50, this old pro viewed the move as an 'exceptional buying opportunity.' Thus he took his position in the stock—and told the world about it—just before the bottom dropped out.

"In his misery over Pan Am Sulfur (or Pasco, as it is known), the unlucky expert today has plenty of company. Except in a major bear market, few securities have suffered so drastic or abrupt a decline: since reaching the high less than a month ago, the shares have lost more than 40 percent of their value. Hence the plunge caught a good many knowledgeable Wall Streeters long. Several brokerage firms and advisory services recently recommended the stock. Chartists projected a clear-cut uptrend. Institutional investors at latest reckoning owned over 400,000 shares, or roughly one-fifth of the total equity.

"Their confidence rested on apparently solid ground; until mid-April, Pan American Sulfur had all the earmarks of a growth company in a resurgent industry. Virtually overnight, however, its glowing prospects have dimmed. For the Government of Mexico (where its properties lie) arbitrarily has imposed export restrictions which have hampered its day-to-day operations and will halt its long-term expansion. The new decrees are designed to conserve Mexico's supply of a vital raw material. They will have other, less palatable results. For one thing, they are likely to create a new privileged class of local entrepreneur with close, and doubtless mutually profitable, connections with officialdom. What is worse, the episode is bound to jeopardize the inflow of foreign capital. For a quarter-century Mexico has sought, with considerable success of late, to live down its ill-advised expropriation of United States and British oil interests. Last month, the Government suddenly acted like a reformed bandit who cannot give up his old tricks. Robbing the gringo, as everyone south of the Rio Grande should have learned by now, is no way to get rich.

"In Mexico, as in other parts of the world, highway robbery today may go cloaked in legality. As the Pan American Sulfur Co. carefully noted in its listing application, its operations are subject to inspection, study and regulation by the Mexican Government; production and exports are subject to limitation, and, in order to export sulfur from Mexico, a permit from the Mexican Government is required * * *. After years of bureaucratic routine, the authorities last month suddenly invoked their powers. Without explanation or warning, they held up one of Pasco's shipments. After several days of painful uncertainty, they finally disclosed their purpose. Mexico has imposed export quotas on Pan American Sulfur and a smaller competitor, Gulf Sulfur. Under the new conidtions, both U.S.-owned producers this year may ship without hindrance half of last year's volume; the other half, as well as all future quotas, will hinge on their discovery of fresh reserves (10 percent of which may be exported). In no event may either company exceed last year's total sales abroad.

"The new restrictions, so the Secretary of the National Patrimony has avered, aim to protect Mexico's supply of sulfur, which otherwise soon might run out. The quaintly named official surely knows better. While traces of the mineral turned up a half-century ago, Mexico for all practical purposes had no reserves until a handful of daring U.S. promoters, financed by American capital, launched programs of exploration and development after World War II. Ten years ago the country produced less than 100,000 tons; last year, in striking contrast, output approached 2 million. Since the Government estimates current proven reserves at nearly 16 million tons—a figure which other sources regard as far too low—fears of future shortage, even at the recent recordbreaking rate of shipment, hardly can account for the abrupt flexing of bureaucratic muscle. A likelier explanation, in our own jaundiced view, is the striking shift in the marketplace, which has transformed sulfur, after years of oversupply, into a relatively scarce, highly profitable commodity, a prize which local interests have grown greedy to share. Heads we win, the Mexicans have told the U.S. producers in legal language, tails you lose.

"The new rules faithfully embody what might be called the looter's code. For they bestow valuable privileges on one group (seven prospective entries, all of which boast majority control by local interests, already have applied for sulfur concessions) at the expense of another; i.e., the industry's pioneers. Both Pan American and Gulf, as the stock market belatedly has realized, will suffer in various ways. Much sulfur is sold on long-term contracts, which, in view of the massive uncertainties surrounding exports after January 1, henceforth will be hard to come by. Any business enterprise must plan for the future; in the case of both Pan American and Gulf, however, production and sales schedules apparently will hinge on the unpredictable discovery and proof of fresh reserves. Perhaps the worst of all, by making last year's results the ceiling, the authorities have slapped a lid on further growth.

"To one of the most inspiring pages in the annals of postwar capitalism, the dead hand

of Government thus threatens a sorry end. On the industrial map of the world, the Isthmus of Tehuantepec represents quite an achievement. To put it there, men took enormous financial risks. Despite the backing of the Export-Import Bank, one venture, the Mexican Gulf Sulfur Co., went broke when its reserves petered out; Gulf Sulfur in its early years piled up a staggering deficit. Once in operation, the fledgling producers plunged into competition with such powerful rivals as Texas Gulf Sulfur and Freeport, thereby shattering one of the most lucrative and longest-lived cartels in history. (Shares of both concerns, which will benefit from Mexico's folly, shot up last week.) Far from exploiting the hapless natives, finally, the two producers have made a major contribution to the nation's economic life. Mexico collects a 15-percent royalty on every ton of sulfur mined, as well as nearly half the producer's pretax profits. Pasco last year accounted for $21 million of the gross national product; all told, since it was organized, the company has bought and paid for nearly $150 million worth of local goods and services. Against such a record of achievement, official concern over the 'national patrimony' adds insult to injury.

"On the latter score, thanks to the Mexican authorities, U.S. investors are out-of-pocket over $50 million. In the end, however, Mexico is apt to be the biggest loser. Nearly 30 years ago President Cardenas, with a stroke of the pen, destroyed his country's credit and set back its development. Those who refuse to learn from history are doomed to repeat it."

ELIMINATION OF THE MENACE OF LEAD-BASED PAINT POISONING OF CHILDREN

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the years before World War II, lead poisoning was a common-enough occurence to warrant a vigorous attack against its causes. Cases of lead intoxication among adults are rare today, even in lead processing and lead-using industries where the possibility of overexposure seems greatest.

These improvements are the direct result of broadly increased knowledge about the physiological effects of lead as well as extended research on ways to protect against lead poisoning hazards.

One insidiously damaging problem area still remains a threat to the health of thousands of children, lead-based paint poisoning.

Generally, buildings constructed more than 30 years ago are the prime source of lead-based paint poisoning today. Particularly in big city slum areas is this danger highest. Chips of peeling paint from radiators and flaking paint from deteriorating walls create the major source of this hazard because young children have a natural tendency to place objects in their mouths. Flaking paint chips seem to be a particularly appealing item to children with pica, which is a condition of abnormal appetite that makes children want to eat nonfood items.

Children also fall victim to lead intoxication by chewing on lead-painted windowsills, baseboards, or other surfaces.

Major sources of present-day contamination with lead, aside from deteriorating housing, include solder, food processing, gasoline engine exhaust, and industrial waste.

Lead poisoning or plumbism, in our contemporary urbanizing society, is one of society's defects that lie just below the surface. To the lay community and even to a major part of the medical community, this problem exists much like an iceberg; only a small part of its enormity is visible on the surface. But, since lead poisoning is an entirely preventable disease, it is appropriate that the public and the medical community be made aware of the problem.

New York City once averaged 500 cases of lead poisoning a year; the city health department now estimates that a "silent epidemic" of lead contamination may be affecting as many as 25,000 slum children.

In 1965, the board of health in Chicago termed the city's 12 reported lead poisoning deaths to be of "epidemic proportions" and launched a screening program to detect victims of poisoning. Through September 1966, tests on 30,000 youngsters turned up 700 youngsters for treatment of lead poisoning.

Rochester, N.Y., reports show about 7 percent of that city's preschool slum children poisoned by lead. In Baltimore, the incidence is reported at 7 percent and in Cleveland it is 6 percent.

Children's Hospital in Boston estimates the incidence of the disease in the slum areas of that community include 5 to 10 percent of the children from 1 to 5 years of age. Other evidence shows that the incidence in the newer suburbs built after World War II is less than 1 in 1,000.

In the summer of 1968, of 800 children screened in one high risk area of Boston, 98 had evidence of lead poisoning and required treatment.

Across the Nation reports show that children between 1 and 3 years of age are the sufferers in 85 percent of all reported cases. Two-year-olds account for more than 50 percent of the deaths attributable to lead poisoning. About 200 children die from lead poisoning every year. Estimates of the number of children that may be poisoned by lead each year ranges as high as 400,000. Between 12,000 and 16,000 are treated and survive. Half of those who receive treatment are left mentally retarded. Only about one case in 25 of these is treated.

Although the rate of deaths directly attributable to lead poisoning has dropped in recent years and there is an almost certain chance of saving children who are diagnosed as lead victims, for many of those who survive, the outlook remains grim. Brain damage and damage to the central nervous system looms as one of the most tragic consequences of high lead levels. In one study of youngsters who were followed 6 months to 10 years after treatment for plumbism, there were cases of recurrent seizures, cerebral palsy, eye disorders, and mental retardation. The exact incidence of lead poisoning as a cause of mental retardation is not known. Yet there is considerable evidence that victims of lead poisoning show unsatisfactory school progress because of intellectual defects. Many other children have been found to experience a marked drop in IQ.

Mr. President, it is alarming to learn that even after treatment, many of these young survivors have a substantial chance of suffering brain damage, and many of these tiny victims simply become complete vegetables. Once a child has been poisoned by lead, he is very likely to be poisoned again. After returning home from treatment children often resume their paint eating habits, and if they again come down with lead poisoning, the risk of permanent brain damage increases to "virtually 100 percent."

We know that lead poisoning affects black and Puerto Rican children more frequently that it strikes white children. It is most likely to strike children in the same family.

During his lifetime, a severely retarded child can cost health agencies $250,000 in caretaking expenses. Yet, we can prevent and cure the disease for less than $1,000 per child.

In past years, when six or seven cases of polio were reported, alarms and frantic reactions spread wildly through our cities. But cases of lead poisoning are known to be more than 10 times those of polio and nobody notices them. That is the cruelest and most ironic part of this tragedy—a poorly informed public.

Many parents are not aware of the danger associated with the consequence of paint ingestion. Even when parents know a child is eating paint, they often do not know that this is a hazardous habit. Unfortunately, the medical community is not usually aware of this hazard either. Treatment of lead poisoning necessarily involves making the diagnosis first. That is not a usually considered diagnosis because the symptoms are very much like those caused by other maladies. Moreover, most physicians generally are as unaware as laymen that this threat is a common one in some communities of our society.

It seems to me that an informed community can be a rational and effective deterrent to plumbism in children. Families that know about the danger of peeling paints will bring their children to clinics for screening and therapy. Those same families will be more likely to report deteriorating housing conditions to the proper authorities. Finally, community education through publicity, public warnings, and programs to screen high-risk areas for victims helps to insure an informed public.

Mr. President, I have personally joined the battle against childhood lead intoxication by stressing the need for education and awareness of the problem—both in the general public and in the medical community. I recently asked the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for advice on ways to increase the availability of information of this dread disease. The Department's very informative publication, "Lead Poisoning in Children" should be in the hands of every family and landowner in the high-risk areas of our big cities. Perhaps with posters, bilingual broadcasts, periodic statistical reports, and community meetings, we may be able to alert families to the dangers of this menace.

In addition, I am prepared to introduce legislation that is designed to erase

the hazards of lead-based paint poisoning from our urban neighborhoods.

Last March Representative WILLIAM RYAN of New York responded to the need for legislation in this crucial area by introducing in the House of Representatives a package of reforms "aimed at combating this silent epidemic." That package realistically meets the three fundamental needs that must be attacked in the assault on childhood lead poisoning. Because I fully endorse BILL RYAN'S approach to the problem, I am prepared to introduce similar legislation in the Senate.

In remarks included in the RECORD of the Senate on November 13, I listed the three basic requirements for eliminating lead paint poisoning as a hazard to our Nation's children. For the sake of emphasis, today I would like to repeat the three fundamental steps we must take to get rid of lead poisoning.

They are: First, to identify and treat lead poisoning victims; second, to seek out the presence of lead-based paints and require property owners and landlords to remove such paints from all wall surfaces; and third, we must prevent lead poisoning from spreading through our cities' neighborhoods by enforcing existing housing codes.

Mr. President, I am preparing a bill that will reach these goals by insuring communities that an active, vigorous campaign will eradicate the menace of lead-based paint poisoning. My bill provides Federal moneys to help cities carry out programs to identify those youngsters who are affected by lead-based paint poisoning. It will insure for cities and communities the procedures and techniques that will seek out those youngsters who are currently afflicted with high lead levels. Health officials have found that when they go out looking for cases they find them, and the more they look the more they find.

The Children's Hospital Medical Center in Boston dramatically demonstrated the value of that kind of screening program in the summer of 1968. In a group of 800 youngsters believed to be highly susceptible to the lead hazard, doctors found 98 cases of poisoning and provided therapy for them. Louis Kapito, Randolph Byers, and Harry Shwachman of Boston's Children's Hospital have found that tests on samples of children's hair are a revealing indication of high lead levels. They particularly note that the ready availability of hair as a specimen, the ease with which it can be collected, sorted, and transported are the outstanding features that favor it as a screening device for lead poisoning. This kind of testing, coupled with programs used in other cities can be used to detect victims in other communities. In every community that has launched a screening program the number of reported cases of lead intoxication has climbed sharply.

My bill also provides for financial assistance to cities and communities to develop and carry out intensive local programs to eliminate the causes of lead-based paint poisoning. Every community that has old homes with interior painted walls containing lead is a potential high-risk area for this dread disease. Plumbism is a recurrent disease by the very nature of the social and economic conditions which foster its existence. It is not necessarily limited to the ghetto. Older, currently affluent residential communities in the center core cities such as Park Avenue, Cambridge, and Georgetown await deterioration and the creation of a slum in which lead poisoning can prevail.

Therefore, my bill will provide money to use such present methods for preventing the disease as covering walls and ceilings with a plaster board, removing the old paint and covering old flaking walls and ceiling with a tough plastic spray layer which can be coated with lead-free paints.

Finally, in recognition of the need to insure that the rehabilitation or renovation of housing shall include plans for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning, my bill provides for Federal assistance to communities to carry out such rehabilitation only on the condition that the community also carry out an effective plan for getting rid of the causes of lead-based paint poisoning. In too many instances, the enforcement of existing housing and health codes becomes buried in a bureaucratic morass. Local health departments look at the problem as a housing agency responsibility, and local housing authorities are known to have insisted that lead poisoning is the sole responsibility of the health department. Still, in other instances it is financially expedient for landlords to pay a fine or abandon buildings because of the high cost of rehabilitation.

I am hopeful that through the three provisions of my bill we can easily take advantage of new techniques, an enlightened populace, and readily available medicines to rid American cities of childhood lead poisoning.

Lead poisoning sickens at least 225,000 children a year in the United States. It is a needless cause of mental retardation and death in young children. Lead intoxication is a manmade disease. It is subject to complete control. In cases that are not too severe it can be completely cured with no aftereffects. It is not one of those social or medical ills that requires intensive study to search out its cause, or thorough research to find its cure. We know that it is caused when young children swallow bits and chips of lead-based paints peeling from deteriorating walls—usually in the homes of our Nation's poorest citizens.

We also know what can cure youngsters of this disease. Once a lead poisoning case is detected, the child is usually hospitalized for several days and treated with chelating agents—chemicals that bind that lead and remove it from body tissue. Before chelation therapy was developed, 66 percent of severe lead poisoning cases were fatal. With early detection and treatment, this figure has probably dropped to less than 5 percent.

Thus, I am enthusiastic about the legislative thrust of Congressman RYAN'S package and the proposals in my bill because they do not endorse the usual call for study and contemplation. Instead, my bill authorizes a direct, forthright approach to this debilitating hazard.

The principal obstacle we face will be instilling in the public's eye the urgency for immediate action. Landlords will protest when they have to panel or strip their buildings. They will say they cannot afford it, and some of them will not be able to. Dr. Rene Dubos, who won a Pulitzer prize for his book, "So Human an Animal," likens the elimination of lead poisoning in the slums to the pasteurization of milk. At one time, the dairy people insisted there was no way to market milk that was guaranteed not to give tuberculosis. The public demanded, and it was done. Dr. Dubos says the same must be done with lead. He believes this problem is so well defined that it may provide an occasion to introduce a kind of social accounting.

If we do not act in a ruthless manner on this limited problem, then I believe that our society is intellectually and morally dishonest in talking about improving social conditions or improving our total environment. If we, with all our technological means, are not willing to make the effort that would be demanded to get rid of lead poisoning, then our society deserves all the disasters that may come to it.

The cost of lead poisoning is borne by the whole community in terms of wasted human resources, institutionalization of victims, and the resulting burdens on municipal health facilities and finances. The benefits accrue only to those owners of slum property who find it unprofitable to keep their properties in good repair.

The need to eliminate this hazard from the list of the many hazards that affect our Nation's children is very clear. My efforts will be designed to meet that need.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

RETIREMENT OF DR. GEORGE E. MUELLER FROM NASA

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, when Dr. George E. Mueller leaves the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on December 10, 1969, an era of the space age will have come to an end. It might be called the end of the beginning—the end of the beginning of the amazingly successful man-on-the-moon program.

For Dr. Mueller has been in charge of the Apollo program, and to him must go the primary recognition for the tremendous achievement of that program. It was probably the greatest sustained scientific achievement in the history of mankind.

But its great value to our Nation and to our people goes far beyond the scientific achievement. Like nothing else before, our putting a man on the moon and returning him safely has done more to raise the prestige of the United States than any other preceding achievement.

More than that, at a time when the U.S. Government has been the buffeted target of vilification, not only through-

out the world, but as well from within our own Nation, our placing a man on the moon and returning him—and doing it openly on worldwide television—has not only thrilled the people of the entire world but has created immeasurable goodwill and friendliness for us.

We have spent billions upon billions of dollars in foreign aid and in mutual security assistance trying to buy the friendship of the people of the world. But for the greater part, we have not been able to purchase friendship and support through the billions spent on foreign aid and mutual security.

To the contrary, instead of harvesting friendship, respect, and support from these multibillion-dollar programs, we have too often and to too great a degree reaped enmity, resentment and contempt. Even those Western European nations, like France, which we saved through the Marshall plan, have repeatedly given us the back of their hands economically and in the United Nations—after their rise from economic chaos to such economic affluence as to regard the United States too often with arrogance and treat us with contempt.

What we have not been able to accomplish with the billions we spent for foreign aid and mutual security, we have accomplished to a high degree with our truly inspirational success on the Apollo program.

And for that we owe a very, very grateful thanks to Dr. George E. Mueller on his stewardship of the Apollo program. The United States and its people are in deep debt to Dr. George E. Mueller.

He has been the inspirational leader of a team of over 400,000 people from government, industry, and universities. Unrelentingly, he has driven toward the goal of the program that has raised the United States again to preeminence—and after the state of shock in the late fifties when our space failures made us a second-rate national power on space exploration.

Dr. Mueller had a rare knack for translating and relating the high technical and scientific space program into words and phrases and presentations that even we nontechnicians and nonscientists on the Senate aeronautical and Space Sciences Committee could understand. He could make even me understand.

So I am going to miss Dr. Mueller very much in the work of the committee. Just as I do not think anyone will ever be able to fill the shoes of James Webb as the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I really do not think that anyone will be able to fill the shoes of Dr. Mueller.

NOMINATION OF HENRY J. TASCA AS AMBASSADOR TO GREECE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Henry J. Tasca, originally of Providence, R.I., who has been nominated by President Nixon as our Ambassador to Athens, is a competent and able American Foreign Service officer. He has been well and favorably known to me for 25 years.

Unfortunately, at this time his nomination is caught in the fiery cross winds of American-Greek relations. Actually, his nomination would fare better if our administration had a clear and strong policy vis-a-vis Greece. Unfortunately, this is not the case today.

As far as I can ascertain, the Defense Department, which too often calls our foreign policy tunes, approves of the present regime. On the other hand, the State Department seems to disapprove of it, although it is not willing to express its views publicly, although it has privately.

In my view, our administration should recognize the fact that the present best thing for Greece would be the early restoration of some form of democracy or government that would reflect the wishes of the independent and individualistic Greeks. And our State Department should express itself accordingly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD following my remarks an article entitled "Tough Job for Mr. Tasca," written by Ian Vorres, and published in the Providence Journal of November 30, 1969.

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

ENVOY TO GREECE: TOUGH JOB FOR MR. TASCA

(By Ian Vorres)

ATHENS, GREECE.—Of all postwar American ambassadors to Greece, none is faced with a more difficult and thankless mission than Providence-born Henry J. Tasca, the new American ambassador to Greece.

A leading economist and scholar, Mr. Tasca has held many important positions in Washington and abroad. He was awarded the Medal of Freedom. A U.S. Navy commander during World War II, he has served as U.S. Treasury representative and economic adviser of the American Embassy in Rome.

Mr. Tasca was until recently U.S. ambassador to Morocco. He is expected to arrive in Athens before Christmas. Although he has yet to set foot on Greek soil, he is in the unenviable position of being already the center of controversy, drawing upon himself the ire both of the supporters and the opponents of Greece's army-backed regime.

"He is a sitting duck for all the political tempers of Greece which are currently spilling over. I would hate to be in his shoes just now," commented a Western ambassador in Athens recently.

Political observers in Athens anticipate that Mr. Tasca's relations with Greece's revolutionary regime will be cool and formal especially if, as it is rumored, he is arriving from Washington with definite instructions to "be tough." The Greek military brass, meanwhile, is well entrenched, ruling the country by decree.

Government circles in Athens are increasingly incensed over the refusal of the United States to ship heavy military hardware to the Greek army which is in dire need of it. Premier George Papadopoulos, it is expected, will express in no uncertain terms the resentment of his government to the new U.S. envoy. The heavy arms embargo had been adopted both by the Johnson and Nixon administrations as a way of exerting pressure on the Greek regime to return the country to full democracy promptly.

Another sore point with the Athens regime has been the delay in appointing a new U.S. ambassador. Mr. Tasca succeeds Phillips Talbot who resigned last December. The Athens post has been vacant since. The absence of a U.S. ambassador for so long was taken as a snub from Washington and proved a continuous embarrassment to the Greek regime.

To complicate matters, Mr. Tasca's recent statements before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in Washington have not exactly helped him gain popularity with the present rulers of Greece. Mr. Tasca in his testimony said that the exchange of ambassadors does not necessarily imply approval of the Greek government. Mr. Tasca also said that he "would like to see Greece evolve to a more representative form of government" and that he would use whatever influence he has to that end.

Ironically enough, Mr. Tasca has also come under heavy fire from opposition groups in Greece who see his appointment as U.S. endorsement of the Athens regime. Even King Constantine, exiled in Rome, has been reported concerned over the appointment. Authoritative sources confirm that he even discussed the matter with Greek Foreign Minister Panayotis Pipinelis when the latter was recuperating in Switzerland recently. It is known that the King wants Mr. Tasca to call on him before proceeding to Athens. This would show publicly that the United States still considers Constantine the lawful ruler of Greece.

Greek resistance groups, meanwhile, have openly warned U.S. servicemen, businessmen and diplomatic personnel in Greece that they plan reprisals against them over the Tasca appointment. A group even threatened Americans with kidnapping and possible execution. Some Athenians believe that fanatical opponents of the regime might even try to kidnap Ambassador Tasca the way U.S. Ambassador C. Burke Elbrick was kidnapped on a Rio de Janeiro street last September.

Greek officials are not particularly worried. They feel they have the situation well in hand. Athens security police recently rounded up more than 50 persons who were exploding plastic bombs around the city. The consequent trials before military courts revealed a sadly disheartened underground, lacking in coherence, organization and public support.

Athens police are confident that they have broken the backbone of the underground movement. Greek security, however, is not taking any chances. Neither does the U.S. Embassy in Athens. Besides tackling the toughest job a U.S. ambassador ever faced in Greece, Mr. Tasca already may claim the heaviest police protection ever accorded a U.S. envoy on Greek soil.

THE MEDIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I was impressed by reading an article written by Richard Wilson and published in the Evening Star of December 1, 1969. It expresses the opinion of many Americans and I would assume many of their elected representatives in both parties in the House and Senate.

While no one is suggesting censorship, the radio-TV executives have certainly missed the point in the thoughtful and well reasoned remarks made by Vice President SPIRO T. AGNEW in Des Moines, Iowa, and again in Montgomery, Ala. The points he raised were valid; however, the responses from those referred to in his remarks have been less than enlightening.

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:

TV MISSES PUBLIC'S RESPONSE TO AGNEW SPEECH

(By Richard Wilson)

The available evidence suggests that Vice President Spiro T. Agnew's criticism of bias

in the mass media struck a responsive chord among the general public. There is nothing to suggest, however, that the tonal gradations of the responsive chord have penetrated deeply into the hushed chambers where radio-TV network policy is made.

A tonal deafness seems to have developed on what it was Agnew was talking about, with the network moguls all professing to see a dangerous frontal challenge to freedom of speech in their government licensed medium.

The radio-TV executives, therefore, may well ask themselves why it is that as many as three out of four persons think Agnew has a valid point.

The answer to that question could prove to be quite disconcerting. It may merely involve the simple conclusion of a great many people that the commentators now practicing are not qualified by background, information and depth of thought to share equal time with the President of the United States. This is the equivalent of heresy in the broadcasting business. It is unthinkable that some handsome, well-spoken broadcaster with five or 10 years experience should not be entitled to go on the air with his authoritative analysis and be listened to with the same attention and respect as the President or whomever it is the broadcaster is analyzing and judging.

Dr. Frank Stanton, president of Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc. expounds the current thought in the industry on the point. He attributes to these instant analyzers the ability to call "attention to emphases, omissions, unexpected matters of substance, long anticipated attitudes, changes of views, methods of advocacy or any other aspect of the speech." The analyzers function as critics, in other words, judging this omission or that change of attitude as it seems to strike them in the spirit of guiding and instructing the public on what they ought to think about the speech they have just heard.

In the case of the President's speech on Vietnam, Dr. Stanton points out that the text was handed out to the press and to radio-TV analyzers two hours in advance of delivery. He adds, "If a professional reporter could not arrive at some meaningful observations under those circumstances, we would question his competence." Two hours is enough, it is judged, to permit these highly skilled professionals to gather their thoughts for airing to an audience which assembled before their television sets to hear the President make a major announcement after weeks of study. Otherwise they had better look for work elsewhere than CBS.

It is at this point that a great many TV viewers turn off their sets and turn off Dr. Stanton. They are simply not convinced that the analyzers are professional enough, informed enough or profound enough to share time with the President on major U.S. policy. In the case of Nixon's speech, two hours of deep thought was not enough to reveal to the analyzers that four out of five of the listeners they were instructing would approve of Nixon's stated views on Vietnam.

The TV moguls, in their profound concerns for the right of analyzers to say anything that occurs to them after their gruelling two hours of thought, have simply missed the central point that a vast host of TV watchers do not share the respect with which the analyzers view themselves.

This would be as hard for a TV commentator to accept as for a newspaper columnist, the difference really being that many newspapers give their readers a wider choice of opinion which they can usually adequately sample by reading the first and last paragraphs and thus turn off before they become too deeply involved.

Analysis and interpretation is a great art which only a few, such as Eric Sevareid, have wholly mastered. As Sevareid handles his art, it is to explore a subject rather than to arrive at conclusions on it, and in this way to open his own mind and the minds of listeners to various inherent possibilities. This seems too inconclusive to others whose two hours of thought leads them toward conclusions they would not think so irrefutable if they could hear the concurrent comment of their listeners.

The listeners, who likes comment, wishes along with it at least the versimilitude of fairness and wisdom, and it is perhaps the shortage of this quality in TV commentary which has caused the great majority to agree, in principle at least, with Agnew. The TV business would do better to examine itself a little further while warning of the baleful potential of government repression.

ALLEGED MASSACRE AT MYLAI

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, as the story of the alleged massacre at Mylai (4) in Songmy village, or "Pinkville," has unfolded in the press and on TV, I have been much disturbed. Several concerns come to mind. One relates to the rights of the accused and to our legitimate concern that these soldiers and former military personnel not be tried in the public media, that their right to due process not be jeopardized by pretrial publicity. Hopefully this has not and will not occur. The warning of the judge assigned to the case of Lt. William Calley, is timely and should be heeded.

Deep as is this concern for the rights of the accused, I have become increasingly distressed with other aspects as each new edition of the newspapers these past days has brought to my attention further aspects of this and other incidents in Vietnam. I have been shocked and horrified at the stories recounted.

War is not exactly a stranger to me nor are the stresses and strains of combat. I am well aware of the incomplete nature of President Theodore Roosevelt's remark that war brings out all the best in man. It also seems to bring out the worst, as well. Far too often I have witnessed the bestiality of war. The atrocity pictured and recounted here will now go down in history as the Mylai massacre and take its place along with Lidice, Katyn Forest, and Malmédy.

The concern of some that these disclosures will have a most damaging effect upon our effort in Southeast Asia is, I fear fully justified. However, this concern cannot permit us as a nation to close our eyes to what has occurred. Nor must it prevent us from seeking answers as to why this happened.

For the Nation which took the lead in attempting to establish an international code of morality in warfare at the Nuremberg trials to attempt now to sweep under the rug this flagrant violation of our most solemn principles would but compound the tragedy.

If any way is to be out of this national disgrace, it is to be found only through the prompt, complete, and public investigation of what has occurred, the proper punishment of those responsible, and through every effort to determine why Mylai happened. Let no one minimize the importance of this affair.

A number of questions must be answered:

Is what happened at Mylai (4) only worse in degree than what occurs every day in a war where friend, foe, and neutral are indistinguishable one from the other?

Can we condemn the men charged in this matter and at the same time justify a policy of indescriminate bombing and artillery attacks on inhabited villages and hamlets?

Can we entertain any hopes for success in a guerrilla type war if we fail to distinguish clearly between friend and foe in the punishment we impose?

Are the 2,000 to 3,000 civilians killed by the Vietcong during Tet in Hue to be equated now as justification for the 100 to 200 annihilated by our forces at Mylai in March?

Is our current practice of paying a set price to surviving relatives for each noncombatant Vietnamese man, woman, or child inadvertently or accidently killed by our forces, and to the owner for each water buffalo similarly killed, symbolic of our regard. Have we so cheapened our concept of the sanctity of human life that we can now measure it on the same scale as water buffalo?

Is American training which permits common reference to the Vietnamese as "Gooks," "Dinks," or "Slopes" at fault? Are racist overtones at work here?

And the bigger question: Can we bring self-government to a people with friendship for the United States where attitudes such as these permeate our speech and our actions? Can there be any hope of winning the war in Vietnam under these circumstances?

If our answer to this last question is negative what then should be our course of action?

A few months ago I read a lead article in Esquire magazine entitled "An American Atrocity" by Normand Poirier. As a result, what happened at Mylai did not come as such a surprise. Last August 14 I wrote to the Department of the Navy expressing my concern over the apparent laxity in the handling of this affair. I drew attention to the sentences imposed. Of the 10 Marines involved in what was a planned and organized murder and rape of civilians, one has since been promoted, six are back in civilian life, and only three are in prison of whom two are serving out short sentences. As I said then, the punishment was in sharp contrast to that meted out for incidents such as the "mutiny" at the Presidio.

I have been assured that this marine atrocity which occurred in 1966 has resulted in changed training and indoctrination procedures being adopted by the Marine Corps to prevent a repetition. It is to be hoped that such is the case, but apparently the Army's training and indoctrination procedures have not been effective.

As Private Meadlo's mother said:

I raised my boy to be a good boy.

I think this is a statement every mother with a son in Vietnam would make. Let us hope they will be given no further cause to fear that this war has so changed their sons.

Much as these revelations distress me,

I now see some glimmer of hope. During my time, three wars have transpired, but there may be some progress toward a higher morality. In world war II there were only enemy atrocities. Censorship and sentiment—not unrelated—were such that our brutal bombing of Dresden, or the second atomic bomb at Nagasaki, were questioned by few—at least, not until after the conflict was over. In the Korean war, the atrocities of friend and foe were recounted without recrimination.

Should this Mylai massacre now trigger a national self-examination to seek out flaws in our character previously rationalized or ignored, this can be the beginning of a new day which can draw us together with those who have questioned our involvement and our priorities. Should it result merely in a search for scapegoats, we will have but compromised our ideals further.

For the lessons of Mylai and elsewhere are lessons for all of us to ponder. They are a part of the ongoing national debate over our commitment, our course, and our goals.

As we seek to interpret and explain Mylai we need remind ourselves of our attack on those nations which in the past have adopted a national policy of the ends justifying the means. And we must rededicate our efforts to assure that such a policy never becomes our national epitaph. A shrug of the shoulders and a Sherman-like statement of the evils of war will not suffice. If the American character is to be deserving of special acclaim, it must in this case come from our willingness to engage publicly in critical self-examination and to take corrective measures. If we are truly to atone for such acts, it must come through our increased dedication to join with other nations in efforts to find alternatives to war for settling disputes among men.

FIRST NATIONAL INDIAN EDUCATION CONFERENCE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on November 20 the distinguished junior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) addressed the first National Indian Education Conference in Minneapolis. The conference brought together the Nation's leaders in Indian education for 2 days of intensive workshops, aimed at reforming the ways in which we educate Indian children.

Senator MONDALE's remarks at that conference focused on the recently released final report of the Subcommittee on Indian Education, which I had the honor to serve as chairman. The Senator succinctly summarized the major findings and recommendations of the subcommittee, and made the report an object of much considered discussion at the conference. I am convinced that through such dissemination and discussion will come the understanding and action needed to bring about the changes recommended in the report.

I might say that as we worked to write that report, no one member of the subcommittee worked harder or with greater understanding than did my good friend from Minnesota. He carried much of the burden and deserves a large share of the credit.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator MONDALE's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE

No conference is ever complete without an address by a noted author in the field under discussion. I see that your conference planners took care of this matter in grand style, providing not only Dr. John Bryde of the University of South Dakota, but also the Pulitzer Prize-winning Indian, Mr. N. Scott Momaday.

Will Antell undoubtedly thought the authors were already taken care of when he invited me to speak here this morning. A politician, you know, is supposed to know how to speak, but not necessarily how to write. Speaking supposedly comes naturally. But as for writing and editing, those are things we are supposed to leave to the experts and literary stylists.

At risk of disappointing Mr. Antell and the rest of you who have been eagerly awaiting a political address, I'd like to step briefly out of my U.S. Senator's role and talk to you as an author—the author of a newly-published book.

I'm afraid the title of this book lacks both the intrigue of Mr. Momaday's "House Made of Dawn," and the intellectualness of Dr. Bryde's "Accultural Psychology" or "Modern Indian Psychology." In fact, my title has all the sexiness of a used Volkswagen. It is called "Senate Report No. 91–501."

I agree that isn't the kind of title which would lead a book to the top of the best-seller list. I can frankly admit that no Hollywood studio has been beating down my door seeking movie rights to it. Yet this book has had the makings of a spectacular because its theme is spectacular—the spectacular failure of our nation to provide its Indian citizens with an equal educational opportunity.

I am a co-author of this book, along with the other eight Senators who comprised the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee. The report is the culmination of more than two years of hearings, interviews and field investigations into the manner in which the American Indian is educated—non-educated may be a better word—in both public and federally-operate schools.

The report, which was released last week, is formally known as "Senate Report No. 91–501." But its theme is more accurately reflected in its subtitle, "Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge."

I am not very proud of this report.

Despite the fact that it is the culmination of the most comprehensive study of Indian education ever conducted, I am not proud of this report.

There is little to be proud about a system which sends an Alaskan child 6,000 miles from his home to a boarding school in Oklahoma.

There is little to be proud about a system in which 25 per cent of the teachers of Indian students admit they prefer not to teach Indians.

There is little to be proud about a system which ignores the Indian half the time and demeans him the rest.

The statistics give us some idea of the magnitude of the problem: 50 per cent of all Indian students never complete high school; 40,000 Navajo Indians are functionally illiterate in English; the average educational level for all Indians under federal supervision is 5 school years; Indian graduates of federal schools are academically at least two years behind the average non-Indian high school graduate in the United States.

I could go on and on, but you have heard them all before. In fact, that might be part of the problem. We have heard them so often and for so long that they have lost their meanings.

We can look at a statistic, and two minutes later, have forgotten it. But one cannot forget the loneliness of a 5-year old Navajo boy—a boy who barely came up to my knee—who must live in a boarding school, away from his parents, away from his home. Or the Alaskan children huddled in a small classroom, struggling to understand what their "Dick and Jane" readers mean by "a cow", "a farm", or "green grass". Or the repressive military atmosphere of a Bureau of Indian Affairs boarding school where the principal asked me to look at a passing column of Indian children and "see how happy they are."

I looked at the vacant, expressionless faces. I saw how happy they were. Those are the things one remembers—not the statistics.

It mattered little if we were in BIA schools or public schools. Our findings were basically the same: culturally-insensitive teaching materials; a sometimes well-meant but condescending attitude toward Indians by faculty and administrators; little, if any, influence or control by Indians over the education of their children; and a serious lack of funding for Indian education programs. All these items pointed to one conclusion: Whether being educated in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools or public schools, Indian children were not receiving the same educational opportunities as other students.

We analyzed the problems, consulted with Indians and other outside consultants and discussed the situation amongst ourselves. The result was a report of 60 recommendations—many of them suggested by the Indian people themselves. These are 60 recommendations, which, if implemented, would radically improve American Indian education.

Each of the recommendations is a necessary, essential step if the goal of the Subcommittee—a national policy of educational excellence for the American Indian—is to be achieved. Yet I can't help but feel embarrassed over making these recommendations—embarrassed that in this day of moonwalks and lunar-landings the recommendations we make have to be made at all.

The problems we found were identified years ago.

In 1928 the Meriam Report noted the lack of Indian control over their own affairs and the poor quality of services, particularly in education, available to Indians. The Meriam Report recommended such changes as: the end of taking children from their parents and placing them in off-reservation boarding schools; the development of curriculum materials relevant to the needs and backgrounds of the students; the development of bilingual materials; participation by Indians in school policymaking.

Forty years later these same recommendations run through the Indian Education Subcommittee's report. Forty years after the Meriam study, the situation remains the same.

To those unfamiliar with the manner in which we educate Indian children, some of the recommendations may seem absurd, simply because they are so fundamental to any effective educational program.

We recommend, for example, that locally-elected school boards be established for federal Indian schools so that Indian parents will have some control over the education of their children. This is a concept basic to public school education in the United States, but foreign to the paternalistic Bureau of Indian Affairs.

We recommend that financial need be the major determinant of a student's eligibility for BIA scholarships. To me, that would seem only reasonable. But to the BIA, the nearness of a student's residence to a reservation is the determining factor.

Another "bold" recommendation is that

Johnson O'Malley money—money which is directed by law to be used to service the needs of Indian students in public schools—be used for programs for Indian students. All we are demanding here is that the law be followed. Yet the BIA dispenses these funds indiscriminately, and many public schools use them indiscriminately.

We recommend a National Indian Board of Indian Education to supervise the federal Indian school system in the same way a State Board of Education oversees a State's public schools. We recommend the immediate development of curriculum materials with which the Indian child can identify. We recommend the use of educational approaches, such as bilingual methods, which meet student needs. And most of all, we recommend funding levels appropriate to the need.

These are hardly radical recommendations. But their implementation can radically change the course of Indian education.

I would like to single out one recommendation because of its particular importance.

To many persons, the thought of a Select Committee on the Human Needs of the American Indian immediately raises their hackles. Aha, they say, another study by the white man. Another study in futility.

Well, a Select Committee could be that. But it could be much more.

It could take our shotgun approach to Indian human resource programming and weave education, health, and economics together into a unified policy. These elements cannot be adequately dealt with separately. Each is interdependent upon the other.

In the Indian Education Subcommittee we tried to limit ourselves to our Congressional mandate—Indian education. But we found it impossible to look at the basic problems in education without also touching upon mental health, hunger and malnutrition, unemployment, poverty, etc.

There are presently 86 different statutes which have specific provisions under which Indians can receive federal assistance. This proliferation of programs has led to confusion, overlapping responsibilities, programs working at cross-purposes and a general lack of coordination which can only work to the detriment of the Indian. A Select Committee is needed to give definite direction to a national Indian policy.

Such a Committee would serve significantly as a forum for the Indian people. It would be a place at which their problems would be assured of receiving nationwide attention. The Indian Education Subcommittee has served superbly in this function. No Congressional Committee has probably ever solicited Indian opinion more. Our job was merely to turn those Indian opinions into recommendations.

The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs provides a good example of what can be accomplished with a concerted effort. A Select Committee on the Human Needs of the American Indian can do just as well.

Now that the Report has been published and the recommendations made, the question can be legitimately asked, What is to keep this report from going the way of all other Indian studies? What is to keep this report from serving primarily as a dust-catcher on the shelf of the public library or as a handy source for a high school student's term paper?

The answer to that question lies in the hands of the Congress, the educational institutions and—most of all—the white society which dominates Indian education.

One of the major reasons Indian education is a national disgrace is because the U.S. Congress has failed the Indian population. Time and time again the Congress has acted irresponsibly and insensititively in its dealings with the American Indian. Its policy toward Indians has varied from extermination to assimilation to isolation to termination. It continually places a higher priority on land and resource policies than it does on the human need programs of Indians.

Our priorities as a nation are confused. Not only does the military establishment drain funds from much-needed domestic programs, but some domestic programs drain funds from human programs. For example, I believe our nation needs a highway beautification effort, but there is something wrong when we can authorize $15 million for pilot programs to find ways to remove abandoned billboards, and yet only appropriate half that amount—just $7.5 million—to develop bilingual programs for Indians, Mexican-Americans and other children who fall behind in school because they do not speak English.

I wish I could promise a dramatic change in the way in which Congress responds to the needs of Indians, but I cannot. But I can promise an effort, a strong effort, to bring about change.

The Indian Education final report has been out a week now, and already we are beginning to see action. Last week the Senate Education Subcommittee accepted two amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which were offered by Senator Kennedy, Senator Dominick and myself. One is Recommendation 39 of our Report, a change in the law to increase the number of Teacher Corps personnel permitted in BIA schools. The other is Recommendation 46, a change in the priorities of Public Law 815 so that federally-impacted public schools educating Indians will receive priority in school construction funds. Because of their low priority under the existing law, such schools haven't had construction applications filled for almost three years.

These two amendments may not be giant strides, but they are a start. And more Congressional action is coming.

In the near future I will co-sponsor legislation to give two more recommendations the force of law. One bill will authorize the Senate Select Committee on the Human Needs of the American Indian. The other will authorize an Indian-organized and Indian-conducted White House Conference on Indian Affairs. Out of this conference would come detailed policy, legislative and program recommendations which could serve as the blueprint for reform and change over the next generation. It would also give Indians the opportunity themselves to decide if and how the Bureau of Indian Affairs should be reorganized or relocated within the federal structure in order to better meet Indian needs.

The Subcommittee examined this question in depth, and concluded it is an issue the Indian people themselves must decide. We recommend some changes in BIA structure, such as raising the Commissioner to Assistant Secretary of Interior status, but the greater question of whether or not the Bureau should continue within the Department of Interior was left unresolved. A White House Conference of Indians could settle this issue once and for all.

The Congress can therefore make some changes, especially in regard to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. But for the two-thirds of all Indian children who attend public schools, reform is going to have to come at the local level. The federal government can supply money for some programs, but the local institutions will have to take the initiative in making their programs responsive to Indian needs.

Testifying before the Subcommittee, William Penseno of the National Indian Youth Council explained it this way:

"The problem is not with the Indians. They merely react. The problem is with the institutions that service Indians. . . . The institutions that serve Indians were created by man. The Indians were created by God. Surely the institutions are more amenable to change than the people."

You'd never guess that was true judging by the way we educate Indian children.

We somehow have adopted the notion that the purpose of an educational institution is to change the Indian, to have him lose his Indianness and adopt the culture and values of the dominant society. For 400 years we have tried to do this. For 400 years we have failed. The Indian still is an Indian.

We never stopped to ask if maybe our institutions, rather than the Indians, required changing.

"We must stop blaming the Navajo and other Indian children for their failure in education," Senator Robert Kennedy once said. "We must realize it is the educational system we have created that is at fault."

An Indian child enters school already well-nurtured in the language, culture and values of his tribe. He encounters a teacher who knows little about his heritage and less about his language. He is told to disregard his family's teachings and adopt the Great White Way of doing things. Teachers, textbooks and curricula are all programmed to this end.

According to anthropologist Anne Smith: "At home he has learned to be cooperative; at school competitiveness is demanded. At home the value of good inter-personal relations is highly prized; at school individual success above everything is the goal.

"Is it therefore surprising that the Indian student becomes confused?"

The language problem alone is enough to make a child feel like an unwanted alien in a new country.

Dr. Bruce Gaarder, formerly chief of the U.S. Office of Education's modern foreign language section, says:

"The official language policy has kept the Indians in the primitive status of non-literate peoples, and the constant effort to eliminate the differences, forcing each child, in greater or lesser degree, to choose between his own people and the outside world, is nothing less than attempted assimilation by alienation. The language and alienation policies together have effectively prevented the formation of an Indian intelligentsia and have systematically cut away from the tribes most of their potential leaders. The overall result has tended to keep the Indians in a condition of unleavened peasantry."

It becomes the task of educators then, to build upon the cultural strengths a child brings into the classroom, to cultivate in that child a pride in his ancestry and to reinforce, not destroy, the language he natively speaks. The child must be given that sense of personal identification so essential to his social maturation, so essential to his growth in learning.

In all my travels with the Subcommittee there was only one school that seems to be accomplishing this: The Rough Rock Demonstration School on the Navajo Reservation. There an all-Navajo school board supervises an operation which encourages the "Navajoness" of the students. Culturally-sensitive curriculum materials prepared by the Navajos themselves are in use. Bilingual teaching techniques are in operation. Navajo teachers and Navajo aides dominate the school.

It is a rare instance of Indians completely controlling the education of their children. It is a rare ray of hope in the field of Indian education.

There's no reason why there has to be just one Rough Rock. The innovations of Rough Rock can just as well become the standard fare for Chilocco Boarding School or Chemawa or for the Cherokee students of Oklahoma public schools or the Chippewas and Sioux of Minnesota. But it will take a commitment by educators and administrators to stop changing the Indian and begin changing the institution.

Once the dominant society quits treating the Indian condescendingly and paternalistically, once the dominant society cleanses

its mind of Indian stereotypes and recognizes the Indian as a human being deserving of a role in school policymaking, once the dominant society stops trying to remake the Indian in the mold of the white man, then progress will begin. Only then will we begin achieving educational excellence for the American Indian.

A lot of time has been lost already. A lot of damage to human beings has already been done. But it is not too late. It's not too late if we listen and believe and commit ourselves to the philopohy which Miss Margaret Nick, a beautiful and articulate Alaskan native, expressed so compellingly to the Subcommittee in Fairbanks, Alaska.

"One thing I know," she said: "is that if my children are proud, if my children have identity, if my children know who they are and if they're proud to be who they are, they'll be able to encounter anything in life. I think this is what education means. Some people say that a man without education might as well be dead. I say, a man without identity, if a man doesn't know who he is, he might as well be dead. This is why it's a must that we include our history and our culture in our schools before we lose it all. We've lost way too much already. We have to move now."

THEY LOWERED THEIR VOICES AND RAISED THEIR STANDARDS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, all indications were that the Poor People's March on Washington was not as successful as some participants had hoped for.

But an article by the Associated Press from Los Angeles, published in last Sunday's Washington Post, indicates that at least some people profited from their experiences in Washintgon.

The article recounts how a group from the Watts-Willowbrook district of Los Angeles got an idea just from seeing what was called Resurrection City. On the way home from Washington, the people decided to clean up their own neighborhood. And the AP article says this decision has led to success.

The people of the Los Angeles neighborhood had help, in the form of donations of paint and equipment, but the chief ingredients for the success of their project were their own elbow grease and desire for self-improvement.

According to the article, these people made the decision for "no more noise-action." 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:

PRIZES SPUR PAINTING, RENOVATING—RESIDENTS CLEANING UP WATTS

LOS ANGELES.—One day last June the Rev. James Mims and 27 other persons rode a rickety bus home to the Watts-Willowbrook district of Los Angeles from the Poor People's March on Washington.

"An idea was born inside that bus," the 37-year-old Negro minister said. "Or maybe it was more like a dream.

"After seeing 'Resurrection City,' we decided to come back home and brighten the corner where we are. No more noise-action."

Mims and his followers joined forces with the TRY Foundation—a white group founded last May by some prominent members of the Los Angeles cultural community who wanted to improve the area that had been devastated by rioting in August 1965.

Plans were announced for a "Clean-Up, Paint-Up Campaign" in Watts-Willowbrook. Widely distributed circulars promised cash prizes for the best achievements.

The Rev. Mr. Mims, who heads the nondenominational Household of God church, housed in what once was a bookie joint and liquor store, said Watts residents were doubtful at first. "They didn't believe it," he said. "They wondered, 'What's the gimmick?' "

A paint company donated paint for 50 houses. TRY furnished more, along with brushes and rollers, through anonymous contributions.

The morning a truck rolled up with the free paint, people began to believe it, said the Rev. Mr. Mims. "The next day you couldn't drive down the streets—they were filled with junk and stuff the people cleaned out of alleys and garages and yards.

"The whole neighborhood was swinging. Three women painted a two-story house all by themselves. Kids and dads painted while their mothers washed windows. One family painted until 4 a.m. racing other TRY houses on the block."

So far, in less than a month, 90 homes have been painted, trees have been trimmed, blacktop poured for a playground, a garage renovated for a teen center, and plans made for a child care facility and a fund-raising thrift shop.

Prizes are to be distributed in December, when the competition ends.

Said a member of TRY: "We're down there to help and we're down there on a permanent basis. We seek not only money for this work but donations of time, labor and knowledge."

Said the Rev. Mr. Mims: "Each person must have a dream. Then he can have motivation. You have to want to be better. You can't love anybody as long as you hate yourself."

MISUNDERSTANDING OF AMERICA'S FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, as a believer in America's foreign aid program, I have often been distressed by the misunderstanding, often purposely pursued by those who oppose the program, which has beclouded this country's efforts to assist other nations in need of help in the name of peace.

In yesterday's Evening Star, columnist David Lawrence wrote of this problem and of the views of Secretary of State William Rogers, who recently appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee to testify on the subject of foreign assistance. Foreign aid is justified, as Mr. Lawrence quotes the Secretary, not only for moral and humanitarian reasons, but also because it is a very important factor in our foreign policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Lawrence's column, which puts forth the position of Secretary Rogers and goes far toward explaining the whole purpose of our foreign assistance program, be printed in the RECORD.

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

FOREIGN AID ESSENTIAL PART OF POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

"Foreign aid" has become an unpopular phrase in America largely because its critics have spread the wrong impression—that the program is bigger than it really is and that the United States could better use the money at home. But Secretary of State William Rogers points out that the program, in effect, pays for itself many times over.

The administration asked Congress for an appropriation of $2.6 billion. The House cut it by $466 million. The Senate is being asked to restore this sum to the measure. Actually, the amount requested for the entire "foreign aid" program is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the gross national product of the United States at present. Secretary Rogers feels that such a percentage is only a small part of America's capacity to befriend two-thirds of the peoples of the world.

"Foreign aid" is justified by the secretary of state not only for "moral" and "humanitarian" reasons but because it is "a very important factor in our foreign policy."

He declares that the cut will be viewed abroad as a backward step by America and will lead to a belief that the United States is beginning to turn away from aid programs for the underdeveloped countries.

He says that the effects would be felt in the next few years and that the American aid could have a lot to do with whether "the peaceful revolution in economic and social development now taking place in most regions of the world maintains a satisfactory momentum or not."

It so happens, incidentally, that much of the "foreign aid" given by the United States consists of products or services that are purchased from American companies. The net result, however, is to stimulate ways of building stronger economic systems in each of the countries aided.

The United States is regarded everywhere as a rich country and one able to help the underprivileged. No step has ever been taken in international relations which has won more acclaim for the American people than the "foreign aid" projects. Under the Marshall Plan, which was developed during the Truman administration, the countries hurt in World War II were given a chance to rehabilitate themselves through the use of American funds.

The record of the United States in canceling most of the loans made to the allied powers after both wars and in coming to the rescue even of former enemy countries is unsurpassed in world history.

It is most unfortunate that the same policy was not followed immediately after World War I. Instead, the German people were neglected and they became the victims of Hitler's fascism—an ideology that took advantage of the frustration of the people.

Today the situation is in many respects more acute. The Soviet Union has quietly been using a "foreign aid" device of its own, with large sums spent for military equipment given to North Vietnam as well as the Arabs. There has been some penetration, too, in Africa.

Of course, the example of a Communist-dominated Cuba, with bases for missiles made available to the Soviets, is a not-to-be-forgotten illustration of what can be done by our own potential enemies through the use of their kind of "foreign aid."

It's time the "foreign aid" rendered by the United States was explained fully so that American citizens will not be applauding those members of Congress who want to wreck it but will be warning them instead that the whole project is essential to the carrying out of a successful foreign policy.

The United States has a mission to perform in assisting the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia to improve their economic facilities so as to be able to handle an ever-increasing population. America can certainly afford more than a quarter of 1 percent of the money taken in by all kinds of businesses and financial operations in what is known as "the gross national product."

Above all, "foreign aid" is a practical policy that could help to prevent another world war by aligning America with other nations everywhere which not only are free but may become strong enough to do their part in preserving world peace.

NO SMOKING, PLEASE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, a persuasive, straight-talking article has come to my attention concerning the dangers inherent in smoking cigarettes.

The author of this piece is Dr. James E. Crane of Stamford, Conn., who is an eminent specialist in aviation medicine.

Dr. Crane's short paper contains the most concise description I have read of what the consequences of smoking can be. His arguments as to why people should not smoke are all too convincing when one considers the fact that most smokers have not yet given up the habit.

The unusual quality of this article, however, is that it also seeks to help the reader understand why he smokes and how he can stop. In order to allow this instructive paper to receive the wide audience which it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "No Smoking, Please," be printed in the RECORD.

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

NO SMOKING, PLEASE

(By James E. Crane, M.D.)

Thanks to the press, radio and TV, we're all well aware of the dangers inherent in smoking cigarettes. Of course not every person who smokes will contract chronic bronchitis or lung cancer or have a heart attack. We've all known heavy smokers who have lived to a ripe old age, none the worse for the habit, and non-smokers whose lives were cut short by coronaries at an early age. But evidence has piled up which shows that the habitual use of tobacco can shorten our lives. "The Health Consequences of Smoking," published by the Public Health Service, reports that a person who smokes two packs or better a day can expect to live 8 years less than a non-smoker, while those who limit their smoking to half a pack daily can lose 4.6 years of their lives.

Although sales of cigarettes in this country have dropped off in recent months, for the first time in many years, as reported in the New York Times, scare psychology has not been enough to convince most people—particularly women and teenagers—that the time to stop smoking is *now!* Why? Because the problem is being approached from the wrong angle. Isn't it too much to expect people to give up something they find pleasurable—and all too often downright necessary to their sense of well-being—simply out of fear over what may happen to them some time in the future? Not until they realize what the consequences of smoking can be, and understand why they smoke and why they *should not,* is there any chance of convincing them that continuing the habit may substantially shorten their life span.

WHAT HAPPENS

We're all familiar with the phrase, "Have You Thought About What Happens When You Smoke a Cigarette?" That question really should be "Do You *Know* What Happens?" For example, did you know that—

Coronary artery disease is the chief contributor to the excess number of deaths of cigarette smokers over non-smokers?

An association exists between cancer of the esophagus, cancer of the bladder, peptic ulcers and cirrhosis of the liver, pulmonary emphysema and cigarette smoking?

Cigarette smoking is the most important cause of chronic bronchitis and a significant factor in the causation of laryngeal cancer?

The causal relationship of smoking a pipe to the development of cancer of the lip has been established?

Amblyopia (dimness of vision) is related to smoking?

Coughing and the production of sputum are more frequent among smokers?

Smokers are far more likely to suffer from gum disease and loss of teeth than are non-smokers?

You don't have to smoke many cigarettes for a very long time before harmful effects show up? As reported in the Boston Herald, a study involving students at San Fernando State College revealed that there were measurable changes in the heart and lungs of the young and healthy student smokers. Also, their blood was found to clot faster. A second study made at the University of California at Santa Barbara disclosed abnormal lung cells suspected of being precancerous in 14.3 percent of the students who smoked.

A close relationship between habitual cigarette smoking and the presence of wrinkled facial skin has been noted by H. W. Daniell, M.D. He finds this a powerful argument in persuading his women patients to give up the habit.

There is a large body of knowledge that should be understood by all smokers. To begin with, in arterio-sclerosis (hardening of the arteries), the blood vessel wall becomes calcified and its calibre diminished. This usually begins at about thirty years of age and may progress slowly or rapidly. If the coronary (heart) vessels are involved, the narrowing of the calibre sets up the pathological state of angina. If there is a total obstruction, coronary thrombosis (heart attack) occurs.

When a cigarette is smoked and inhaled, ½ milligram of nicotine is absorbed into the general circulation. This, in turn, releases a hormone called Serotonin, which constricts the arteries and the veins and dilates the capillaries. Consequently, an obstructive disorder can result which is capable of producing death to the heart muscle due to the loss of blood supply. In addition, a chronic state may develop due to the inability of the heart to pump enough blood to satisfy the needs of the body. Also, sudden death from cardiac arrest or ventricular fibrillation (convulsion of the heart muscle) can take place.

In some people, there is a significant inherited tendency to coronary artery disease. There are also the coronary prone personalities, people who are aggressive and competitive. These are the heavy cigarette smokers who work long hours, take on too many jobs, fight deadlines, seldom exercise or take adequate vacations, and who are obsessed by the lack of time for the performance of their work.

BRONCHITIS AND EMPHYSEMA

Chronic bronchitis and emphysema are non-malignant, non-cancerous diseases of the lungs that disable large numbers of people of working age. Both contribute directly towards premature death. These two diseases frequently coexist, although one can be present without the other.

Chronic bronchitis is a clinical disorder that affects the bronchi (tubes of the lungs). It is characterized by the presence of excessive mucus secretions and a chronic, productive cough. Emphysema, on the other hand, is a disease that affects the air spaces where the gaseous exchange takes place between oxygen and carbon dioxide. Cigarette smoking is the most important cause of chronic bronchitis, and there is a definite relationship between pulmonary emphysema and the consumption of tobacco.

The clinical manifestations of chronic bronchitis consist of (1) cough; and (2) expectoration of mucus. A superimposed infection may also exist and if this is the case, there will also be wheezing.

A knowledge of pulmonary hygiene is necessary in order to recognize the chronic productive cough. In the lining of the airways there are two types of cells. The first are those that continually secrete mucus, so that a carpet of viscous material completely lines the breathing apparatus. It is in this media that foreign particles and the products of cigarette smoke are lodged and enmeshed. The second type are cells with cilia (hair) whose function it is to drive the mucus with its trapped particles upward toward the larynx (voice box) and into the throat.

Cigarette smoke produces alterations in both these types of cells, but particularly in the area endowed with cilia. There is a decrease in the number of ciliated cells, and a shortening in the length of the hair. The failure of the ciliary function to provide a constantly moving stream of mucus enables the foreign particles that are irritant to reach the epithelial lining or cells. The presence of such a constant irritant could produce cancer.

Respiration is the exchange of gas between the air and the blood which takes place in a small pocket of the lung. This pocket is called the alveolus. It has a very thin wall, lined by small blood vessels and supported by connective tissue. It is through this thin wall that the actual exchange of gases takes place. Alteration of the lung, characterized by an abnormal enlargement of the air spaces and destructive changes of the alveolor walls, is known as emphysema. The condition is usually described as an excessive expansion of the "gas exchange area" because of a chronic, increased pressure within the lungs. This expansion crushes the adjacent gas exchanging area and thus diminishes the exchange media. There is also a destruction and loss of the elastic tissue of the lungs which normally forces air out. Consequently, there is an abnormal accumulation of stale air in the lungs.

The symptoms of emphysema consist of shortness of breath, at first only following exertion. Later there are episodes of difficulty in breathing which occur at rest, accompanied by a respiratory infection, due perhaps to exposure to dust, smoke, cold air or damp weather. At night there is apt to be shortness of breath due to the pooling of secretions. This is relieved by cough and expectoration. As the disease progresses, the cough becomes chronic and productive and there are repetitious infections. The victim has a chest that is barrel-like; his/her complexion is bluish and the fingers are clubbed. X-ray of the chest does not always correlate with the clinical state. Forced ventilation may be so impaired that the victim is unable to blow out a lighted match held at close range to the mouth.

CANCER

Cancer of the esophagus, presumed to be due to swallowing smoke which incites irritation, is definitely related to the use of tobacco. It is a known fact that cigarette smoke has immediate as well as long term adverse biological effects on the lungs, blood vessels, central nervous system, esophagus, etc. Volatile factions in the smoke are cytotoxic (poisonous to the cells). Malignant disease of the esophagus is rarely diagnosed early because difficulty in swallowing, pain and loss of weight are late manifestations. The vague, early symptoms such as heartburn are often ignored by either the doctor or the patient and labeled as due to nerves or tension.

Cancer of the lung is a malignant tumor which arises from the bronchial tubes. This form of the disease is increasing more rapidly than other forms. It usually appears in a 55 year old male, a heavy smoker, who complains of cough, spitting of blood, chest pain and weight loss. By the time all of these symptoms are present, it is usually too late. Surgical removal of all tumor-bearing tissue is the only cure for lung cancer, and unfortunately, only 8% of the people who

undergo surgery for this disease are alive at the end of 5 years.

Cancer of the larynx is usually seen in males, in their sixties, who have irritated the "voice box" with too much tobacco, too much alcohol and too much talk. The symptoms consist of hoarseness, a sensation of discomfort, tickling or a "lump" in the throat, or pain on swallowing or talking. Later there is halitosis, cough, wheezing, shortness of breath and difficulty in raising secretions. Finally, there are enlarged nodes, and a mass, which is the secondary spread of cancer from the original site (larynx).

There is definitely an association between cigarette smoking and cancer of the urinary bladder. Protein in our food, when ingested, is broken down by the digestive juices and enzymes into amino acids, which are then absorbed in the general circulation. The ultimate fate of proteins and amino acids is disintegration into waste products which are excreted in the urine. There is an amino acid called Tryptophane which, when mixed with the inhaled ingredients of tobacco smoke, is blocked in its ultimate conversion and disintegration into a harmless waste product. At a particular stage or site of blockage, Tryptophane is known to be orthoaminophenal, a cancer-causing metabolite. The Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health has cited a marked increase in this cancer-causing agent in the urine of cigarette smokers. The Report pointed out that when non-smokers took up the habit, and when smokers who had stopped smoking resumed, there was an average increase of 37% of Ortho-aminophenal in the urine. In some cases, it was as high as 64%. The collection of cancer-causing metabolites in the bladder urine causes an irritation to the lining with the ultimate development of cancer. The symptoms and signs of cancer of the bladder consist of Hematuria (blood in the urine), frequency of urination, urgency and burning. There may also be difficulty in starting the stream. It depends on the type and site of the cancer, whether or not infection is present, and whether or not there are clots of blood in the bladder.

THE HABIT

You know—or you've been told—that you smoke too much and it isn't doing you any good. Your doctor has no doubt suggested that you stop or at least cut down. But you keep right on reaching for a cigarette. Why? You can get a clue from the following motivating or driving forces which *Patient Care* Magazine lists as being behind the habit.

1. *Stimulation.* Tobacco in this category keeps you from slowing down. It's a stimulant—a mood elevator.

2. *Satisfaction.* The cigarette gives simple gratification, both objective and subjective, when rolled between the fingers or shifted to various parts of the mouth.

3. *Crutch.* The smoker in this category leans heavily on cigarettes during a personal crisis, when he is angry or blue, or under pressure or uncomfortable. In the intervening periods of calm, he feels a negligible call for tobacco.

4. *Habit.* This smoker no longer enjoys tobacco. He lights up frequently, often without realizing he has done so.

5. *Psychological Addiction.* This smoker is in serious trouble. He lights a cigarette in the morning as soon as his feet hit the floor, and each one thereafter sets off a cycle of craving for the next one. His body's physical demand is probably less important than the psychologic demand which builds up.

In the writer's personal experience, there are several other psychological factors involved. In addition to being a mood elevator, tobacco causes a pharmacological reaction in which there is an increase in the threshold of cerebral irritability. Smoking a cigarette causes irritation of the mucus membranes. The rolling, rhythmic movement of the facial muscles is soothing and satisfying. In essence, the act of smoking is a conditioned reflex. While some people do smoke for relaxation or merely for the pleasant taste, they are few and far between.

NICOTINE

A cigarette, when inhaled, will invigorate or stimulate as alcohol. Nicotine is the principal alkaloid of tobacco, but its proportion has no connection with the taste of tobacco when smoked. Actually, nicotine is a powerful, rapidly acting poison as we know from its use in agricultural sprays. An overdose may produce giddiness, nausea, vomiting, weakness, rapid pulse, clammy skin, muscle tremors and shortness of breath. These same complaints are often found in heavy smokers.

The physiological action of nicotine is primarily stimulation of the nervous system. If the dose is excessive, there is depression in which every bodily function is involved. The most striking changes are those which take place in the circulatory and digestive organs. The blood pressure rises. Inhibition of hunger contraction occurs, with consequent loss of appetite. (This is the reason why the reformed smoker tends to gain weight). Many of the effects produced by nicotine are similar to those produced by epinephrine (adrenalin). When the dose of nicotine is large enough, it causes a depression, with a fall in blood pressure, rapid pulse, irregular respirations and paralysis of secretions.

MOTIVATION

To better understand the forces that cause you to smoke, answer honestly the following questions which are based on a list published in *Patient Care* Magazine. How long you've smoked and how much can forecast possible longevity.

1. At what age did you begin to smoke? _____ (Longevity).

2. How many packs of cigarettes do you smoke per day? _____ (Longevity).

3. Do you smoke to keep yourself stimulated? Yes _____ No _____ (Stimulation).

4. Do you smoke for the sense of satisfaction in handling something or of having something in your mouth? Yes _____ No _____ (Handling).

5. Do you smoke only during a personal crisis? Yes _____ No _____ (Crutch).

6. When you run out of cigarettes, is it all but unbearable until you get one? Yes _____ No _____ (Psychological addiction).

7. Are you aware of the fact that you are not smoking? Yes _____ No _____ (Psychological addiction).

8. Do you have a growing hunger for a cigarette when you haven't smoked for awhile? Yes_____ No_____ (Psychological addiction).

9. Do you smoke in the morning before getting out of bed or before you have breakfast? Yes_____ No_____ (Psychological addiction).

10. Do you smoke automatically, without even being aware of it? Yes_____ No_____ (Habit).

11. Do you light a cigarette without realizing you still have one burning in the ashtray? Yes_____ No_____ (Habit).

12. Have you ever found a cigarette in your mouth but can't remember putting it there? Yes_____ No_____ (Habit).

HOW TO TAPER OFF

It's not easy to stop smoking, except for those people who only light up occasionally over coffee or cocktails. No one pretends that it is. It takes will power and sometimes professional help to break the habit.

When you decide to stop, there will be plenty of free advice from well-wishers, some of which you can discount. The non-smokers—except for those who've succeeded in quitting—who tell you, "There's nothing to it—just don't buy any more cigarettes," have no idea what you're up against. If it were that easy, you'd have probably stopped long ago. Also, it's all well and good to get rid of the ashtrays, but your friends may not be as strong-minded as you intend to be and the ashes have to go somewhere.

There are, however, a number of things that anyone can do to give the will power a lift and make the process a little less difficult. Here are a few suggestions, some of which are drawn from the *Patient Care* article.

1. Taper off. Few people can quit cold turkey. For example, as a start, limit your smoking to alternate half-hours, then gradually lengthen the period to one, two and finally three hours.

2. Allot yourself half the number of cigarettes you're accustomed to smoking per day, and try to leave some unsmoked by bedtime. Then cut to a third and a quarter.

3. Ask yourself, "Do I really want this cigarette?" and put it down; "Why did I light this one?" and put it out.

4. Change your method of smoking. The risk of lung cancer increases with the number of puffs and the time taken to smoke a cigarette. The smoker who puffs rapidly at the end of the smoke is more apt to contract lung cancer than the one who takes several quick puffs when he first lights up. The reason? The shorter the cigarette, the higher the temperature and the higher the concentration of nicotine and tar.

5. When you go out in the car or shopping or for a walk, leave your cigarettes home.

6. Ease up on the amount of coffee and liquor you consume. Both stimulate a desire to smoke.

7. Fight that sudden craving for a cigarette by drinking water, chewing gum or sucking on a piece of hard candy (but watch the calories.) The craving often disappears after 10 minutes or so.

8. Shift from your own brand to one you dislike.

9. Get out of doors and exercise as much as you can—within reason, of course. When your hands are busy gardening, or indulging in some sport or hobby, you can't smoke.

10. Spend as much time as you can in places where smoking is not permitted—museums, movies, etc.

11. Make a bet with someone that you can stop, and put up enough money so that losing will hurt.

12. Visit a chronic lung disease clinic one day, sit in the waiting room and watch the respiratory cripples fight for breath. Yes, it *could* happen to you.

Inhaling is one of the pleasures of smoking. This can be replaced, at least partially, according to Dr. Ejrupls, by deep breathing. Fill your lungs to capacity and then slowly empty them by keeping the lips partly closed as you exhale. If you are a chain smoker, you probably have an unconscious habit when breathing of hypoventilating or underbreathing. This makes you tense and uncomfortable. You can be retrained in your breathing habits, says Dr. Kaufman, by a simple exercise which consists of first exhaling and then inhaling rhythmically, 16 times per minute. This should be practiced for three minutes, eight or 10 times a day.

For those who have great difficulty in stopping or cutting down on the use of tobacco, try as they will, a doctor can prescribe a variety of drugs that will help during the period of withdrawal. These include Librium (5 mg) to be taken 3 times a day; a combination of Lobeline (5 mg) and Amphetamine (8 mg); or 10 mg. of Methamphetamine HcL, plus 60 Mg. Pentobarbital. There are also several products which can be purchased in a drugstore without prescription, which have proved helpful to many people during this period. And, believe it or not, tobacco may aid in breaking the smoking habit. The variety is Indian (Lobella inflata) Tobacco,

sometimes called "asthma weed." The alkaloids from this plant are used as aids to people who wish to stop smoking according to researchers at the University of Mississippi's Institute of Pharmaceutical Sciences.

The psychologically addicted smoker who finds it impossible to stop, but who must stop for reasons of health, may have to be treated in a hospital and placed on heavy sedation or tranquilizers for a period of days or weeks until he is able to cope with the situation himself.

When you come right down to bedrock, it makes very little sense to indulge oneself today without even thinking about what could happen tomorrow. This holds true for overeating, overdrinking, oversmoking—overanything that is potentially harmful to that remarkable machine: the human body. And even if you should be lucky enough to escape all the serious consequences of cigarette smoking, why continue a habit that increases fatigue and nervous tension, and that is known to impair mental efficiency (most school dropouts are smokers, incidentally), memory, muscular power and even sexual capability.

Why not join the "Unhooked Crowd?" You'll look better, feel better and probably live longer. And just think of all the money you'll save!

ADDRESS BY SENATOR EAGLETON

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) has just made a timely and an important speech in San Francisco. It states clearly and forcefully a concern which many Senators have expressed in the last few weeks. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CHAIRMAN'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE LUNCHEON, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., NOVEMBER 24, 1969

Last fall, in one of the most poignant scenes of the Presidential campaign, Mr. Nixon noticed a sign held up by a young girl in a train-side crowd in Deshler, Ohio. It said simply, "Bring Us Together."

Mr. Nixon recognized this slogan as an expression of the hopes and desires of a divided nation. It became the theme of his victory speech and his inaugural address—the "great objective" of his Administration.

It is so obvious that the Administration which announced its intention to "bring us together" has decided, as a matter of calculated strategy, to bring *some* of us together . . . and isolate the rest.

A consistent pattern of statements and events during the last few weeks suggests that the Administration intends to use the force of government not just to rally a majority in support of its policies, but to exclude or suppress the views of those who dissent.

The Administration has resorted to demagogic tactics designed to frighten dissenters from dissenting and, much more dangerous, to whip up fears and hatreds against those who dare to disagree—fears and hatreds that lie very close to the surface in some of our people.

Unable to win dissenters over to its side, the Administration has not merely written them off. It has apparently determined to separate them, if possible, so thoroughly from other Americans . . . to discredit them so profoundly . . . and to frighten them so badly that only one viewpoint will get an airing—the Administration's.

An effort to restrict divergent ideas is dangerous enough in any democracy at any time. But in our own society today, already on edge from the tensions and frustrations of a fast-changing era, a policy of further polarization and division is a tragic betrayal of the responsibilities of leadership.

To encourage political polarization in an attempt to silence dissent is probably more dangerous today than ever before because advances in technology and education have changed the dynamics of dissent. Today public policy is more deeply, more intelligently, and, in most cases, more rationally questioned than at any time in our history—and probably by more people. And attempts to stifle dissent could well lead to turmoil rather than tranquility.

Unless this policy of polarization is recognized and firmly resisted now, we run the risk of slipping into another McCarthy era, this time with the full faith and credit of the U.S. government behind it.

Consider, for example, the transformation in the image of Vice President Agnew. The name-calling—like the "soft-on-communism" charges—which seemed to embarrass both him and the President during last year's campaign, now earns him accolades from Mr. Nixon as a "great" Vice President.

The Vice President's references to "effete snobs" and masochists, and his charge that Senator Edmund Muskie was playing "Russian roulette with U.S. security" when he suggested a six-month suspension of U.S. MIRV testing, were probably spontaneous. But they struck a responsive chord in certain quarters of our society, and the important point is that this kind of talk now clearly has White House approval.

The Vice President's rhetoric is surely no worse than the ranting hyperbole we have heard from some radical quarters during the 1960s. Words like "racist," "imperialist," and "fascist" have seriously degraded American political discourse, even in very sophisticated circles. Perhaps it is not surprising that there should now be a rhetorical reaction in kind. But when such a reaction is officially condoned by the White House, then the entire nation is degraded in proportion.

If Spiro T. Agnew goes down in history as the Great Polarizer, let it be said that he had plenty of help—from above.

The President's November 3 speech on Vietnam, while ostensibly an appeal for unity, presented the people of this nation with a simplistic pair of alternatives: You are either for "peace with honor," which was clearly meant to be equated with whatever President Nixon decides to do, or for a sell-out.

The President said nothing, for example, about the idea that we can only achieve a peace with honor if the Thieu-Ky regime is encouraged to broaden its base enough to earn the support of the South Vietnamese. This is my position, but the President wants me either for or against, and no back-talk.

The President was entirely within his rights in trying to mobilize and demonstrate support for his viewpoint. Certainly, he was entitled to publicize the 58,000 telegrams he received from the "silent majority," even if, from a purely statistical point of view, they compare unfavorably with the 250,000 marchers who came to Washington a week and a half later.

What was troubling, though, was the implicit effort to isolate those who were not for him *100* per cent.

Then there was the Justice Department effort to wrap the recent moratorium marches in violence. There *was* prior evidence that the Weathermen and others did mean to perpetrate riots at the South Vietnam Embassy and at the Justice Department. Some of the organizers *were* communists.

But it was also well known that the vast majority of the organizers and the demonstrators intended to march peacefully. To many observers, including this one, Secretary Volpe's November 10 assertion that a "majority" of the organizers were "communists or communist inspired," and the Justice Department's early predications of mass violence, plus the initial refusal to issue a parade permit for Pennsylvania Avenue, looked like calculated attempts to frighten off as many people as possible. This tactic, of course, would not, and did not, discourage those bent on violence. If it kept anyone home, it was those who didn't want violence, were not Communists, but sincerely disagreed with Administration policy.

Two despicable and criminal acts of violence did in fact occur, as the Justice Department's intelligence had predicted. They were committed by a comparative few not connected with the main body of marchers.

Yet the Attorney General announced that the demonstrations as a whole could not be considered non-violent, a statement that was clearly meant to invite the conclusion that all the protesters had contributed to a riot.

Vice President Agnew's attack in Des Moines on the television network news commentators is probably the best example of the effort not just to isolate but also to foment ill-will towards those who disagree with the President. The timing, just before the moratorium . . . the witch-hunt rhetoric . . . the admitted White House participation in its preparation all suggest that it was planned not only to support the President but to still his critics.

The speech contained some truth—as demogoguery must to be effective. The Vice President said that the networks have enormous power over public opinion . . . that commentators sometimes make flash judgments which are wrong . . . that they should make greater efforts to provide balanced coverage . . . and that their viewers ought to let them know it.

Fair enough. Had the Vice President gone only this far, he would have been well within the bounds of legitimate free expression, and deserved credit for having the courage to bite the hand that made him a household word.

But the Vice President did not just criticize the media people; he also tried to *discredit them generally* to prove that those who criticized the President's speech must ipso facto be wrong.

He held up the network people as a "little group" in New York and Washington—a group apart from and different from the rest of America, irresponsible, sinister, conspiratorial, maybe even un-American.

Not satisfied to single out a body of critics—and remember that they are not *all* critics and their reporting is not *all* slanted—the Vice President resorted to the classic tactic of using a single individual as his scapegoat, Ambassador Averell Harriman.

Consider what the Vice President said:

"To guarantee in advance that the President's plea for national unity would be challenged, one network trotted out Averell Harriman for the occasion. Throughout the President's address he waited in the wings. Mr Harriman recited perfectly."

"Trotted" him out . . . Is Mr. Harriman a studio prop at the network to be used to advance its own theories?

"Waited in the wings . . ." When he had been America's chief negotiator in Paris? . . When he had made his position known repeatedly and privately to the State Department and to the President's advisers?

"Recited perfectly . . ." Recited what? The network line? the Communist line? Perhaps just the truth?

The Vice President went on: "He told a little anecdote about a 'very, very responsible' fellow he had met in the North Vietnamese Delegation." Guilt by association? Is the Vice President suggesting that, as chief U.S. negotiator, Ambassador Harriman should not have met with members of the North Vietnamese delegation? . . . Because they were Communists? What were we doing in Paris, then?

Then he said: "A word about Mr. Harriman. For ten months he was America's chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks—a period in which the United States swapped some of the greatest military concessions in the history of warfare for an enemy agreement on the shape of a bargaining table." What concessions? The bombing halt, which had begun some months previously? Did he make these concessions on instructions from our government, on his own? Or, if the bombing halt was wrong or improper, is the Vice President advocating that we renew our bombing?

Let's face it. This was demagoguery, designed not to achieve support for a policy on its merits, but to do it by scapegoating—by isolating and discrediting those who disagree. Perhaps it wasn't the blatant, "Kick 'em in the teeth" demagoguery of Joe McCarthy, but however polished up, however sanitized—it was demagoguery nonetheless.

This tactic assumes a solid majority and an expendable minority. It assumes a country divided can indeed endure.

We can do no better now than to repeat the noble sentiments of the President's inaugural address.

He said we had endured "a long night of the American spirit," and that "to a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer of the spirit."

"To find that answer, we need only look within ourselves.

"When we listen to the 'better angels of our nature,' we find they celebrate the simple things, the basic things—such as goodness, decency, love and kindness. . . ."

To lower our voices would be a simple thing.

"In these difficult years, America has suffered from a fever of words; from inflated rhetoric that promises more than it can deliver; from angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds; from bombastic rhetoric that postures instead of persuading.

"We cannot learn from one another until we stop shouting at one another—until we speak quietly enough so that our words can be heard as well as our voices."

At this point the transcript reads "Applause"—applause which surely reflected the sentiments of the vast majority of Americans—Forgotten, Silent, or otherwise.

Now, ten months later, we find Mr. Nixon's own Administration speaking not to the "better angels of our nature," but to the evil ones . . . not to "goodness, decency, love and kindness" but to fear and hatred . . . not with lowered voice but with the shrillness of the demagogue . . . not in the measured terms of reasoned and compassionate statesmanship, but in the "angry rhetoric that fans discontents into hatreds" which the President himself so rightly condemned.

We find the Administration opening the gates to a tide of unreasoned anger and frustration—the kind of tide that could turn so rapidly into an uncontrollable flood that even the White House won't be able to call it back.

Why the 180 degree change in these ten months? It sounds as if the Administration has lost its nerve . . . lost faith in its original purpose . . . lost faith in the American people.

Whatever the cause, only Mr. Nixon can correct this course. It is time to get on with the difficult work of governing in a democratic context.

STUDENT SEMINARS ON POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration is sponsoring on December 29 and 30 a series of student seminars on the problems of pollution and our environment. I congratulate the FWPCA and the Department of the Interior for this most significant effort to involve our youth in the struggle to prevent the contamination of our environment.

Each 7-hour seminar, featuring speakers and participants from FWPCA regional offices, will focus on what is being done and what remains to be done in our national effort to combat water pollution. As Secretary Hickel explains:

We want to tap the enthusiasm, vigor, and fresh ideas of our country's high school and college youth in this battle to protect and preserve our precious and irreplaceable water resources.

The Department has put together a program that involves much more than just a discussion. It also has a plan for the election of regional student advisory groups and a National Student Council on Pollution and the Environment—SCOPE. I am confident that this effort will bring our young people into an active role in the protection of the environment they shall inherit.

Seminars are scheduled on December 29 in Boston, Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, and San Francisco. The following day seminars will be held in Richmond, Va., Kansas City, Mo., and Portland, Oreg. I hope each will attract a capacity gathering.

Increasingly, the students and young people of our Nation are picking up the cause of environmental enhancment. This trend, I believe, is a most significant and hopeful one. On their enthusiasm alone, we should go far toward a better environment in which to prosper.

This interesting trend, Mr. President, was also discussed at length in a report published recently in the New York Times. 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:

ENVIRONMENT MAY ECLIPSE VIETNAM AS COLLEGE ISSUE

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, November 29—"We want to stop the war, end pollution—and beat Stanford!" yelled a Berkeley pep leader at last weekend's big football rally.

The mention of pollution brought a roar of approval from a University of California crowd of 5,000 that almost drowned out the reference to the big game.

Rising concern about the environmental crisis" is sweeping the nation's campuses with an intensity that may be on its way to eclipsing student discontent over the war in Vietnam.

This is indicated by interviews with students and faculty members from many campuses and with leading conservation authorities around the country.

There is a strong feeling on the campuses that the war will be liquidated in due course. Meanwhile, it is physically remote. And, in the wake of the big protest marches, many students feel Vietnam offers only limited scope for student action.

But the deterioration of the nation's "quality of life" is a pervasive, here-and-now, long-term problem that students of all political shadings can sink their teeth and energies into. And they are doing it.

A national day of observance of environmental problems, analogous to the mass demonstrations on Vietnam, is being planned for next spring, with Congressional backing.

From Maine to Hawaii, students are seizing on the environmental ills from water pollution to the global population problem, campaigning against them, and pitching in to do something about them.

"A ground swell of concern is starting, on everything from population and food supply to the preservation of natural areas," commented Dr. Edward Clebsch, assistant professor of botany at the University of Tennessee.

"I've been floored by the intensity of their actions and feelings," said Dr. Vincent Arp, a Bureau of Standards physicist close to the University of Colorado at Boulder. "The student group is going like a bomb."

"They can see it, they can feel it, they can smell it. And they think they can change it," said William E. Felling, a program officer of the Ford Foundation, which contributes to many conservation activities.

In Los Angeles a fortnight ago, a student bloc stole the spotlight from 1,000 older participants in a gubernatorial environmental conference. Last week in San Francisco, at a meeting of the United States National Commission for UNESCO, something similar happened.

WORDS AND DEEDS

In Massachusetts last week, Boston University students put on a two-day campaign of public education in ecology. In Seattle, the University of Washington Committee on The Environmental Crisis was staging a similar "learn-in".

Words are only the surface of the iceberg. University of Minnesota students, fresh from a mock funeral demonstration against the fume-belching automobile engine, were planning to dump 26,000 cans on the lawn of a beverage manufacturer to protest use of such packaging. Northwestern University students were campaigning against a controversial regulatory proposal of the Chicago Sanitary District, and against the waste discharges of a big drug manufacturer.

At Stanford and the University of Texas, law students were researching new courtroom stratagems against despoilers of the environment. University of Arizona students in semisecrecy, were collecting data on the fume emissions of copper smelting operations.

EFFORTS GET RESULTS

Already the student environmental front can point to many accomplishments. Student activists had significant roles in the campaign to "save" San Francisco Bay and the northern California redwoods, and to block new dams on the Colorado River.

The University of Wisconsin's Ecology Student Association was active in the campaign against the recently truncated Project Sanguine, the Navy's high-power communications development; and provided important logistical support for the Environmental Defense Fund in the months-long Madison hearings on DDT.

At the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana, Students for Environmental Control sallied forth in freezing weather 10 days ago and extracted six tons of refuse from nearby Boneyard Creek. They persuaded city officials to follow up the effort, and are working on a beautification plan for the creek.

A University of Texas student is launching a state environmental newsletter. University of Washington students, on their own time, are preparing an 80-page report on ecological problems of Puget Sound. At the California institute of technology, students organized an intercollegiate summer research project in environmental problems that already has attracted nearly $100,000 in foundation financing.

On some campuses—Vassar, the University of Oklahoma, and the University of Nebraska are examples—there are no evidences of organized environmental concern. But they are far outweighed by the ferment elsewhere.

On the University of Texas campus at Austin there are at least six environmental groups, with interests ranging from water pollution to conservation law. One group, in the College of Engineering, has filed 58 for-

mal complaints against the University itself for pollution of a nearby creek. At the University of Hawaii, there are close to two dozen groups, each organized around a particular cause.

ACTION IS KEYNOTE

Some groups, like Boston University's Ecology Coalition have as few as a dozen members. Others have hundreds. But with causes on every hand, mass membership and parliamentary formalities mean less than action, which can be initiated by a handful of people. Then the causes gather their own following.

A few groups cherish the designation of "radical" and are indirect offshoots of the leftist movements like the Students for a Democratic Society and California's Peace and Freedom Party.

"Capitalism is predicated on money and growth, and when you're only interested to maximize profits, you maximize pollution. We need a system that takes maximum care of the earth," said Cliff Humphrey, the 32-year-old leader of Ecology Action, one of several groups at Berkeley.

But generally the aura of the environmental "new wave" is conservative, with coats and ties as conspicuous as beards and blue jeans. "There's a role for everybody in ecology," said Keith Lampe, a cofounder of the Yippie movement, who puts out an environment-oriented newsletter from Berkeley. "People with widely different styles and politics can talk to each other with no more tension than a Presbyterian talks with a Methodist."

FEW "ANARCHISTS"

"I doubt if you'll find many anarchist ecologists," commented Steve Berwick, a 28-year-old Yale environmentalist. "Ecology is a system, and anarchy goes against that."

A typical group is Boston University's Ecology Action, whose 75 members are led by Bruce Tissney, a 20-year-old junior geology major. Edwardian rather than hippie in appearance, he has a trimmed red beard, wire-rimmed spectacles, and affects such sartorial accoutrements as a blue plaid vest and matching bow-tie, white shirt, and gold watch and chain.

Ecology Action's two-day educational program last week included "friendly" picketing of the state capitol, a pollution film festival, pamphleteering and lectures, and a mock award of a pollution prize to a local power company. The group has been conferring with state water pollution officials about doing spare time "watchdog" work, and is planning to set up dust-catching devices to monitor air pollution.

There have, across the country, been incidents, but mostly minor—such as the arrest last month of 26 University of Texas students who tried to block the felling of some trees for a campus building extension.

LOCAL ORIENTATION

Some of the campus groups are branches of national organizations such as the Sierra Club (which has just installed a campus coordinator at its San Francisco headquarters), the Wildlife Federation, and the newly established Friends of the Earth. But most of them are spontaneous local movements. Many tend to shun the established national organizations as being dedicated to old-line "conservation" rather than the environmental crisis. They also feel the older groups are wary of "direct action" for fear of losing the tax-exempt status that is their financial base. Ad hoc student groups don't have this problem.

"We don't want to be labeled as 'conservationists' or 'antipollution'," said Wes Fisher, a 26-year-old ecology student at the University of Minnesota. "Pollution and overpopulation are like a web, and pollution is just the symptom."

The students are employing the gamut of communications and political-pressure techniques—meetings, lectures, rallies, picketing, research, pamphleteering, letter-writing, petitions, legislative testimony, collaboration with public agencies and contacts with politicians.

Last month, Illinois' representative William Springer, Republican, felt student heat when conservationists from the University of Illinois picketed a testimonial dinner for him because he backed a controversial dam project.

IMPETUS IS RECENT

The environmental "new wave" gathered in California as far back as 1965, when Berkeley students staged a sitdown protest against a freeway and Stanford students became involved in campaigns for San Francisco Bay, the redwoods, and Point Reyes National Seashore.

But most of the organizing is recent, and is proceeding unabated. A Boston University group was sparked by a recent Ramparts magazine article by Stanford's Dr. Paul Ehrlich, the "population bomb" crusader. San Francisco State College students were galvanized by a speaker from the Planned Parenthood organization. Bob Hertz, an organizer of the University of Minnesota's Students for Environmental Defense, said his inspiration came from Zen Buddhism and its emphasis on the interrelationship of man and nature. A student group gathering strength at Ohio State was motivated by concern over the Army Engineers' Clear Creek Dam project in southern Ohio, which threatened to flood a pristine natural area used by science students.

In more instances than not, students are welcoming faculty collaboration and counsel. In some places, faculty members have taken the lead. At the University of Arizona in Tucson, a philosophy professor, David Yetman, and a recent law graduate, William Risner, organized "GASP" (Group Against Smelter Pollution) to do battle with the copper companies. The group now includes students and townspeople.

ACADEMIC GROWTH

A University of Illinois engineering instructor, Bruce Hannon, has been a leader of the Committee on Allerton Park, opposing a $70-million Army Engineers dam project near Decatur. Students joined in a campaign that lead to the University's commissioning of an engineering firm to produce an alternative plan.

The environmental ferment caused Ohio State to establish a School of Natural Resources last year. Its original involvement of 180 has grown quickly to 300. An introductory conservation course that had 147 students last fall had 210 this fall. The college's perennial Biologists Forum, which used to draw 20 persons to its meetings, has been attracting hundreds. The University of Tennessee reports an enthusiastic reception for a new course in "Biology and Human Affairs." Colby College in Waterville, Me., has organized two special seminars in January and February on pollution problems and conservation law.

Students are taking the initiative in some environmental teaching. At Stanford, Jeff Bauman, a 22-year-old senior majoring in biology, this fall has been attracting 20 to 40 students to an informal after-dinner dormitory seminar.

OVERSHADOWING VIETNAM

There are differing indications on the campuses about how soon environment may overshadow Vietnam in student interest, but the trend is evident.

"A lot of people are becoming disenchanted with the antiwar movement," said Boston University's Bruce Tiffney. "People who are frustrated with disillusioned are starting to turn to ecology."

"I think environment is a bigger issue than the war, and I think people are beginning to sense its urgency," said Robert Benner, a 22-year-old geology student in the University of Colorado conservation movement.

"The country is tired of S.D.S. and ready to see someone like us come to the forefront," remarked Alan Tucker, a member of Ecology Activists at San Francisco State.

"Environmental problems will obviously replace other major issues of today," said Terry Cornelius, president of the University of Washington's committee on the environmental crises. "The is not just a social movement for Biafra or Vietnam, but for everybody and our closed system, Earth."

"Environment will replace Vietnam as a major issue with the students as the Vietnam phase-out proceeds," commented A. Bruce Etherington, chairman of the University of Hawaii's architecture department. "And it will not be just a political lever to be used by radicals."

Many of the over-30 environmentalists see the student movement as the catalyst, if not the main driving force, that will get environmenal improvement rolling, and overcome the older generation's tacit resignation to the status quo.

"These kids are really remarkable in their understanding and maturity," said 52-year-old Dr. Barry Commoner, the prominent Washington University ecologist who has been addressing many student groups.

Campuses are seen as representing a greatly broadened base for the "conservation constituency" needed to jog bureaucrats and support the politicians through whom environmental reforms generally must clear."

Conservation lawyers look to campuses for the scientific expertise vital in pressing environmental battles in the courts, and for the energy necessary to raise funds for the usually expensive legal proceedings.

Indications are that coming months will see the student conservation tide swelling and manifesting itself in an arresting variety of ways.

Already students are looking forward to the first "D–Day" of the movement, next April 22—when a nationwide environmental "teach-in", being coordinated from the office of Senator Gaylord Nelson, Wisconsin Democrat, is planned, to involve both college campuses and communities.

Given the present rising pitch of interest, some supporters think, it could be a bigger and more meaningful event than the anti-Vietnam demonstrations.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION MISTAKES

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, an article written recently by the distinguished Washington Post Reporter Morton Mintz discloses that the Food and Drug Administration is now in the position of certifying as safe and effective a very large number of drugs which, it admits, can cause injuries and death. These drugs include a large number of widely prescribed antibotic combinations which the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, as a result of a 2-year study for the FDA, recommended be taken off the market in late 1968. Yet, 1 year later, these drugs are still on the market and are still being used widely.

With respect to Panalba, one of the 200 most prescribed drugs in this country, FDA Commissioner Ley told Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Finch in a memorandum inserted in the hearing record of the Fountain subcommittee of the House that he "cannot certify this drug as safe and effective." The product "has been judged by very competent people not to be effective and to be a hazard to the public health."

The FDA Commissioner said:

We have the right and the obligation to protect the public by requiring its removal from the market and by requiring an appropriate warning to be issued to the doctors of this nation.

Despite the FDA's obligation to protect the public, and although, as Dr. Ley testified, this drug "needlessly injured hundreds of thousands of persons annually and, along with the pen-streps contributed to the possibility of staph epidemics, this agency continues to certify Panalba as safe and effective. In addition, the FDA has not even issued a direct warning to the physicians of our country.

What is especially disconcerting about this whole affair is the political interference by Secretary Finch in matters dealing with the health and welfare of our people. Mr. Mintz describes in detail the unprecedented efforts on behalf of the drug industry by Secretary Finch and Under Secretary Veneman, as documented in the hearing record of the Fountain subcommittee, not only to keep on the market dangerous and ineffective drugs but also to prevent the public and medical profession from finding out about the dangers involved.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles written by Mr. Mintz be printed in the RECORD. I hope that Senators will have an opportunity to read them carefully, because they show how naked and unprotected the public can be when a regulatory agency loses sight, even for a moment, of its function as a protector of the public interest.

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

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 23, 1969]

PUBLIC SWALLOWS FDA'S MISTAKES

(By Morton Mintz)

Despite a lot of tough talk, the Food and Drug Administration continues to approve the sale of about 90 widely prescribed antibiotic combinations that, it says, cause needless massive injury and even death.

FDA Commissioner Herbert L. Ley Jr., solidly backed by the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, has ruled the medicines unsafe. With full NAS–NRC support, he has also ruled the products ineffective as fixed-ratio combinations. In such combinations, the components are mixed in proportions determined by recipe rather than the individual needs of patients.

Yet month after month, under a court order he has failed to resist, Dr. Ley goes on certifying new batches of the combinations as safe and effective, thus permitting them to remain on sale.

Dr. Ley, himself a specialist in the use of antibiotics to treat infections, has testified on Capitol Hill that one of the mixtures, Panalba, alone causes hundreds of thousands of injuries—a few of them lethal—every year. Other specialists are alarmed at the possibility that widespread, needless use of the combinations may bring worldwide epidemics of infections resistant to treatment.

Yet there is no assured end to the "conflict between commercial and therapeutic goals," as Dr. Ley once described it, in which he goes on certifying the combinations.

A CHARGE OF FEAR

This extraordinary situation has many roots—in the FDA's approach to the broad problem of ineffective medicines, in a series of agency responses to resistance from the drug industry and in attitudes of the medical profession.

But according to two former FDA scientists, the period of transition between the lame duck Johnson administration and the incoming Nixon administration was crucial to FDA treatment of the case. There was, the scientists say, an intuitive fear that if agency leaders took strong action against the combinations, it would bring retaliation from a business-oriented White House.

Dr. Robert S. McCleery, who was Commissioner Ley's special assistant for communications, says bluntly that the commissioner "wanted to keep his job," in which he serves at the pleasure of the President.

Dr. McCleery and Dr. B. Harvey Minchew, who was acting director of the FDA's Bureau of Medicine, were interviewed during an investigation by The Washington Post that turned up hitherto secret aspects of the agency's decision-making processes

They say that a second factor inhibiting the FDA in its treatment of the antibiotic combinations was an uneasy recognition that such a move would focus attention on failures within the FDA itself—starting with a medically unjustified decision a dozen years ago to let the mixtures enter the market.

Thus, Drs. McCleery and Minchew argue, fear abetted by coverup joined to obstruct the FDA from protecting the health and pocketbooks of a vast number of patients.

Dr. Ley and another key figure in the case, J. Kenneth Kirk, associate commissioner for compliance, heatedly deny the charges of fear and cover-up. Kirk concedes, however, that he delayed action on the antibiotics in order to obtain figures on their sales volume (probably $100 million or more a year at wholesale). That was "my idea," he says.

And FDA's counsel, William W. Goodrich, acknowledges in retrospect that had the agency invoked one simple word in the drug law, the subsequent problems might have been substantially minimized if not avoided. The law allows action against drugs posing "an imminent hazard to public health." The agency balked at the word "imminent."

"SHOTGUN" THERAPY

The antibiotic combinations are among the so-called "ethical" drugs, which means that they can be sold only by prescription and cannot be advertised to lay audiences. Their names, therefore, are hardly household words. But in medical channels, including journals distributed free to physicians, they have been long and heavily promoted.

They began entering the market in the 1950s. The FDA released them even though—then as now—specialists in the antibiotic treatment of disease almost universally opposed them.

The main argument in favor of the mixtures has been convenience. This appeal has been especially strong to doctors who wish to be spared the need to make precise diagnoses.

Dr. William L. Hewitt, professor of medicine at the University of California at Los Angeles and chairman of a National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council panel to review drugs, told Sen. Gaylord Nelson's Senate Monopoly Subcommittee last May that the person responsible for FDA's initial approval of antibiotic combinations was Henry Welch, a bacteriologist who in the 1950s headed the agency's Division of Antibiotics.

Dr. Hewitt recalled that Welch had staged symposiums and had engaged in other efforts with an FDA imprimatur to popularize the combinations. This "very bad policy" encouraged "a shotgun approach to the treatment of undiagnosed disease," Dr. Hewitt testified, and he denounced it as "pharmaceutical quackery."

The late Sen. Estes Kefauver developed evidence that Welch got $287,000 from antibiotics producers in an eight-year period, mainly by collecting "honorariums" from two journals whose existence depended upon the antibiotics companies. Welch resigned after the situation was exposed.

However they got on the market, the antibiotic combinations took up an increasing share. Many have been among the 200 most-prescribed medicines. Last year, sales of Panalba—the combination involved in FDA's test case—ran at a rate of $1.5 million a month and accounted for 12 per cent of the domestic gross of the manufacturer, the Upjohn Co.

CASE AGAINST COMBINATIONS

Almost without exception, specialists in the treatment of infectious diseases denounce the use of combinations. They say that the use of two antibiotics when one will do at least doubles the risk of adverse reactions. They also say that fixed ratios prevent a physician from increasing the dose of one component without increasing the dose of the second, thus ruling out treatment tailored to the needs of individual patients.

Panalba, for example, combines two effective antibiotics—novobiocin and and tetracycline. But Dr. Ley has said that novobiocin contributes little but risk to patients receiving tetracycline.

In addition, tests sponsored by the Upjohn firm about a decade ago (but not disclosed until an FDA inspector discovered them in company files this year) showed that the components of Panalba were "antagonistic." That is, novobiocin and tetracycline acted against each other, making one less effective than either would be if used alone.

UCLA's Dr. Hewitt told the Nelson subcommittee that all sales of Panalba thus become "a net theft from the public."

A primary worry among 30 specialists in infectious diseases—members of five panels that reviewed combinations of anti-infective drugs for the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council—was that the products allow resistant strains of bacteria to proliferate, creating the possibility of epidemics of infections that resist treatment. They recall with dread, for example, staphylococcus epidemics of the 1950s that were nurtured by over-use of sulfonamides and the early penicillins.

Testifying about one group of mixtures, Dr. Calvin M. Kunin, chairman of one of the NAS–NRC panels, told the Senate Monopoly Subcommittee that "widespread" and "indiscriminate" use "has almost led to disaster" by threatening not merely the individuals receiving the drugs but—because of possible epidemics of resistant infections—"all society."

Dr. Kunin, who is chairman of the department of preventive medicine at the University of Virginia, was speaking about 16 combinations of penicillin with streptomycin (pen-streps). The latter antibiotic can cause deafness, particularly in children. An additional 32 products also contain penicillin but mix it with sulfonamides (pen-sulfas).

THE PANELS' VERDICT

Until 1962, the Food and Drug Administration was empowered to get prescription drugs off the market only if they were unsafe. But in that year, Congress passed the Kefauver-Harris amendments, which added regulatory weapons against ineffective drugs as well. Aften seven years, no drug with significant sales has been removed.

The National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council entered the picture in 1966, when the FDA made a contract with it to review the efficacy of the approximately 4,000 formulations marketed in the period before 1962 when safety alone had to be demonstrated before marketing.

Last year, NAS–NRC review panels concluded that the pen-streps and the pen-sulfas were not only unsafe but also ineffective as fixed combinations because none was more efficacious than a component used alone. As to Panalba, the initial conclusion

was that it was ineffective and "has no place in rational therapeutics."

Last Christmas Eve the FDA moved formally to take Panalba off the market. The reason given was that the company had not submitted the substantial evidence of efficacy required by the 1962 drug legislation. The agency failed, as had the NAS–NRC panels, to cite a lack of safety.

That failure was surprising. For one thing, the FDA for several years had approved a labeling for the novobiocin component of Panalba warning that it can cause serious and even fatal blood diseases, serious liver damage and allergic or hypersensitivity reactions "in a significant percentage of patients."

FDA Commissioner Ley told Sen. Nelson's subcommittee last May that because of novobiocin, about one out of five patients on Panalba is expected to suffer a "reaction that, most often, is merely irritating . . . you can't sleep for several nights or a week, or you may break out in a very unpleasant, uncomfortable rash."

The FDA's formal notice last December gave Upjohn 30 days to file comments, after which the company could request a hearing.

At roughly the same time, the FDA was working to produce positions on two other major classifications of the antibiotic combinations—the pen-streps and the pen-sulfas—which the review panels had found both hazardous and ineffective.

Testimony before Rep. L. H. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee last spring established that a document declaring the agency's intention to remove the pen-streps from the market reached the office of Associate Commissioner J. Kenneth Kirk last Dec. 3, and that a similar document relating to the pen-sulfas reached the same office Jan. 10. Both would have been effective upon publication in the Federal Register, and that in turn would have triggered publication in a medical journal of a "white paper" by two NAS–NRC review panel chairmen warning of the hazards of pen-streps and pen-sulfas. Both documents were in final form—awaiting Commissioner Ley's signature—on Jan. 15.

A FINE SENSITIVITY

On that day, Robert S. McCleery remembers, he had a chance encounter with Associate Commissioner Kirk at FDA headquarters in the Crystal Plaza in Arlington. Then Commissioner Ley's special assistant for communications, Dr. McCleery acquired a reputation for tough-minded regulation during his six years at the agency. He holds FDA's award of merit and the distinguished service medal of the parent Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

He was under pressure at the time from the NAS–NRC panels, which wanted to alert the medical profession to the hazards of the pen-streps and pen-sulfas. Since release of the "white paper" designed to do so depended on publication of the Federal Register documents, "Dr. McCleery was on my back," Kirk recalls.

In the Jan. 15 meeting with Kirk, Dr. McCleery recalls inquiring about the regulatory documents involving the pen-streps and pen-sulfas that had been prepared for the signature of Commissioner Ley. Kirk told him, Dr. McCleery says, "I have advised him [the commissioner] not to sign the papers, because he would be fired by the Nixon administration when it comes in next week."

Although there was no evidence that anything of the kind might happen, Dr. McCleery says, there was in the FDA a finely tuned sensitivity to such signals as Mr. Nixon's campaign stance against tough regulation by the Securities and Exchange Commission and to the incoming President's well publicized friendship with Elmer W. Bobst, the "honorary chairman" of a pharmaceutical firm—not, by the way, one involved in the antibiotics combination controversy.

Kirk "categorically" denies making the statement about administration retaliation, and Dr. Ley says Kirk never told him he might be fired by the Nixon administration. Kirk does say that he told Dr. McCleery that the regulatory papers should not go to the office of the HEW Secretary without a prior determination of the sales volume of the questioned antibiotic combination.

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT

Later the same day, Dr. McCleery says, he met with Dr. Ley in his office. Saying nothing about the conversation with Kirk, Dr. McCleery asked the commissioner if he had signed the papers. Dr. Ley said that he had not yet seen them. Later he was to tell the Fountain subcommittee that he had the documents on Jan. 21, the day after the Nixon administration took office.

Eight days later, there was a meeting at the FDA about the possibility of setting up an advisory committee on antibiotics. Dr. McCleery, who says he was "bird-dogging" the matter, requested Dr. B. Harvey Minchew to check on the status of the papers. Dr. Minchew put the question to Deputy Commissioner Winton B. Rankin, the FDA's No. 2 man.

"His answer, in essence, was that we were not going to act on it until the whole potential impact of the antibiotics was brought to the Secretary's attention," Dr. Minchew says. By "impact," he says, Rankin meant "economic impact—the fact that they were best-selling drugs. Anticipating industry resistance, they did not want to implement the action until the Secretary's office had concurred."

At a later date, says Dr. Minchew, Dr. Ley told him "substantially the same thing."

"I can't see that the agency should concern itself . . . with how much is being sold in terms of the medical issues involved," Dr. Minchew says. "It was a disappointment."

Kirk says he is "sorry that Harvey was disappointed." But, the associate commissioner says, there is a long-standing rule that the Secretary's office be alerted to any regulatory action with a potentially great impact.

The Commissioner signed the Federal Register papers on April 2—2½ months after the day when, according to his testimony, they were in his office ready for signature. Publicly, he has never given a clear explanation for the delay. Nor has Kirk given a clear explanation as to how the computation of financial effect could have accounted for the delay.

THE PANALBA DELAY

The Panalba case was undergoing a parallel delay. When he signed the initial notice of intention to take the drug off the market last December, Dr. Ley had given the Upjohn Co. 30 days to file comments. But in January, he extended that deadline to give the firm an additional 120 days. That had the effect of ensuring that any possible decisive action would be taken under the Nixon administration.

Dr. Ley has acknowledged that the extension was "a mistake" because it was used by Upjohn not to supply substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy but for a campaign to deluge the FDA with testimonials from physicians. An estimated 23,000 doctors have prescribed a reported 750 million doses of Panalba since it went on sale in 1957.

Not all the effects of the delay were in the drug company's favor, however. For by March, Dr. Minchew, as acting director of FDA's Bureau of Medicine, was becoming increasingly disturbed about one of Panalba's components, novobiocin.

In a memo to Dr. Ley, Dr. Minchew cited multiple and serious health hazards of this antibiotic that had been noted by an NAS–NRC panel that recommended its removal from the market. (Dr. Ley had overruled the recommendation, choosing instead to try to restrict novobiocin's use drastically with new warnings to doctors.)

The Minchew memo threatened a crisis for the Upjohn firm. So long as efficacy has been the sole issue raised by the FDA, sales of Panalba could continue unabated while an administrative hearing was sought and held and then litigated in the courts. That would probably take years. But with safety an issue, Upjohn had to face the possibility that sales would be halted immediately.

At the FDA, the Minchew memo became the basis for a crisis of a different kind. After all, the agency had been certifying Panalba as safe and effective for 12 years, batch by batch and month by month.

But Dr. Ley himself—in a draft letter of April 29 to the Upjohn firm—discussed Panalba's "clearly evident imminent hazards . . ." And he testified that it needlessly injured hundreds of thousands of persons annually and, along with the pen-streps, contributed to the possibility of staph epidemics.

How, then, could he fail to take the "imminent hazard" route—a route that, in hindsight, FDA counsel Goodrich says "would have been better?"

Commissioner Ley now concedes that the case for an "imminent hazard" decision might have been made on the basis of serious or fatal blood diseases attributed to Panalba. He contends, however, that the FDA would have faced a severe court challenge because of a lack of records showing that skin and allergic reactions were as prevalent as the agency claimed.

Differing from counsel Goodrich, Dr. Ley insists that, overall, the public health probably was better served by his decision to follow an "intermediate" course. This was to declare Panalba a "serious" or "significant" hazard to patients.

In choosing such a middle ground, Dr. Ley says he was trying to come down between "the Rankins and the Kirks" on the one hand—a reference to the two high-ranking FDA officials who rose from the ranks of agency inspectors and who are known for their bureaucratic caution—and the "Don Quixotes" on the other.

Before Dr. Ley's newly contrived weapon could be tested in court, the commissioner had a struggle within HEW that indicated he could not count on the kind of unequivocal support from Secretary Robert H. Finch that his predecessor, Dr. James L. Goddard, had received from former Secretary John W. Gardner.

The struggle began when Dr. Ley called in the Upjohn firm to say that he was going to announce several decisions. These included halting certification of Panalba as effective and safe, recalling existing stocks and requiring the company to distribute a warning letter to physicians.

Through the intervention of Rep. Garry E. Brown (R-Mich.), whose district includes Upjohn's home city of Kalamazoo, the firm met with Finch and Under Secretary John G. Veneman. The result was that on the day of the meeting, May 5, Veneman took an action without known precedent in the history of antibiotic regulation.

In a phone call to Deputy Commissioner Rankin, Veneman asked the FDA to consider resolving the dispute by taking certain alternative steps. These, it turned out, were the very proposals that Upjohn had made. They included a ban on publicity about Panalba, no recall of existing supplies and an administrative hearing that would allow Panalba to remain on the market without interruption.

The next day, Dr. Ley responded in a memo addressed to Finch that, along with other key documents, was aired by the Fountain subcommittee of the House. Dr. Ley said that he "cannot" certify Panalba as safe and

effective. The product "has been judged by very competent people not to be effective . . . and to be a hazard to the public health," Dr. Ley's memo said.

"We have the right and the obligation to move to protect the public by requiring its removal from the market and by requiring an appropriate warning to be issued to the doctors of this nation," Dr. Ley said.

"I recommend that the department endorse and support the action initiated by FDA," he continued. "If the department is unable to accept this recommendation, I request your instructions as to the departmental position that I should follow."

On May 9, three days later, the "departmental position" was relayed to the FDA: to do what Upjohn had asked. But as it happened, that was the very same day that the Fountain subcommittee, preparing for a hearing that was to begin the next week, asked to see FDA files on combination antibiotics.

This request set off a chain of events that included a briefing of Finch by FDA counsel Goodrich. Late in the day, Secretary Finch reversed himself and backed Dr. Ley.

THE UNUSED WORD

With this development, Upjohn moved on May 27 to put Dr. Ley's concept of a "serious" or "significant" hazard to a court test. The firm filed a petition in federal court in Kalamazoo that was intended to keep Panalba on sale through the device of an administrative hearing.

On June 19, the eve of oral arguments before Judge W. Wallace Kent, W. Donald Gray of the Fountain subcommittee staff asked FDA counsel Goodrich in a phone conversation why he was not asserting that an "imminent hazard" existed. Goodrich assured Gray that he had the legal weaponry he needed without that one.

In court on June 20, the Washington lawyer opposing Goodrich—Stanley L. Temko of Covington and Burling for Upjohn; Lloyd N. Cutler of Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering for the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association—emphasized repeatedly that the FDA had not claimed an "imminent hazard."

FDA's Goodrich, using phrases about Panalba that are nowhere in the statute ("unwarranted hazard," "substantial hazard," "unacceptable risk"), argued that the agency had not deemed it necessary to invoke "imminent hazard."

He contended that the FDA had traveled the correct legal route when it first required Upjohn to submit substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy and then, when such evidence was not forthcoming, refused to certify the product as safe and effective.

Even though Goodrich produced affidavits showing 11 fatalities among Panalba users, Judge Kent was clearly unimpressed. His concern, he said, had to be with legal issues, not issues of safety and efficacy.

In July, Judge Kent held that there was not serious threat to the public health. But, he found, there was a threat of another kind—of irreparable injury to the Upjohn company.

He granted an injunction requiring Commissioner Ley to go on certifying Panalba until 30 days after whatever date he disposed of company objections to the FDA's refusal to grant a hearing.

Sensing a clear industry victory, the American Home Products Corp., whose Wyeth Laboratories division is a major producer of pen-streps and pen-sulfas, swiftly went into federal court in Wilmington, Del., where, on the basis of Kent's ruling, it asked for and got an injunction requiring continued certification of those antibiotic combinations as safe and effective.

The ruling was a shattering setback to the FDA's seemingly interminable efforts to stop the sales of unsafe and ineffective drugs.

By the time Judge Kent ruled, Dr. McCleery had left the FDA to join Rep. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee as a consultant. After the ruling, he and staff member Donald Gray had a three-way phone conversation with Goodrich. Again the question was, why had the FDA counsel not invoked "imminent hazard?"

As Dr. McCleery and Gray recall the conversation, Goodrich said he still believed he had been on solid legal ground in deciding it was unnecessary to cite the phrase. But, they add, Goodrich also alluded to the tortured record of the FDA in the Panalba case—including the 120-day extension granted by Dr. Ley for Upjohn to file substantial evidence of Panalba's efficacy—and asked, "How could I go into court and charge an 'imminent hazard'?"

Judge Kent's order to continue certifying Panalba posed for Dr. Ley what Dr. McCleery calls "one of the greatest moral challenges" ever faced by a public official.

As a physician and scientist, how could Dr. Ley certify as safe and effective what he had fervently pronounced unsafe and ineffective? As an official of the government, how could Commissioner Ley refuse to obey a court order?

"Above all else," Dr. McCleery argues, Dr. Ley should not have signed certifications for Panalba—"even if it meant resigning." But there was, he points out, an honorable third course: appeal Judge Kent's decision.

Asked why he didn't take it, Dr. Ley says, "I can't really answer this . . . I'm not really sure this course was open to us at this time."

The commissioner adds that he relied on William Goodrich because "I trust Billy as much as I've trusted anyone in my life." He is sure that if an appeal had been "an attractive course, I'm sure I would have followed it."

But Goodrich says he rejected the idea of appealing in favor of what he deemed to be "the shortest and surest way" of getting unsafe antibiotic combinations off the market—ruling on Upjohn's objections to decertification without a hearing. So long as these objections were pending in FDA, Goodrich contends, the chances of a successful appeal would be "not good."

MIDDLE GROUND AGAIN

Commissioner Ley formally ruled that the objections filed by Upjohn offered neither substantial evidence that Panalba was either safe or effective (as a fixed combination) nor reasonable grounds for an evidentiary hearing. "Such a hearing would serve no purpose other than delay," he said in a statement in the Federal Register.

Had Dr. Ley left it at that, he could have stopped certifying Panalba 30 days later as stipulated by Judge Kent. Then the company, if it wished, could appeal. Once again, however, Dr. Ley procrastinated on an invented middle ground.

First, while denying an "evidentiary hearing," he gave Upjohn an opportunity "to make an oral presentation to the commissioner." Second, contrary even to the FDA's own press release, he did not start the clock running on the 30-day moratorium on decertification.

The "oral presentation"—which was as much of a legal novelty as was the "serious," "significant" and "unwarranted" hazard—was held Aug. 13. Five weeks went by in which the FDA continued to certify Panalba—and the pen-streps and pen-sulfas, as well—as safe and effective.

On Sept. 19, Dr. Ley, ruling that nothing in Upjohn's "oral presentation" had changed his judgment, signed a "final order" to take Panalba off the market. But, reversing the position he had taken in May, he did not propose to decertify existing stocks. With this action, the 30-day clock at last began to run.

The Upjohn firm then stopped the clock by filing an appeal in Cincinnati. The FDA "voluntarily agreed to suspend any action against the [Panalba] products pending a decision by the court," The Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association Newsletter reported. "The court further noted that the government had not found any 'imminent hazard' to health requiring immediate prohibition of the products' sale, and that in the past these products had been repeatedly certified as 'safe and efficacious' by the FDA."

"INEPT" IS TOO KIND

Sometime in December, the appellate court will hear oral argument on issues that it has termed "very significant both to the public and the drug industry." Sometime after that, the court will rule. Sometime after that, an appeal probably will be taken by the losing party—the FDA or Upjohn—to the Supreme Court. And for an indefinite time to come, the FDA commissioner will go on certifying as safe and effective products that he believes to be neither.

It was with more than a premonition of these events that Dr. McCleery went to Dr. Ley last February to tell him he was leaving.

"I told him I couldn't agree with his kind of regulatory philosophy," Dr. McCleery recalls. "I told him I was seeing evidence that he was handling matters so as to take into account political and economic factors.

"Dr. Ley asked me to stay, to reconsider to take a couple of weeks vacation to think it over," Dr. McCleery says. "I refused."

Dr. McCleery then was retained as a consultant by the Fountain subcommittee, which at the time was preparing for hearings in April and May on how the FDA had been fulfilling its mandate from Congress to halt the sale of ineffective drugs. The hearings showed, Dr. McCleery says, "that the FDA is not upholding the provisions of the law."

After the hearings, Rep. Fountain characterized the FDA's performance as "inept." Dr. McCleery finds that a "complimentary" adjective. As Dr. McCleery sees it, the consequences for the public of the mishandling of the antibiotics will reach far beyond these drugs to vast numbers of ineffective medicines of all types which were marketed before 1962 but which remain among those most often prescribed today.

"How well have the leaders of the FDA served the nation with only the law to protect it in this confrontation with industry self-interest?" he asks. Yet "in these serious and deadly matters, the FDA is our sole agent for the use of law in the protection of public health. If the law can be so misused by some against the government and the public interest, then the law should be employed by others against the government but in the public interest."

Dr. McCleery recently left the Fountain subcommittee to join consumer advocate Ralph Nader.

Another of the FDA's "Don Quixotes," Dr. Minchew, resigned in May to join the Johns Hopkins Hospital unit in Columbia, Md. "The Rankins and the Kirks," of course, are still there.

In a speech a few months ago, FDA Commissioner Ley defined "the real 'gut' issues of the antibiotic combination controversy" this way:

"Are we in this country dedicated to a rational, scientific basis of antibiotic therapy or are we dedicated to contributing unnecessarily to the 1.5 million hospital admissions annually attributed to adverse reactions to drugs?"

A speech given a few days ago by Dr. Lester Breslow, president of the American Public Health Association, contained a sentence that reads as if it were tailored to give Dr. Ley his answer. In the Panalba case, Dr. Breslow said, "The administrative and judicial action to assure continuing sale was clearly designed to protect the interests of the drug manufacturer, not to avoid the hazard to patients taking the drug."

[From Science, Aug. 29, 1969]

FDA AND PANALBA: A CONFLICT OF COMMERCIAL, THERAPEUTIC GOALS?

(By Morton Mintz)[1]

Last month the National Academy of Sciences–National Research Council sent a final report to the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on its review of the therapeutic claims made for 80 percent of the medicines Americans use. The review—carried out by 30 NAS–NRC panels, each responsible for particular categories of disease—concluded that manufacturers were unable to provide substantial evidence to back up one or more claims made for a significant proportion of the preparations.

Five NAS–NRC panels reviewed anti-infective agents that combine one antibiotic with another in fixed ratios, or an antibiotic with one or more sulfonamides. In addition to finding about 40 such products to be ineffective, by reason of being no more effective than their components used singly, the panels judged at least 50 combinations to be dangerous. The hazard was said to be not merely to the individual user, but to the public at large, because these agents can permit resistant strains of bacteria to proliferate. The mixtures held to be hazardous as well as inefficacious are the "pen-streps" (penicillin and streptomycin), the "pen-sulfas" (penicillin and sulfa), and Panalba (tetracycline and novobiocin).

Panalba is one of the most popular items manufactured by the Upjohn Company of Kalamazoo, Michigan, a prominent member of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association (PMA). It was expected that the FDA, which received the NAS–NRC judgment on Panalba well before the final report on the entire efficacy review was released, would move to take it off the market; and it was predicted by Commissioner Herbert L. Ley, Jr., in testimony on Capitol Hill, that such a move would face a prolonged legal challenge. The FDA *did* move to take Panalba off the market, and Upjohn *did* file a lawsuit, in federal court in Kalamazoo.

The Panalba case is significant not only because of its impact on the continued sale of a drug termed hazardous in the NAS–NRC study but because it raises much deeper issues bearing on the "rights" of drug companies, physicians, the government, and patients. The case and congressional criticism have also highlighted what a U.S. senator called "serious ethical questions" on the part of the drug company, a conflict of interest within the American Medical Association, a remarkable flip-flop in FDA enforcement attitudes, and an abortive, late-hour intervention by HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch on behalf of the drug company.

The narrow issue before Judge W. Wallace Kent was whether to grant the petition of the company—which was supported by PMA—for an injunction against the Food and Drug Administration to force the agency to grant an administrative hearing. For Upjohn, the overriding point was its "right" to such an administrative hearing—a procedure which would allow Panalba to remain on the market while the hearing was conducted and the matter perhaps litigated in the courts—and also the "right" of physicians to prescribe as they wish. As for PMA, the lawyer acting in its behalf argued that the FDA had to be prevented from making "an authoritarian official determination of what is good for medicine." He called the Panalba action "truly a test case" both for "the doctors in this country and the drug industry."

[1] Morton Mintz, a reporter for the Washington Post, is author of The Therapeutic Nightmare. For his reporting on thalidomide in 1962 he was awarded the Heywood Broun, Raymond Clapper, and George Polk memorial awards.

The government saw things differently. In court a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare lawyer argued that the case will control "the future of patient care in the United States." And FDA Commissioner Ley said in congressional testimony that the struggle over hazardous and ineffective combinations of antibiotics was at bottom a "conflict between commercial and therapeutic goals."

Judge Kent ruled on 11 July. On the crucial issue of an administrative hearing he held that the company was not entitled to one "as a matter of right." But this defeat for Upjohn—and the industry—was considerably softened. To take one example, the judge said that the FDA could not now stop sales of Panalba (which, in the United States alone, were running at a rate of $1.5 million a month in 1968). Instead, he said, the agency first must act on objections filed by Upjohn to the decision of the commissioner to refuse to certify Panalba as safe and effective. Once the commissioner had acted on the objections (he rejected them on 9 August), he still would be barred from decertifying Panalba for 30 days (after which, presumably, the company could carry the case to a court of appeals that would have to decide whether to allow sales to continue).

The public-interest forces involved in the Panalba struggle were unusually formidable. They included an unbroken rank of medical scientists specializing in the treatment of patients with infections; a strong law that Congress enacted without audible dissent; an agency determined—albeit belatedly—to enforce the law; the NAS–NRC verdict; and the chairman of two actively concerned congressional subcommittees, Representative L. H. Fountain (D-N.C.) and Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.).

The counterforces also were unusually formidable. Predictably they included the PMA, whose members make 95 percent of the prescription drugs sold—and consistently enjoy profit rates higher than those of any other industry, according to Federal Trade Commission records; the American Medical Association, which derives almost half of its income from drug advertising in its Journal; and two leading Washington law firms. Covington & Burling, representing Upjohn, and Wilmer, Cutler & Pickering, representing the PMA. But there was also in the Panalba case the intervention, on the company side, of Robert H. Finch, Secretary of HEW, which was triggered by Representative Garry E. Brown (R-Mich.), of Kalamazoo, and—odd as it may seem, and up to a certain point in time—of the FDA itself.

In defending Panalba the Upjohn Company has ignored invitatons to testify before the interested congressional subcommittees. It preferred a day in court, where lawyer Stanley L. Temko of Covington & Burling warned that a halt in the sale of Panalba would inflict "irreparable injury" on Upjohn. The drug accounts for 12 percent of the firm's domestic gross income.

The PMA had a broader concern: If the sale of Panalba could be halted without the years of delay that might accompany a grant of a hearing, the FDA would have a clear legal track to stop the sale of the pen-streps and the pen-sulfas. In addition, there would be ominous implications for other drugs that, even if not shown to be actually hazardous, had never been shown to be effective—but that nonetheless produce hundreds of millions of dollars a year for the companies that manufacture them.

For many physicians—Upjohn says that 23,000 regularly prescribe Panalba—the stakes were of a different order, having to do with the claim to an unrestricted "right" to prescribe, even if that "right" is founded on advertising, promotion, and other forms of nonscience. Panalba, Temko told Judge Kent, is one of the medicines most often prescribed, and since it entered the market in 1957, he said, 750 million doses have been administered. Indeed, fixed-ratio combinations of one kind or another—including Panalba and the pen-streps and the pen-sulfas—account for 83 (more than 40 percent) of the 200 most popular prescription products.

For patients, the important issues were not profits, wounded egos, or even high prices (Panalba is not sold under a generic name) but a risk of adverse reactions that is at least doubled by the use of two antibiotics when one suffices. "The real 'gut' issues of the antibiotic combination controversy are exceedingly simple," Commissioner Ley said in a speech in February. "Are we in this country dedicated to a rational, scientific basis of antibiotic therapy or are we dedicated to contributing unnecessarily to the 1,500,000 hospital admissions annually attributed to adverse reactions to drugs?" This view was solidly supported in the medical-scientific community. Five NAS–NRC panels, appointed at FDA's request to review all available evidence on the efficacy of anti-infective agents, concluded that mixtures are ineffective as fixed-ratio combinations because none is more effective than its components used separately. In fact, all 30 members of the panels concluded unanimously that these products "no longer belong in the therapeutic armamentarium" and should be removed from the market. The panel chairmen and Dr. Louis Weinstein, author of the "Microbial Diseases" section of the authoritative *Pharmacological Basis of Therapeutics*, in affidavits filed with Judge Kent, said that scientific literature contains no adequate, well-controlled studies to support the claims made for antibiotic combinations. This is the position held "without exception by the outstanding experts in the antibiotic field," said panel chairman William M. M. Kirby, a professor of medicine at the University of Washington. According to another panel chairman, Dr. Heinz F. Eichenwald of the University of Texas, Dallas, "There are few instances in medicine when so many experts have agreed unanimously and without reservation." None of this was any surprise, because the experts had been denouncing fixed-ratio antibiotic products from the time the FDA allowed them to enter the market, starting almost two decades ago. The combinations, of course, have the appeal of "convenience" to practitioners who prefer "shotgun" therapy to painstaking diagnosis. But such alleged advantages come at the price of preventable injury to patients who get an antibiotic they do not need, or who cannot get enough of a component they do need without also getting more of another potent agent they do not need.

The issues raised by the antibiotic combinations have, with extraordinary clarity, exposed a conflict between profit and principle in the American Medical Association. For at least a dozen years AMA's respected Council on Drugs has condemned fixed-ratio preparations as "irrational." On 16 May, by unanimous vote, the Council endorsed the stand of the NAS–NRC. In 1960 a former chairman of the Council, Dr. Harry F. Dowling of the University of Illinois, told an AMA meeting that none of the antibiotic combinations "is justified." Even as he spoke, the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (*JAMA*) was carrying 18 full pages of advertising for antibiotic combinations. In 1961 Dr. Ernest B. Howard, now executive vice president of the AMA, assured the late Senator Estes Kefauver that the Board of Trustees "has reached a decision that the mixtures . . . will be gradually withdrawn from the *Journal*, during the next two to three years." Although 8 years have gone by, such ads remain abundant in *JAMA*. At a hearing on 6 May, Senator Nelson wondered if the reason was "that advertising these drugs provides an important source

of revenue." Kirby took pains to display two recent full-page ads in *JAMA* for Panalba, which, he said, are fortified by the "implied endorsement" of the AMA. Early this year, the AMA, which was seeking tax-reform legislation to exempt profits from its ads on the ground that they are "educational," had a choice before it: to continue to run ads that, as Nelson put it, "promote bad medical practice," or to publish a unique "white paper" signed by all five chairmen of the NAS–NRC panels. They were so concerned about their findings that they wanted the medical profession to be alerted by *JAMA* because of its wide circulation. However, the request to *JAMA*—made by Duke C. Trexler, executive secretary of the NRC—was, he said, refused "bluntly, flatly," and without explanation by Dr. John H. Talbott, editor of *JAMA*. The refusal was "indefensible," Dr. John Adriani of New Orleans, chairman of the Council on Drugs, told Senator Nelson. "It boils down to this," he said. "They need every dollar they can get." The *New England Journal of Medicine* was offered the "white paper" and, on 22 May, published it.

Congressional committees have continued to play a pivotal role in drug politics, particularly by putting pressure on federal agencies. Last March, for example, Roy D. Sanberg, an inspector for the Food and Drug Administration, went to Kalamazoo to search Upjohn's files in the Panalba case. He discovered a series of controlled studies which the company had sponsored in 1960 and earlier. FDA regulations required submission of materials such as these in 1964 and 1966. Nothing was known of Sanberg's discovery until 13 May, when an analysis of them by the FDA's Dr. McQueen was put into the record of a hearing by Representative L. H. Fountain's House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee. At a hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly, Senator Gaylord Nelson said that Upjohn's failure to offer the studies raised "very serious ethical questions." William Goodrich, the FDA counsel, testified that there was a possibility of "regulatory action of a criminal nature." Upjohn's explanation was that "no valid conclusions could be drawn" from the studies.

One of the studies, conducted by Dr. Bennett W. Billow, was a double-blind trial of 50 persons who were moderately to severely ill with pneumonia treatable with tetracycline. Dr. Billow found that Panalba was no more effective that its tetracycline component used alone. Dr. E. L. Foltz conducted four in vitro crossover studies to compare efficacy by measuring blood levels after use of Panalba, novobiocin alone, and tetracycline alone. For Panalba, the results were unfavorable. They showed, Dr. McQueen said, that Panalba produced "lower blood serum levels for both novobiocin and tetracycline than the levels attained by the use of either used alone."

In earlier hearings, Fountain was critical of Dr. Ley, who, on 1 July 1968, was promoted from director of the Bureau of Medicine to FDA Commissioner. The subcommittee probed Dr. Ley's handling of chloramphenicol sodium succinate, the injectable form of the antibiotic most commonly known by the Parke-Davis trade name of Chloromycetin. Fountain was appalled by the FDA's "lack of vigor in protecting the public, and especially children," against the continued marketing of a drug with a labeling recommending sites for injection, the efficacy of which had not been established and which could result in irreparable harm and even death. He told Dr. Ley that his performance in this case "appears to border on indifference." The commissioner has said privately that the hearings turned him into a hard-liner on efficacy, not only because of the sting in the Fountain charge but also because of sharp work by the subcommittee staff that exposed weaknesses in his executive echelons, of which he has been insufficiently aware.

Dr. Ley's performance in the early stages of the antibiotic combination controversy also drew congressional fire. For one thing, despite the urgency felt by the five NAS–NRC panel chairmen about the need to get the "white paper" swiftly before the medical profession, Ley had sat on it for 6 weeks. This period, it must be noted, was one of tense uncertainty because of the transition to the Nixon Administration. For another thing, in what Ley later told me was "a mistake," he granted Upjohn and E. R. Squibb, producer of Mysteclin-F, which, simultaneously with Panalba, had been declared ineffective as a fixed-ratio antibiotic combination, a period of 120 days stop an original 30 to submit "substantial evidence" of efficacy (this was before the safety issue also was raised). The companies used the extra time to solicit almost 3500 letters of support—"testimonials." Ley called them—from the profession. Some of the letters picked up verbatim phrasing suggested by the companies. A number of letters from doctors at the Oak Forest Hospital in Oak Forest, Illinois, were identical to letters from doctors at the Chicago State Hospital. The Maine Medical Association circularized its membership with a paraphrased list of guidelines for letters that had been prepared by Squibb. On 28 January, J. C. Gauntlett, a vice president and director of Upjohn, sent an appeal to doctors to protest to the FDA on the ground that it was violating the physician's right to prescribe." Dr. Hewitt of the University of California, in his appearance before Senator Nelson, denounced Upjohn's "Dear Doctor" letter as an "ill founded, confusing, threatening, and dangerous" method for deciding a scientific issue; as "bold, unscrupulous and selfish"; as "insulting to the intellectual and scientific training of physicians"; and as "detrimental . . . to the practice of medicine as well as to the necessary efforts of regulatory agencies to protect the public from truly unscrupulous promoters." But it may tell us something about the state of the profession to note the number of letters of support the FDA got in comparison with the 3500 "testimonials." The number was ten.

POLITICAL OVERTONES

The controversy had other political overtones. Since January 1967, the Third Congressional District of Michigan, which includes Kalamazoo, has been represented by Garry E. Brown. On 15 May he voluntarily presented himself before the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee as a "Congressman-ombudsman" summoned by high duty to protect any constituent—personal or business—that becomes "a victim of the impersonal, remote and awesome structure of the Federal Government." [2] It was in this role of "Congressman-ombudsman," Brown testified, that he had arranged a meeting between a delegation from Upjohn, including its president, Ray T. Parfet, Jr., and its Washington counsel, Stanley Temko, and Robert H. Finch, Secretary of HEW. Finch's involvement had been a surprise disclosure when the hearings opened 2 days earlier.

On 26 March, the Bureau of Medicine formally recommended to Ley that FDA stop certifying Panalba as safe and effective because its novobiocin component created serious risks without commensurate benefits. On 30 April, the commissioner said in a memo to Finch that, at a meeting the next day, he would (and he did) tell Upjohn that FDA was discontinuing certification of Panalba, which would make further distribution illegal; that all outstanding stocks were being decertified and had to be recalled by the company, and that Upjohn would have to send a "Dear Doctor" warning letter about novobiocin and Panalba. The memo was routed through Surgeon General William H. Stewart, Acting Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs; whether it reached Finch, who declined to testify, was not established. At the 1 May meeting, Temko attacked FDA's plans as "drastic and shocking." The same day, Ley sent a memo on the meeting to the Secretary.

On 5 May, thanks to the intervention of Representative Brown, the Upjohn forces met with Finch and Under Secretary John G. Veneman. The company's proposals, repeated later in the day to the FDA, were that there be no publicity about the Panalba matter, that a "Dear Doctor" letter not be sent, that certification of Panalba be resumed promptly and that a hearing be granted without interruption to sales of Panalba. Later the same day, Veneman phoned Deputy Commissioner Rankin with an instruction: to "consider" a "possible resolution" that turned out to be identical to Upjohn's own proposals.

"The basic question before us," Ley said the next day, 6 May, in a memo to Dr. Stewart (the commissioner meanwhile had been instructed to stop addressing memos to Finch), "is whether the Government is prepared to move promptly and effectively to stop the use of a hazardous drug when the available facts and the national drug law show clearly Panalba represents serious hazards to patients who take it which are not balanced by any benefit to be expected." The commissioner said that the evidence made it impossible for him to certify Panalba to be safe and effective. He said he could not suppress publicity, as Upjohn had requested, particularly because Senator Nelson and Representative Fountain had scheduled public hearings and "are insisting that when public interest must be weighed against private interest the former should take precedence." As for FDA holding an administrative hearing, Ley said he would grant one, with sales of the drug in question continuing, if the issue is efficacy alone; but in a case such as Panalba's, he said, a hearing would be considered, with certification stopped, only if Upjohn could supply reasonable grounds for holding one— meaning "substantial evidence" of efficacy. If HEW is unable to back him, Ley concluded, "I request your instructions as to the Departmental position that I should follow."

FINCH INTERVENES

The Finch episode came to a climax—or a series of climaxes—3 days later, on Friday, 9 May. At 9:15 a.m., C. C. Johnson, who is Administrator of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, is Ley's boss in HEW, phoned the commissioner to report that Stewart had approved his recommendations for the course of drastic action against Panalba. Fifteen minutes later, however, William Goodrich, the assistant HEW counsel, phoned with a contradictory message: "The Secretary said we must have a hearing." Although Finch wanted it to be convened "with all possible dispatch," it could take 4 months even to get a hearing under way. Goodrich, who testified that he had acted at the request of Robert Mardian, general counsel of HEW, told the subcommittee that at this point Finch had not seen the 6 May memo in which Ley said that he could not in conscience certify Panalba to be safe and effective.

An hour later, at 10:30 a.m., W. Donald Gray, an investigator for the subcommittee, who was unaware of the events of the preceding 75 minutes, notified the FDA that he wanted to examine its files on antibiotic combinations. He was told the files would be

---

[2] In the proceedings before Judge Kent, local counsel for Upjohn was Henry Ford, Jr., of the Kalamazoo firm of Ford, Kriekrad, Brown & Staton. "Brown" is the congressman. However, he says he left the firm when he entered the House 2½ years ago. He received at least $1000 from the law firm in 1968, as disclosed in his filing, with the House Committee on Standards of Official Conduct, but he says this was entirely in settlement of his severance.

ready for him within an hour. Shortly, however, the FDA informed Gray that there would be a delay because, it was disclosed, Finch had "an unwritten policy that requests from congressional committees regarding 'potentially explosive situations' were to be called to the Secretary's attention." Was President Nixon invoking "Executive privileges," the subcommittee inquired. No such claim was being made. Assistant Secretary Creed Black said—but he was unable to cite a legal basis for refusing to open the files. After lunch, Goodrich testified, Finch was briefed on the situation. The Secretary authorized that the files be opened. Goodrich phoned at 3 p.m. to tell Ley of the decision.

Once the files were examined, subcommittee chairman Fountain told the hearing, it was "apparent that the decision with respect to the marketing status of this drug [Panalba] was made by the Secretary, rather than the Commissioner." This was unprecedented: In the approximately 15 years during which a succession of Secretaries had delegated their power over antibiotic certification to the FDA, none had ever been known to try to prevent a commissioner from acting to protect patients from a serious hazard.

PLANS ENDORSED

At 3:10 p.m., soon after Finch knew that the documents revealing his involvement would be discovered by the subcommittee, he rescinded his earlier order to FDA to leave Panalba on the market while a hearing was being held and endorsed the commissioner's plans for Panalba.

(Finch's defenders claim that he was misled, at the meeting with Upjohn executives and counsel, into believing that the FDA had inexcusably reneged on a promise to hold a hearing. Such a hearing, of course, is available so long as the issue is efficacy alone. But efficacy had been the sole issue in the Panalba case only for a time.)

On 27 May, the Upjohn Company responded by asking Judge W. Wallace Kent for a temporary restraining order and an injunction to stop the Food and Drug Administration from decertifying Panalba without a hearing. In granting the order (after a discussion in chambers) and the injunction the judge constructed a legal structure whose intricacy awed students of food and drug litigation. A primary question was how *any* court could assume jurisdiction in a case in which the FDA had pending before it, and was required to rule on within 30 days of filing, the company's objections to the agency's declared intention to stop certifying Panalba as safe and effective. Judge Kent answered the question simply by holding that, in issuing the decertification order, the FDA in fact had completed final administrative action. But the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 says that, when administrative action is completed, a company may carry a grievance to a court of appeals; how, then, could a lower court in Kalamazoo take jurisdiction?

The judge met this situation with a finding that Upjohn was entitled to the extraordinary relief of a preliminary injunction. This finding, in turn, required the company to show that it probably would prevail in the administrative process or on the merits in a judicial review. However, the judge held that the company did *not* have to show a strong likelihood of success in an administrative process. The basis for this holding was the statement he made repeatedly to counsel, when the case was argued on 29 June, that he was not at all concerned with the issues of safety and efficacy, only with the legal issues. Thus, as the FDA summed up Judge Kent's ruling in a brief filed later in another injunction case, he "refused to recognize" that Upjohn "had been wholly unable to produce" adequate and well-controlled studies to demonstrate the efficacy of a potent drug it had sold for 13 years, and that his injunction would allow the firm to continue to make claims of efficacy which it had not documented. While ignoring the commissioner's explicit finding that Panalba created an unwarranted hazard, and the documentation of unnecessary fatalities in the affidavits, the court was able to hold that an injunction would in no way seriously threaten the public health—but was necessary to avert irreparable injury to Upjohn. Upjohn, the judge said, was entitled to interim relief because it had been placed in "an extremely awkward position" by the refusal of the FDA to divulge the names of the NAS–NRC panelists—"faceless judges." Upjohn lawyer Stanley Temko had called them. The judge rejected the FDA's explanation that NAS–NRC had insisted on anonymity "so to avoid pressures from commercial sources" (8 July, in its final report, NAS–NRC listed the 180 members of all 30 panels). He also said that the commissioner had placed complete reliance on the anonymous NAS–NRC panelists—even though the commissioner said the panel reports were advisory and the final decisions were his alone.

On challenged, intricate legal grounds, a federal judge in Upjohn's home city assumed jurisdiction and allowed the company to go on for more than 3 months selling a product that the NAS-NRC and the FDA found to be a serious hazard and ineffective. In mid-August, it was disclosed that the judge is the unpaid chairman of the Kalamazoo Science Foundation, a charitable organization, half of whose trustees are connected with Upjohn.

It will be recalled that the commissioner, Dr. Herbert L. Ley, Jr., said the conflict over the combination antibiotics was "between commercial and therapeutic goals." If he is correct, the Panalba case reaches a great question of our time: In a struggle between public interest and special interest in which the stakes are needless exploitation, injury, and even death to helpless patients, can American institutions function reliably to protect the public?

NAS-NRC VERDICT ON THE BENEFIT-RISK RATIO OF "COMBINATIONS"

Panalba, the drug at issue in the Kalamazoo court case, is one of the fixed ratio combinations criticized by the NAS-NRC review. The tetracycline component of Panalba is effective against a broad spectrum of infections. The other ingredient, novobiocin, has a spectrum of antibacterial activity conceded by Upjohn to be covered by several other safer and more efficacious drugs. Indeed, a review panel of the NAS–NRC found the benefit-to-risk ratio so lopsided that it recommended removal of novobiocin from the market. The vote on the injectable form was 6 to 0, and on the oral form, 5 to 1. Although the panel said that oral therapy is not indicated in serious infections, the FDA, in May, decided to let novobiocin remain on sale "for those serious infections where other less toxic drugs are ineffective or contraindicated." This new, severely restricted labeling is in a special, boxed warning emphasizing "the rapid and frequent emergence of resistant strains, especially staphylococci," as a risk in the use of novobiocin.

That the same dread threat of "staph" epidemic exists with the "pen-streps" has been emphasized by Dr. Calvin M. Kunin, an NAS–NRC panel chairman who heads the Department of Preventive Medicine at the University of Virginia. The "widespread" and "indiscriminate" use of the pen-streps, he told Senator Gaylord Nelson's Senate Subcommittee on Monopoly, has caused a proliferation of resistant organisms throughout the world and "has almost led to disaster," thus threatening injury "not merely to the individuals receiving such combinations, but to all society." [3]

[3] The NAS–NRC panel on the fixed-ratio penicillin-sulfonamide combinations ("pen-sulfas") said, "Reactions to these drugs are common, and . . . can be severe and even fatal. . . . Another troublesome aspect . . . is that it is difficult to detect the drug causing an untoward reaction when multiple drugs are used." In addition, the panel warned that the pen-sulfas often *decrease* antimicrobial effectiveness because of antagonism among the components, a problem averted by their separate use as determined by the need of the individual patient.

The boxed warning for novobiocin also warns, on the basis of NAS–NRC findings and FDA's own studies, but with Upjohn's concurrence, of "the high frequency of adverse reactions, including hepatic dysfunction and rashes." In testimony on 27 May, FDA commissioner Ley told the Subcommittee on Monopoly, "Approximately one out of every five patients who receives the novobiocin component of Panalba is expected" to have an allergic or hypersensitivity type of reaction. Most such reactions are "merely irritating," he continued. "You can't sleep for several nights or a week, or you may break out in a very unpleasant, uncomfortable rash." There "must be literally hundreds of thousands" of such reactions a year, Ley estimated. In addition, a "smaller proportion" of Panalba patients "experience temporary but very severe liver damage as a result of the novobiocin component." Finally, he said, "a still smaller number" suffer blood disorders. These accounted for 11 of the 12 fatalities among Panalba users that Upjohn has reported to the FDA. But the agency emphasizes that adverse reactions to all drugs "are grossly under-reported." In the case of the pen-streps, yet another NAS–NRC panel chairman, Dr. William L. Hewitt, professor of medicine at the University of California, Los Angeles, said that, in addition to occasional reports of "dramatic streptomycin toxicity, there are, more importantly, "possible countless instances" of a cumulative, hidden threat to the hair cells in the ear, and thus to the sense of hearing.

Are the hazards posed by Panalba and the penicillin combinations offset by therapeutic advantages? The FDA and the NAS–NRC say they are not. This is all the more troubling because of a report—which first emerged on 13 May in a hearing of the House Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee—that the amount of novobiocin in Panalba is sufficient to do harm but insufficient to do good. The report was made by Dr. Max B. McQueen who, as a medical officer in the FDA's Division of Anti-Infective Drugs, analyzed a series of studies of Panalba that Upjohn itself sponsored but failed to submit to the FDA as required by law, and which were discovered in its files by an agency inspector.

These studies showed that the amount of novobiocin that becomes available in the bloodstream is not only a subtherapeutic dose but is occasionally even zero. McQueen's report was included in an affidavit filed with the federal court in Kalamazoo. In another affidavit, Winton B. Rankin, Deputy Commissioner of the FDA, told of a meeting on 1 May at which Dr. Fenimore T. Johnson, director of product research for Upjohn, admitted—despite the company's claims that Panalba was superior to its components used separately—that the company "had substantiated evidence of the efficacy of novobiocin but not of the combinations."

AFTER KEFAUVER, DRUG CLAIMS TESTED

Until the late 1930's, a manufacturer could market a drug without first being required to demonstrate that it was safe and effective in the uses for which it was labeled. The death of 107 people in the Elixir of Sulfanilamide disaster in 1937 led to the passage of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938. Now, for the first time, manufacturers were required to present premarketing evidence of safety. In 1959, Senator Estes Kefauver, then chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on

Antitrust and Monopoly, began 2½ years of hearings that produced overwhelming evidence of the need for reform legislation, including a requirement for a premarketing demonstration of efficacy. President Kennedy agreed. In March 1962, in his message on Consumer Protection, he said that, of the new single entities listed since 1956 by the American Medical Association's Council on Drugs (which does not list combinations at all), more than 20 percent "were found, upon being tested, to be incapable of sustaining one or more of their sponsor's claims regarding their therapeutic effect. There is no way," he said, "of measuring the needless suffering, the money innocently squandered, and the protraction of illness resulting from the use of such ineffective drugs."

The thalidomide catastrophe rescued Kefauver's reform proposals from oblivion, and, in the fall of 1962, propelled them, as the Kefauver-Harris Amendments, through Congress without a dissent being heard. The efficacy provisions require the sponsor of a drug to provide "substantial evidence," which the law itself defines as consisting of "adequate and well-controlled investigations, including clinical investigations, by experts qualified by scientific training and experience to evaluate the effectiveness of the drug involved." Although the efficacy provisions took effect forthwith for new medicines, a 2-year period of grace was granted for the 1938–1962 products. These include most of the drugs prescribed today—approximately 4000 formulations sold by 237 companies. The FDA directed manufacturers to search their files and report, by September 1964, if these contained information showing that any claim—whether for efficacy or safety—was not warranted by actual experience, and if promotional materials failed to disclose any necessary warning or contraindicated use, along with any side effects or untoward reactions that may have appeared after marketing had begun. In July 1966, with an order published in the *Federal Register*, the FDA required manufacturers to submit any materials in their files bearing on efficacy to the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council (NAS–NRC), which, under a contract initiated by the then Commissioner James L. Goddard, was beginning a survey of the effectiveness of the 1938–1962 drugs. Essentially, Goddard felt that only by enlisting the NAS–NRC could he get the job done. His resources within the FDA were extremely limited, whereas, he believed, the NAS–NRC could offer the help of the country's top scientific talent.

THE MEDIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I have received a clipping dated January 23, 1967, from the Jackson, Miss., Daily News quoting David Brinkley of NBC Huntley-Brinkley fame.

The story indicates, in some small way, Mr. Brinkley's philosophy and might offer some insight on how difficult it is for the liberal commentators to be objective when "they report the news."

Mr. President, 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:

NATIONAL TV GIVEN ITS SHARE OF BLAME

GREENVILLE, MISS.—David Brinkley—nationally-known television news commentator—told an integrated audience Saturday night that Mississippi had received some bad publicity "and that television is as much to blame as the so-called northern press."

The statement came in a question and answer session following Brinkley's address to about a thousand persons attending the 51st annual Chamber of Commerce membership meeting.

The newsman was asked his opinion of the state's national image. In a humorous tone he replied that the best law in Mississippi had been changed. "Liquor wasn't on the market, so the prohibitionists were happy. Those who wanted liquor could buy it, and the state got the taxes, and I call that ingenuity," Brinkley said.

On a more serious note he said that Mississippi had been hurt in the last four or five years "but that its image was improving."

He said that it was not just Mississippi that was suffering from racial confusion, but the whole southern quarter of the United States.

"Mississippi has received some unfair publicity and television is as much to blame as the so-called northern press, but in the last couple of years it has become obvious that not only the southern states have not solved the racial problem, but the entire country has not solved it," Brinkley said.

In his address Brinkley said there were people in Washington dedicated to creating a Utopia, a society of perfect peace and prosperity. He said President Johnson is convinced he can bring this about.

Brinkley, an admitted liberal who makes only three or four addresses a year, said "The government can provide a floor and four walls, but you cannot buy equality and happiness, and it cannot be legislated."

At worst, he said, this Utopia would be a dictatorship, and at best it would be dull. "It would be a good place to visit, but you wouldn't want to live there."

The Chamber dinner marked the beginning of many new activities, reorganization, new officers, and the implementation of a newly developed work program "Project 80."

PROGRESS IN PREVENTION OF AIR CARGO THEFT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, for the past year, as chairman of the Select Committee on Small Business, I have been extremely concerned about the serious and growing problem of theft and pilferage of goods in air commerce. On May 22 and 23 and on July 22, I conducted a full series of hearings on the economic impact of such loss and theft on the small businessman, the major shipper of goods in air commerce. In the very near future, the Small Business Committee will release a report detailing recommendations to assist in combating this type of crime.

During these hearings, it was repeatedly called to the attention of the Small Business Committee that the carriers were delinquent in undertaking even minimal precautions to insure safety of air cargo, and their cooperation with the local police authorities was less than adequate. Today I wish to provide for the RECORD an example of what can be accomplished when an air carrier, Pan American World Airways, and a police department, the New York Port Authority Police, work together to prevent theft and pilferage.

It is significant to note that Pan American World Airways was cited, in testimony before the committee on July 23 by the American Watch Association, as being delinquent in its cargo security. In its defense, Pan Am advised the committee that it was undertaking an extensive review of its security system in order to combat whatever inadequacies that might exist.

I am pleased to report that it appears that Pan American's efforts are paying off. I hope to report soon that improved security by the air carrier industry will not be an isolated example, but universal throughout all airports in the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article reviewing Pan Am's success in detail, published in the New York Times of November 27, 1969.

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

THREE ARRAIGNED IN PLOT TO STEAL WATCHES FROM AIRLINE HERE

Three men were arraigned here yesterday, on charges of trying to steal watches at Kennedy International Airport.

Port of New York Authority policemen arrested them Tuesday while they were trying, the police said, to steal watches and parts valued at $14,000 from a Pan American World Airways cargo shipment.

The men were identified as Heinz Wabnik, 39 years old, of 1681 St. Mark's Avenue, Merrick, L.I.; Michael Sampayo, 45, of 922 Barretto Street, the Bronx, and Jose M. Sanza, 38, of 390 Jackson Avenue, the Bronx.

Because attempted theft in international commerce is a Federal offense, the Port Authority turned the suspects over to the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The three men were released on their own recognizances after appearing before the United States Commissioner in Brooklyn, pending appearance in Federal Court there.

Mario T. Noto, executive director of Airport Security Council, formed in June, 1968, to help reduce cargo thefts, issued a statement hailing the arrests.

"This is an example of the type of alertness by the Port of New York Authority Police which is helping rid JFK Airport of the stealing and pilferage which is being committed against air cargo," he said.

Mr. Noto held a special meeting June 9 of Government and industry officials to find ways of coping with the increasing theft of imported watches at the airport. He estimated at that time that the value of stolen watches from January to June was $100,000. He noted that watch packages were small and "the smaller the package the more vulnerable it becomes to pilferage."

RETIREMENT OF DWIGHT J. PINION, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF THE SENATE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, it is my wish to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that one of our most skilled professional employees has retired after serving a distinguished career of 27 years in the Office of Legislative Counsel.

Of course, I am referring to Dwight J. Pinion who retired from his position as head of the Senate's legal office on October 31. Some of the new Senators might have missed the opportunity to work with Dwight personally, but I know that word of his excellent reputation has carried to all of us.

When I entered upon my first term as a Senator in the 83d Congress, Dwight Pinion had already been here 11 years. During the 1950's, Senators still made it a usual practice to deal directly with the attorneys in the Senate's Legislative Council, and I can remember that it gave me a great deal of confidence to learn that I could call on the service of professionals such as Dwight Pinion who

had many more years of experience in the Senate than I myself did.

This quality of continuity in the service of attorneys is the hallmark of the Senate's legislative drafting office. When Dwight Pinion retired, the average length of service of the 11 attorneys in the office exceeded 16 years. Eight lawyers had been with the office for more than 17 years and five of these individuals had served the Senate for over 21 years.

Mr. President, my major purpose at this time is to commend Dwight Pinion for his outstanding record of aid and advice to individual Senators and several committees. But in so doing, it is impossible to separate the work Dwight performed from the work of the office in which he served. Everything that Dwight Pinion did was done according to his high conception of the role expected of him as a member of the Senate's legislative office.

When he met with requests from nine or 10 Senators at the same time, he handled each politely, competently, and swiftly. We all know that Senators do not want to wait once they have decided to introduce a bill or offer an amendment. Dwight knew this, too, and he respected our right to ask for a measure immediately. He never hesitated by making excuses. He just did the job as soon as he could, which often was the very same day that he was asked to do it.

If this meant that Dwight had to stay at his desk until 10 or 11 at night, or drive in to the office for work on Saturdays and Sundays, then that was what he did.

The point that I am raising is that Dwight Pinion dedicated his mind and skills to serving the Senate in the very best way that he could. His personal standards were extremely high and he fulfilled them in every respect.

Although much of his work had to be done swiftly, it was never rushed. His colleagues tell me that Dwight read and reread all his drafting work, two, three, and more times before letting it go out.

He was constantly guided by the thought of protecting each Senator and the Senate, and the public at large, against any unfortunate applications or interpretations of the bill or amendment which he was asked to write.

Dwight Pinion was a reliable, brilliant, and effective technician. He got the job done when it was needed. He performed his tasks in a dignified, friendly manner. He always made you feel he was eager to help you and enjoyed turning out a professional product. I am told that he was an excellent teacher of the younger attorneys, too, looking to the day when they would have to carry the entire burden of a major field, such as labor law or civil service laws, by themselves.

Mr. President, I believe that I can pay no higher tribute to Dwight Pinion than to say that he exemplified by his career the perfect nonpartisan professional assistant which the Senate had in mind when it created the Office of Legislative Counsel.

The office was established just 50 years ago last February for the purpose of providing the Senate with its own independent staff of lawyers who would possess the highest special competence in the art of drafting and advising on Federal legislation.

Dwight Pinion filled to a tee all the exacting responsibilities which the Senate intended for its legislatve attorneys. His standards and his performance will serve as the model for all lawyers in his office for many, many years to come.

Mr. President, I want to convey my wish—and I am confident that I speak for all Senators—that Dwight Pinion and his wife, Kathryn, will enjoy a long and happy retirement. Blessed as they are with a wonderful family of three daughters and a young grandchild, this should be the easiest chore he has encountered in a long time.

Mr. President, I wish also to express my congratulations to the newly appointed Legislative Counsel, John Herberg. He has assumed this position after a career of 31 years as a Government attorney—the last 22 of which he has been in the Office of Legislative Counsel.

In taking over the reins of the office when it is entering upon the second half-century of its existence, he has quite a challenge facing him. The amount of work done by this small office has grown by leaps and bounds. For example, during the short period of time from the 88th Congress to the 90th Congress, its caseload jumped by 23 percent.

The total number of bills, resolutions, and amendments prepared by Legislative Counsel during the 90th Congress reached an amazing 4,500 pieces of proposed legislation. This is an imposing achievement for a law office consisting of 11 attorneys, and I think it deserves our attention and recognition.

Consequently, I want to extend to John Herberg and the entire staff of Legislative Counsel my best wishes on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of their office and to express my highest commendations for the record of excellence the office has built up over the last five decades. If each member of the office will continue to display the same sense of selfless dedication that marked the career of Dwight Pinion, I know they will be able to handle any challenge that the future may bring.

ADDITIONAL DEATHS OF CALIFORNIANS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, between Saturday, November 22, 1969, and Friday, November 28, 1969, the Pentagon has notified seven more California families of the death of a loved one in Vietnam.

Those killed were:

Sgt. Johnny L. Buriss, son of Mr. Frank A. Buriss, of Oakland.

Sp4c. Barry J. Bedard, son of Mr. and Mrs. Walter M. Bedard, of Canoga Park.

Sp4c. Rory W. Hunter, son of Mr. Virgil W. Hunter, of Covina.

Pfc. William F. Lease, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edward O. Lease, of Montclair.

Sp4c. Robert M. Newberg, son of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Pontello, of Long Beach.

Cpl. Dennis L. Stevens, nephew of Mr. and Mrs. James E. Stevens, of Vallejo.

L. Cpl. Charles D. Yllan, son of Mr. Charles Yllan, of San Jose.

They bring tc 3,891 the total number of Californians killed in the Vietnam war.

POLICY POSITIONS ADOPTED BY THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE ON EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT AND FISCAL AFFAIRS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, at the 61st annual meeting of the National Governors' Conference recently, the Nation's Governors discussed and adopted policy positions developed by their six committees concerning the many areas of interest to the States. The Committee on Executive Management and Fiscal Affairs, whose chairman was Gov. Daniel J. Evans, of the State of Washington, recommended policy positions on important issues now being considered by this Congress. Among these are revenue sharing and the taxation of industrial development bonds, subjects of particular concern to me and on which I have introduced proposed legislation.

Other policy positions important to State governments were taken on the taxation of State and local bonds, the interstate taxation of business, the taxation of national banks, and intergovernmental cooperation. These policy positions were unanimously adopted by the Nation's Governors.

I commend Governor Evans for his leadership as chairman of the National Governors' Conference Committee on Executive Management and Fiscal Affairs. Because of the timeliness and importance of these policy positions, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the policy positions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY POSITIONS OF THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

REVENUE SHARING

The National Governors' Conference went on record in 1965 in support of the principle that the federal government share a portion of its revenue with the states, unfettered as to functions for which it is to be used. The Conference reiterates its stand on this matter, and further recommends, consistent with the criteria approved by the Conference in 1968, that a revenue sharing plan be formulated on the following basis:

(1) Congressional appropriations for revenue sharing should be made on the basis of the federal individual income tax base.

(2) Congressional appropriations for revenue sharing should be made to a trust fund established in the Treasury of the United States.

(3) The sums appropriated should be allocated among the states, based primarily on population adjusted by relative state and local tax effort. The relationship between the taxing ability and the percentage of federally-held and administered land acreage in each state should also be considered.

(4) Congress in its appropriations to the states should specify a pass-through formula

to local governments. Eighty percent of the monies which are for distribution to local governments should be passed through automatically according to formula to eligible local governments; twenty percent should be passed through to eligible local governments on application of these units to the state, and should be available for programs at the local level which encourage cooperative or joint efforts of local governmental units to solve a common problem.

(5) The federal pass-through formula should provide for sharing revenue only with general purpose units of government.

(6) The allocation by formula should be made to relatively populous cities and counties based on population and the ratio between the total receipts from all taxes imposed by eligible cities or counties and the total receipts from all taxes imposed by the state and its political subdivisions. The portion of any state's allocation which would be available for local governments within the state would depend upon the portion of total tax revenue raised by the state and that raised by the eligible local units in the state. An alternative state allocation plan of distribution should be accepted if (a) each city and county receive an amount equal to or greater than that allocated by formula, or (b) city and county councils or governing bodies representing fifty percent of those entities entitled to receive at least fifty percent of payments by formula concur in the state's alternative plan.

(7) No functions should be excluded from expenditures made from shared funds.

TAXATION OF STATE AND LOCAL BONDS

The National Governors' Conference affirms the basic constitutional principle that neither the federal nor state governments without mutual agreement have the authority to tax the other. The Conference therefore asserts that state and local bonds issued for general governmental purposes must remain tax exempt. The Conference also strongly opposes those aspects of the House-passed Tax Reform Act of 1969 (H.R. 13270) which would adversely affect the marketability of state and local securities and thus the provisions of needed public services and facilities.

INTERSTATE TAXATION OF BUSINESS

For a number of years the National Governors' Conference has expressed opposition to federal legislation which would restrict the taxing jurisdiction of the state and provide preferential tax immunity to favored multistate businesses, and has expressed full support for legislation which would give congressional approval to the enactment of the Multistate Tax Compact by the states.

This conference now goes one step further in supporting an expanded and/or specific version of a congressional consent bill for the Multistate Tax Compact to allay expressions of concern in the Congress that the original consent bill set out only a broad statement of purpose, and to counter claims that the states were seeking a sort of blank check in the area of multistate taxation.

The Conference therefore urges Congress to enact legislation, drafted by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in collaboration with the Council of State Governments, which incorporates the Multistate Tax Compact and expresses congressional consent to enactment by the states of a compact substantially the same thereto, plus the following additional provisions:

(1) The three-factor formula (Uniform Division of Income for Tax Purposes Act) developed by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State laws is made mandatory for net income taxes upon States which have not enacted the Compact by July 1, 1971;

(2) States are given jurisdiction to require collection of sales tax by sellers making interstate deliveries into a state if the seller makes regular household deliveries there; and

(3) Income taxes may be imposed on congressional salaries only by the district and state represented by the Congressman.

TAXATION OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT BONDS

The Conference recognizes that so-called industrial development bonds have been used for non-governmental purposes. Unfortunately federal legislation adopted in 1968 to remove the tax-exempt status of industrial development bonds erroneously included in its definition some traditional governmental functions and thus made them taxable under this legislation. The Conference reiterates its 1968 resolution urging legislation properly to redefine industrial development bonds.

TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS

The National Governors' Conference reiterates its concern, expressed in a policy statement adopted in February, 1969, that action be taken to counteract the effects of court decisions giving an unfair tax advantage to national banks. The Conference urges the adoption of Representative Patman's bill, as amended and reported out of committee (H.R. 7491, Report 91-290), which would allow states to treat national banks the same as state banks for state and local tax purposes.

FEDERAL ROLE IN STATE PLANNING

Planning has always been a vital element in the decision-making process, and in recent years much effort has been made at the federal and state levels to improve the methods by which it is done. The federal government has shown its concern and interest by many programs of assistance to state and local governments for planning. However, many problems have arisen: a multiplicity of planning grants with different federal requirements; uncertain funding; and no integration of plans, especially at the federal level.

The National Governors' Conference urges that:

The Congress and the Administration should take immediate action to correct the confusing, contradictory, duplicative and overlapping mass of federal requirements and definitions concerning both long-range and annual operational plans. Federal agencies should recognize the Governor as the chief state policymaker and planner responsible for the coordination of all statewide and multi-jurisdictional sub-state planning. The elected heads of local government should be recognized in the same capacity for all state and federal programs operating within their jurisdictions.

An appropriate share of the funds of each functional federal grant program should be made available to the Governor for the purpose of relating functional plans to each other, to statewide goals and policies and to local development policies. This effort should begin with HEW which has thirty-nine programs, each requiring a statewide long-range or annual operating plan.

Major federal planning assistance programs should provide for forward funding on a two or three-year basis; minimum annual funding for each state; interprogram service agreements; evaluation machinery; technical assistance, training and tuition fees as eligible project costs; and minimum standardization and coordination of federal planning definitions and requirements.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

The National Governors' Conference commends the Congress for passage of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, which among other things, provides for keeping Governors and legislatures informed of federal grant-in-aid rules and regulations, provides a means to obtain flexibility in administration of the "single state agency" requirement, provides flexibility in state banking of federal funds, authorizes federal agencies to render technical assistance and training services to state and local governments on a reimbursable basis, and provides for federal coordination with local authorities regarding land use.

The Conference urges Congress now to extend the principles of intergovernmental cooperation by enacting legislation which would establish procedures to allow the simplification of accounting, auditing and reporting of federal assistance funds; authorize the President, subject to congressional veto, to consolidate federal assistance programs within agencies; allow joint funding simplification for the packaging of grants for the same or related programs; and provide for periodic congressional and executive review of grant programs to determine their effectiveness.

TRAINING

The growing complexity of state government programs, and of the many intergovernmental programs in which states are involved, is placing an enormous burden upon state officials and employees responsible for the over-all management and unity of state operations. Training is a necessary part of equipping these officials and these employees to carry their burdens.

The National Governors' Conference commends the Council of State Governments for strengthening its training activities: the Conference notes the successful seminar held last December for newly-elected Governors and their aides, the continuing work of the Council and the National Association of State Budget Officers in providing policy-oriented training for budget personnel, the newly established training program for legislators and legislative staff, the recent collaboration with organizations of local officials to provide training on matters of intergovernmental concern, and the scheduled seminar for Governors' aides. The Conference urges further intensification of these efforts.

The Intergovernmental Personnel Act now before Congress should help to strengthen state and local training programs. The Conference endorses the objectives of this Act.

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR STATE CONSULTING HELP

All Governors have on occasion needed the temporary assistance of persons from outside their state governments to bring a different perspective to policy issues as well as to bring to bear technical knowledge and experience in various fields of state government. Although private consulting firms and universities have been used to help provide this assistance, a major reservoir of talent, largely untapped, is the state governments of the Nation. The use of this talent would be of benefit both to the state receiving help and, through broadening the experience of the personnel involved, to the state supplying the expertise.

The National Governors' Conference requests that its Secretariat establish a clearinghouse to enable states to draw upon the experience and talents in the state governments by helping states define their problems with precision and clarity, and identifying employees in state governments who are qualified to provide effective assistance.

HEALTH BUDGET CUTS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on a number of occasions over the last several months, I have denounced the tragic reductions by the Nixon administration in vital health programs. I will continue to speak out and plan to fight these cuts in the Senate. We need more funds in this area, not less.

One of the more recent announcements by the administration was its decision to terminate the chronic disease programs next year, involving cancer, respiratory

ailments, diabetes, arthritis, heart, and stroke, and neurological and sensory disorders.

An example of the tragic implications of this decision which will cause the closings of 19 clinical research centers was brought to light in an article written by Miriam Kass and published in the Houston Post of November 6. One of the 19 clinical research centers which will be closed is the center at the Texas Children's Hospital in Houston.

The story points out that 3-year-old Jamie Cook has been receiving specialized treatment at the center. His mother, Mrs. June Cook, has written to the President:

Mr. President, his life may very well be literally in your hands.

Jamie Cook has biliary atresia, and it is fatal in 95 percent of the cases.

She hopes the President will change his mind about the Federal budget cuts he has proposed, so that Jamie may still be treated at the center. She has my support, and I will fight to reverse this and other health budget cuts.

Mr. President, 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:

[From the Houston Post, Nov. 6, 1969]

MOTHER PROTESTS HOSPITAL AID CUT—HER SON WAS SAVED

(By Miriam Kass)

Jamie Cook was born with yellow skin.

"It will probably go away soon," the doctor said.

"A month later, when he explained that Jamie might have biliary atresia and it's fatal in 95 per cent of cases—I kind of felt like—like sinking through the floor," says June Cook, his mother.

Yet she was prepared for that moment.

I was 38 when Jamie was born. He's the first child I've given birth to. The doctor said I had about a 20 per cent chance of carrying him.

I would ask myself, What will you do if something is wrong with him?' "

Mrs. Cook, who lives with her family off a country road in Wharton, prayed for her boy.

Now, Mrs. Cook, who believes in action as well as prayer, has written to the President of the United States about Jamie.

"Mr. President," she said, "his life may very well be literally in your hands."

Not that she expects President Nixon to turn healer.

She asks only that he change his mind about federal budget cuts he has proposed. The cuts threaten the existence of Texas Children's Hospital's clinical research center, where Jamie is being treated.

On the day Jamie was 3 months old, doctors at the center examined the delicate insides of the small boy as he lay on the operating table.

"They confirmed the biliary atresia. They told us there was nothing they could do to help, and we could expect Jamie to live probably another four to five months."

Biliary atresia is the absence or closing of ducts that normally drain bile from the liver. "The liver manufactures bile continuously," explains Mrs. Cook, now expert on the subject.

"If there are no ducts, the bile can't get out. It creates pressure. The liver is destroyed."

At surgery it was found Jamie's liver was already half destroyed. The yellow of his skin had deepened, stained by the pigment of bile that could not get out of his body.

Not only did Jamie seem to have no working bile ducts; the surgeon also found there was no connection between his liver and his gall bladder, which normally stores bile for the intestines.

Before he closed up the little body, he did two things. He connected the gall bladder to the liver. And he ran plastic tubes from the liver through an opening made in Jamie's side.

The doctors had no illusion that they would help Jamie's basic problem. At best they figured the tubes would provide the drainage generally needed after any surgery.

But a strange thing happened.

"When Jamie's intestines started functioning after surgery, there was bile in his bowel movement for the first time. It was also coming through the drain in his side.

"He began improving immediately."

Deliberate attempts to create bile drainage in similar cases had failed in the past. Yet here, where doctors had not dreamed they would affect the liver disease, suddenly the liver was draining bile.

To the Cooks it was a miracle.

To the doctors at the clinical research center it was a challenge.

They had a clue.

Microscopic study of a sample of Jamie's liver had shown the liver to be inflamed, infected.

And another clue:

"About the time I got pregnant with Jamie I got a real bad virus," Mrs. Cook recalled.

Usually it is assumed that biliary atresia means the baby is born with no ducts, one doctor says. But in this case, could there have been ducts after all—ducts clogged by infection?

Could that infection have passed into the liver of the developing fetus before his mother even knew he existed?

By chance or by miracle the tubes in Jamie's side may have provided drainage for the infection, allowing the ducts to open, the doctor suggests.

By chance or by miracle those tubes may have been put in just the right place also to carry off the bile from the liver's own ducts.

It's a theory. The doctors at the clinical research center are trying to check it out or to find other explanations for Jamie's apparent escape from death—explanations that might help more babies.

But now the whole biliary atresia study and many others are threatened.

Mrs. Cook admits that "the most active part I've ever taken in government is to vote." Yet she is leading a letter writing campaign to urge the President and congressmen to restore clinical research center funds to the President's budget.

Since his surgery, her baby has had his ups and downs. He is draining a normal amount of bile—half through his side and half through the gall bladder to the bowel.

What will happen tomorrow, no one knows.

Jamie is now 13 months old. He is small, but growing normally, a blue-eyed flirt with sandy hair that stands on end and a big stretch bandage around his middle to secure the dressing over the holes in his side.

And his skin is pink.

WOR–TV ELECTION DAY SPECIAL IN NEW YORK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, much is being said about "what's wrong" and "what's right with television in our country today. I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues and the Nation the 18½-hour election day special presented by a local television station in New York—WOR–TV—as an example of "what's right."

WOR–TV performed a special public service. The station preempted all its programing on Monday, November 3—the eve of election day—and made it available at no cost, for the exclusive broadcast use of the qualified candidates for the offices of mayor of New York City and Governor of New Jersey.

This donation of a full day, 18½ hours—7 a.m. November 3 to 1:30 a.m. November 4—of broadcast time, so that all the candidates and the issues could be made available to the public view, was clearly responsive to the people's need for full, frank, and open discussion and represented a giant step forward to provide programing "in the public interest."

In our society, it is imperative that the electorate have an opportunity to meet the various candidates and to understand their policies. Yet as the populations of our cities and states grow larger and the costs of campaigning continue their upward spiral, it becomes increasingly difficult for candidates to reach all the electorate during a campaign. I believe the unique and important public service offered by WOR–TV should stand as an important example for other local stations as well as for the networks. Such public-service broadcasting is bound to encourage enlightened voting and to permit qualified candidates to seek public office despite limited financial resources.

I wish to record my congratulations to the management of WOR–TV for a fine public service—and for unbiased concern for the important issues of our day. I ask unanimous consent that a press release by WOR–TV as well as an article in the New York Times of November 4, 1969, which describe the special programing, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOR/TV TO PROVIDE FREE TIME TO TOP OFFICE CANDIDATES

WOR/TV (New York 9) in an unprecedented public service move, announced today that it will preempt all programming on Monday, November 3 (the eve of Election Day), and made it available at no cost, for the exclusive broadcast use of the qualified candidates for the offices of Mayor of New York City and Governor of New Jersey.

The announcement was made by Edward A. Warren, General Manager of the RKO-General Flagship Station, who has extended an invitation to the candidates by telegram.

The donation of a full day, 18½ hours (7:00 am November 3 to 1:30 am November 4) of broadcast time, in order that the men and the issues be clearly in the public view, said Mr. Warren in making the announcement.

Invitations have been sent to the following four qualified candidates seeking the mayoralty of New York City: Mario Procaccino (Democratic Party: Non Partisan Party: Civil Service Ind.), John V. Lindsay (Liberal: Independent), John Marchi (Republican: Conservative), and Rasheed Storey (Communist Party), John Emanuel (Socialist Labor Party) and Paul Boutelle (Socialist Workers' Party) have been invited to participate on the condition that they become legal candidates for Mayor.

Also, the following seven candidates for Governor of the State of New Jersey have been invited: Robert B. Meyner (Democratic Party), William T. Cahill (Republican Party), James E. Johnson (Independent Party), Jack D. Alvino (Independent Candidate), Julius Levine (Socialist Labor Party), Winfred O. Perry (National Conservative Party), and Louis Vander Plate (Independent).

According to Director of Programming, Mel Baily, the broadcast day will begin at 7:00 a.m. when Ed Warren, as General Manager of WOR/TV, will deliver an introductory explanation of the entire broadcast day. In addition, members of the station's news staff will provide initial commentary as to the forthcoming day's broadcast. The remainder of the day will follow the format below (all times are approximate and subject to change):

(a) 7:30–9:15 a.m. 1¾ hours will be divided equally among the qualified candidates for mayor of New York City.

(b) 9:15–9:30 a.m. The station's reporters will discuss and deliver a wrap-up of the preceding broadcasts by the mayoralty candidates.

(c) 9:30–9:45 a.m. The station's staff, in conjunction with the League of Women Voters and other organizations will present pertinent voting information in both English and Spanish, including the hours of balloting, candidates for various offices and use of the voting machine.

(d) 9:45–11:30 a.m. The next 1¾ hour period will be divided equally among the candidates for Governor of the State of New Jersey.

(e) 11:30–11:45 a.m. Wrap-up of the gubernatorial broadcasts by the station's reporters.

(f) 11:45–12:00 noon. Repeat of explanations of essential voter information and excerpts of the General Manager's opening remarks.

The foregoing schedule is approximately one-quarter of the broadcasting day, the rest of which will be presented in three similarly scheduled segments. In each of the four segments, all of the candidates for both of the offices will receive equal live airtime. Although the public will not be present in the studios, direct telephone lines will be set up for questions to the candidates, to be used at the discretion of the candidates. WOR/TV will provide transportation for all candidates to their studios as well as office and phone facilities for the day at the studios.

This is the first unconditional offer of free airtime by a New York television station in this major political campaign.

The FCC has been advised of this proposal in order to ensure WOR/TV compliance with political broadcast rules.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 4, 1969]

WOR–TV DEVOTES DAY TO APPEARANCE BY CANDIDATES

(By Fred Ferretti)

In an unusual excursion into political public service, WOR–TV suspended its regular 19-hour daily program schedule yesterday to permit 13 New York City and New Jersey candidates four free television appearances each.

On the day-long program on Channel 9, "Before You Vote," the six candidates for Mayor of New York—four on the ballot and two write-in candidates—and the seven men running for Governor of New Jersey competed for votes, attacked one another, repeated old charges and made some new ones, were sedate and inflammatory, factual and demagogic.

There was only one interruption in the day-long presentation on local politics, when WOR carried President Nixon's address on Vietnam.

WOR's Times Square studios became a motel for the day. Candidates were quartered in various executive rooms and because of their number there was some doubling up. Among the more interesting roommate combinations was that of Rasheed Storey, the Communist party candidate for Mayor, and Jack Alvino, an independent candidate for Governor of New Jersey.

It was a pairing that had the station management a bit apprehensive. Mr. Storey, a Negro, went on at 9 A.M. and asked New Yorkers to "vote for an alternative, for radical change . . . for an end to racism" and for community control of schools.

He finished, went back to his assigned room and pastered the wall around the doorway with Communist party posters. He left, presumably for some breakfast, at about the time Mr. Alvino came in.

The New Jersey independent went before the cameras and said: "Right now the problem were facing is caused by the black man. I am for the colored American, and I said American, 100 per cent. But they must clean up their own race. . . .If the colored want to live like Americans I will hold my hand out to them.

"But if they want to listen to the militants, if they want to live like savages, then they should return to their homeland: Africa—back to the jungles where savages belong."

ROOMMATES DON'T MEET

There are no Storey-Alvino meeting. Mr. Storey came back for three more live appearances. Mr. Alvino let his statement be repeated on tape.

Mayor Lindsay's appearance was smooth and professional. He began his 16½-minute segment with four of his campaign commercials, then he made an appeal for unity. "Of course I care whether I am re-elected," he said, looking into a Teleprompter, "but you have given me something far more gratifying. You have listened.

"It is far more important for a Mayor to be taught by criticism than to be gratified by praise."

Mayor Lindsay, who is seeking re-election on the Liberal and Independent tickets, was given the office of the station's general manager, Edward Warren, for a headquarter.

Controller Mario A. Procaccino, the Democratic and Non-Partisan mayoral candidate, was also subdued. He repeated his several cirticisms of the Mayor in a low voice and said he had "done the best I could to get the message across, even though I couldn't afford Madison Avenue men and television ads." The Controller spoke from cue cards.

State Senator John J. Marchi, the Republican and Conservative mayoral candidate, called Mr. Procaccino a "highly implausible, improbable candidate for Mayor" and said Mayor Lindsay had run a "highly computerized campaign for re-election." Twice Mr. Marchi walked in front of live television cameras, blocking off the Channel 9 commenators, so he could shake hands with the Mayor.

John Emanuel, the Socialist Labor party candidate for Mayor, and Paul Boutelle, the Socialist Workers party candidate, used several of their four rounds for live appearances.

Mr. Emanuel and Mr. Boutelle were on the ballot early in the campaign, but they were forced off when representatives of Mayor Lindsay challenged the validity of their petitions. Both men have been running as write-in candidates since being dropped from the ballot.

Mr. Emanuel said the only solution to the city's social ills lay in voting out capitalism, which he called "out-moded and decadent."

Mr. Boutelle brought guests from the Harlem Community Coalition who described how opposition to the proposed state office building on 125th street has been mobilized.

JERSEY RIVALS APPEAR

Representative William T. Cahill, the Republican candidate for Governor of New Jersey, brought Senator Clifford P. Case with him. Mr. Case said mass transportation in New Jersey was dreadful. Mr. Cahill said he'd improve it.

Robert B. Meyner, the Democratic candidate for Governor, was interviewed in his first appearance by two reporters. The second time around he brought Mrs. Meyner with him as well as Mrs. Richard J. Hughes, the wife of the current Governor of New Jersey.

Mr. Warren, the station manager, estimated that WOR–TV lost $50,000 in commercials for the day, plus whatever the bill comes to for a two-member make-up team, three associate producers, several cameramen, directors and floor managers, and coffee and sandwiches for candidates and lookers-on.

A PLEA FOR RATIFICATION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this month the Senate will consider, and hopefully approve, the 1925 Geneva accord that prohibits its signers from first using poison gas in warfare. I urge this body to ratify this accord outlawing on an international level the "first strike" use of these most destructive weapons.

The record of this Nation on this issue has not been exemplary. As far back as 1899, this Nation refused to sign the declaration on the prohibition of gas weapons adopted at the Hague Conference. The use of poison gas by both sides in World War I caused a revulsion in world opinion and many governments sought to outlaw its use in future conflicts. The United States took the initiative in proposing the inclusion of clauses prohibiting the use in war of poisonous gases in the Treaty of Washington in 1922. The treaty was signed and ratified by the United States, but it did not enter into force because France did not ratify. In 1925, the United States proposed to the Geneva Conference on Traffic in Arms, the inclusion of a convention banning the use of gas in warfare. The resulting protocol, which also contained a prohibition on the use of "bacteriological methods of warfare," was signed by the United States. The U.S. proposal had been approved by Army and Navy officials and ratification was recommended by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. But after debate on the Senate floor, which revealed strong opposition by veterans organizations and chemical manufacturers, the treaty was referred back to the committee. In 1947 President Truman withdrew it as one of a group of treaties which had become obsolete.

Let all of us in this Chamber see to it that this time the Geneva accord is ratified. Let all of us see to it that a future President does not find it his responsibility to withdraw this accord since it had become "obsolete."

HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, the conference committee on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, S. 2864 and H.R. 13827, will begin tomorrow. My distinguished and able colleagues on the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, the chairman, Mr. SPARKMAN, and ranking minority member, Mr. TOWER, together with Messrs. PROXMIRE, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, MUSKIE, BENNETT, and BROOKE will serve as conferees.

One of the issues extensively considered in the committee hearings on the 1969 housing legislation was the unrealistically low statutory cost limits on Government housing programs. These have caused a delay, and indeed, a halt

of Government-subsidized housing construction in many major metropolitan areas of this country.

During the floor debate, I successfully offered amendments to the committee bill which would apply a sliding scale construction cost index to the statutory cost limits of the public housing program and the section 235–236 programs. The committee reported out a provision which applied a base year of 1965 to this construction cost index. Unfortunately, the increase in limits predicated on this base year would have been insufficient to meet the rising construction costs in many of our cities including New York City, Detroit, Boston, Newark, New Orleans, and San Francisco.

My amendments applied the construction cost index from a base year of 1965. This formula will produce adequate cost limits which will reflect actual constructions costs and experience, particularly in our Nation's cities.

At the time these amendments were accepted, concern was expressed by Chairman SPARKMAN and Senator TOWER that the application of the index might itself contribute to rising costs.

I offered to submit additional information on this subject which I did earlier this week in a letter to the chairman. For the benefit of my colleagues, I ask that the text of this letter, which demonstrates the national need for revised cost limits, be included in the RECORD.

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

DECEMBER 1, 1969.

HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: During the Floor debate on S. 2864, the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, we participated in a colloquy concerning my amendments which applied a sliding construction cost index (CCI) from a base year of 1965, to statutory room cost and mortgage limits in public housing and FHA-subsidized Section 236–235 housing.

I sincerely appreciated your acceptance of these amendments subject to further clarification that the application of the CCI would reflect the rising cost of housing rather than contribute to inflation and increasing costs.

It is my concern, as it is yours, that the cost of housing be maintained at a level which will be within the financial reach of low and middle income families.

Inflation and rising prices have greatly increased the cost of housing and construction. The Bureau of the Census "Sale Price Index for One Family Homes," which measures the inflationary factors in home building, lists the following increases in construction costs:

	Percent
1964–1965	2.0
1965–1966	2.9
1966–1967	3.6
1967–1968	7.0
Total increase	16.0

The Bureau estimates that yearly percentages will increase 2–33 percentage points in following years, barring any drastic change in monetary policy. Conservative estimates for increases for 1968–1969 and 1969–1970 thus would be 9% and 11%, respectively.

For construction of multi-family dwellings and apartments, E. Boeckh and Associates supplies a construction cost index for apartments, hotels, and office buildings. This index shows the following increases:

	Percent
1964–1965	4.0
1965–1966	4.7
1966–1967	7.5
1967–1968	9.2
Total increase	25.4

It has been projected by the Economics Division of the Library of Congress that the index will rise between 2–3 percentage points annually. Thus, the estimates for 1968–1969 and 1970–1971 would be 11.2% and 13.7% respectively.

Cost limits for public housing and Section 236 housing programs are based on 1964 cost statistics. In view of the national increase in construction costs over the past five years, statutory room cost and mortgage limits have made the programs unworkable in our nation's cities, where the greatest increases in construction costs have been experienced.

My amendments, by applying a sale price index to the mortgage limits in the Section 236 program and a nationally recognized construction cost index to the room cost limits in public housing—using a 1965 base year—will make the statutory cost limits reflect construction cost increases.

The House proposal, which would increase these limits by only 10%, is clearly unrealistic. From 1964 to 1968, construction costs have risen on a national basis by 16% for one-family homes and almost 26% for apartment dwellings. By the end of 1969, it can be assumed that these percentages will be at least 18% and 28% respectively, making the 10% increase still more out of date as months pass. The House proposal provides no flexibility for these annual increases in construction costs.

The Committee bill as reported used a 1967 base year for the sliding scale cost limits. In view of the fact that existing cost limits are based on 1964 cost figures, using a 1967 base year would fail to take into account the cost increases that took place during 1965 and 1966. During these two years, costs for one-family homes rose by about 5% and those for multi-family dwellings and apartments rose by almost 9%. Thus using the 1967 base year will fail to recognize about *one-third* of the cost increases that have taken place since 1964.

I am enclosing for your information a letter I have received from Mayor John V. Lindsay of New York City. In this letter, he points out:

(1) That under existing cost limits, construction of public housing and Section 236 housing is virtually stopped;

(2) That under the Senate bill's cost limits, using the 1965 base year, the City can proceed with its plans to build 6,000 new public housing units and 8,700 Section 236 units;

(3) That under the Committee bill's cost limits, using the 1967 base year, only 1,000 of these public housing units and 3,000 of these Section 236 units would be built.

I do not believe the increases as proposed in my amendments will cause inflation; rather the index will *reflect* changes in construction costs. Under the sliding scale formula, the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development is authorized to adjust the cost limits by the percentage increase in the previous year. Therefore, the adjustment in 1970 will be based on the average construction cost index for 1969. The formula will reflect the changes of the previous year, and there will be a year's lag between actual cost experience and adjustment of cost limits by the Secretary.

Concern has been expressed that increased cost limits will become "floors" rather than "ceilings" and that subsequently, lower and middle income families will be unable to afford the increased cost of housing.

The plain fact is that, with existing cost limits, housing cannot be built in the numbers necessary to fill the demand.

I have already detailed the problem that the existing cost limits present for New York City. Similar problems are found to exist in cities throughout the nation.

In a study sponsored by the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials, HUD regional officials reported that over 80 cities are encountering difficulties in the construction of public housing under present cost limits.

Detroit, Michigan, which has experienced a 50% construction cost increase since 1965, has been unable to build any low income units since 1953. In March of 1967, bids for 140 units were submitted, totalling $3,519,890 while the statutory limit called for a total of $2,116,501.

Memphis, Tennessee, which is not a HUD high cost area, recently had to reject a bid for a 183 unit high rise apartment building because the sum was 15% over the allowable cost limits.

Dallas, Texas, which has experienced a cost increase of 819% over the past year, was unable to build two high rise projects for elderly because the bids submitted were 12.7% over the allowable limit.

York, Pennsylvania, is unable to construct public housing due to a 31% increase in bid estimates between June, 1968, and April, 1969.

It has been pointed out that, in the case of Section 236 projects, construction cost increases may lead to rent increases. This can be true. By refusing to adjust outmoded cost limits, however, we do not solve this problem. We only prevent 236 housing from being built.

I would point out that it is the public housing and Section 236 programs—not the Section 235 program and conventional FHA mortgage programs—that have been facing the most severe problems with existing cost limits.

The sliding scale provisions as adopted by the Senate using the 1965 base year now apply not only to public housing and Section 236 housing, but also to Section 235 and conventional FHA-insured mortgages. *I would consider it acceptable, if you think this to be desirable, to restrict the application of the sliding scale using the 1965 base year to public housing and Section 236 programs.*

Section 15(5) of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 sets forth two criteria which must be satisfied if the Secretary is to apply an additional increase of 45% to public housing room cost limits in high cost areas. They are:

(1) That is it not feasible under cost limits to construct projects without sacrifice of sound standards of construction, design and livability;

(2) That there is an acute need for housing in the area.

It might be desirable to add a provision requiring the Secretary of HUD to apply the same criteria in exercising his authority under the Senate bill to increase cost limits on the basis of cost increases.

It is my hope that this information will be helpful to you in the conference committee next week. My staff is at your disposal should you have further questions.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. GOODELL.

THE DRIVE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS—ADDRESS BY LEON E. PANETTA

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, as a Senator who is firmly and unequivocally committed to our national goal of equal opportunity for all Americans, I was glad

to note a similar commitment in a recent statement by an administration spokesman in the area of civil rights.

In a speech before the National Civil Liberties Clearing House last month, Leon Panetta, Director of the Office for Civil Rights at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, said:

Desegregation is right, desegregation under law is necessary, and desegregation is a current imperative job—for every single agency of the United States Government . . .

Mr. President, I believe that Mr. Panetta's remarks should be of interest to all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE DRIVE FOR EQUAL RIGHTS: YESTERDAY, TODAY—AND TOMORROW?

(By Leon E. Panetta, Director, Office for Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare)

I must tell you that it is an honor to be asked to speak before so many who have done so much in the struggle to bring equal opportunities to all Americans. Although I am a relative newcomer to the arena, I have had the opportunity to work with many of you in the battles fought on the Hill and on the plains of Pennsylvania Avenue. In spite of the title of my talk, I realized so well before I came here that you are the ones who are most familiar with yesterday, and it would be a presumption for me to dwell on it.

Instead, I intend to talk more about the current product of the practices of the past, some of the steps forward that have been taken, and the urgent need for a revival of the civil rights spirit today. For although the laws are now on the books, the spirit of the law remains to be implemented. Most of all, I want to tell you some of what I see coming or threatened in the next year or two, and my hopes for your help in coping with tomorrow.

If government has learned one lesson today, it is that the Federal government cannot shirk its duty to all citizens as dictated by the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment, as well as by decency and by the inherent duty of government. I feel that my agency and sister Washington agencies have definite obligations, and I shall enumerate some of them. You have some excellent opportunities to carry forward your work, and I may mention some new areas in which I will need your assistance.

One public figure who played a large role in developing my beliefs on civil rights and whom I believe many of you may know was told by his principal campaign advisor last year that "civil rights is dead." The campaign manager meant, of course, that nobody was talking about civil rights in 1968, that it was a moribund if not stone-cold dead issue, and that anybody who dwelt on the subject would be considered irrelevant if not foolhardy, and would certainly lose an election. Well, that public figure was proud of his civil rights record, he talked about it, and he did lose.

Did that prove that civil rights was dead? No, it did not. It proved that the subject had been eclipsed in 1968 by the war, by the fear of riots, by crime statistics and by economic advancement, as opposed to social or other progress of minority groups. Civil rights was not a popular subject, but it was not dead. Surely, the passage of the Equal Housing Law was proof enough of that fact.

But, in 1969, it seems to me, civil rights has become again an issue of profound concern to millions of Americans. It is of profound concern to you and to me, and I would like to see where we can move together to advance the cause.

In discussing the past briefly, it is only necessary to mention the recent ruling by the Supreme Court, to evoke a capsule history of the forward movement of civil rights under law. As it unanimously stated last week, the standard of allowing "all deliberate speed" for desegregation is, in the words of the Court, "no longer permissible."

"Deliberate speed," when coupled with the historic 1954 Supreme Court Decision outlawing so-called separate but equal school facilities, turned out to be a password for delay. It held forth a promise and a hope, it inspired numerous and sometimes successful civil rights efforts, but it also permitted delays and disappointments which seem inexcusable to most of us today. School desegregation cases in many cities of the South which were filed over ten years ago are continuing today, as glaring examples.

Finally, in 1964, Congress passed the Civil Rights Act which declared in part that no Federal funds would go to school districts and other organizations or activities which continued to discriminate. Then it took the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act to provide the massive Federal school aid, which convinced many school districts that they had good reason to begin doing what the Supreme Court ordered 11 years earlier, in order to acquire and retain these funds.

And now, the Supreme Court has spoken again, and, where the state-imposed dual school system is concerned, we hope decisively and finally. The order of October 29 settled for once and for all the question of timing and the need to eliminate all vestiges of the dual school system.

It has given our office additional capacity to achieve compliance, and we have carefully laid our plans in order to reflect the Court's decision in our dealings wtih school districts under HEW jurisdiction.

It suffices to say for the moment that our action will not only reflect the Court's action, but will also reflect Secretary Finch's October 30 statement that we should not "tolerate any further delays in abolishing the vestiges of the dual school system."

At this point, let me sound one note of caution: The greatest time for vigilance is now—a court order is fine but the product is finer. A Court ruling by itself will not accomplish the task. There is a tragic lesson to be learned from 15 years of delay. In 1957, a new dawn appeared but so did a thousand new black schools. In 1964, another new dawn appeared in the Civil Rights Act but so did free choice and a hundred other methods of delay. Today, we talk of "finality" and there are those who still talk of fighting this decision to the death. The combined voices of civil rights groups, the constant campaign in the halls of Congress and in State houses and city halls must continue and must be effective, if this job is to be done once and for all. Because the court has spoken, is no reason to let down the guard and consider the struggle done. Your role is as great as ever and the Nation's need for your voice and your vigilance is as great as it ever was.

Where does this leave us today, assuming that significant new strides can be made in this school year toward unitary school systems? Schools, of course, are only part of the battle for equal rights. My jurisdiction alone extends to colleges, hospitals, and even fair employment practices on Federal education and health contracts. But schools provide us with perhaps the best example of civil rights progress and the lack of it.

History, I believe, will record our ability to deal with the problem of race relations largely by how we deal with the problem of providing equal educational opportunities. For it is what we do today in schools that will determine whether millions of minority group children are divided forever from the opportunities of our society or whether they are permitted to share that society with those they must learn to live with.

It is a deep belief of mine that we stand to lose the hard-fought years of social progress we have seen in recent years, and to polarize society almost beyond reconciliation, if we do not recognize and act on the segregation-desegregation crisis we face today in public education.

The rhetoric has changed, the alternatives are more stark, but the civil rights community is still equipped to cope.

The "in" phrases of today, "community control," "decentralization," "educational parks," and "relevant education" are born of the same universe as those emotion-packed phrases, "busing," "neighborhood schools," "separatism," and "student boycott." The sooner we recognize and act on the relationship between those two sets of slogans, the sooner we will save the best of education and move on to better days.

There is a trade-off, although it is not always as simply seen as I state it, between the call for "separatism" and the need for "equal" education. I think it is not too late to exercise that trade-off, although it can become too late if we do not do something about it this year.

We have seen the challenge all too clearly this year at both the public college and the public elementary and secondary school level, as we try to undo racially dual systems of education.

Negroes are looking for assurances that the burden of integration will be shared by white and black alike. The unspoken—and sometimes articulated—exchange for such assurances is a lessened need for separatism.

The black community is saying, in many instances, "So far, integration is seriously flawed in both attitude and execution, and we are being forced to make the best of what you have left us; make integration work for us, and we are with you." It is an understandable outlook, one which the majority community of this nation, white, richer and better educated, must accept as its challenge.

If our experience at the Office for Civil Rights does not convey some deep sense of urgency, the message of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders—the Kerner Commission—should do so.

In February of 1968, the basic conclusion of this distinguished panel was that "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white—separate and unequal." This past February, John Gardner, President of the Urban Coalition, which participated in a "year-after" appraisal of what the Kerner report had studied, said, "We are a year closer to being two societies, black and white, increasingly separate and scarcely less unequal."

The Kerner Commission, after estimating that the number of Negroes in the 15 to 24-year old age group will rise 40% by 1975, compared with only a 23% growth rate among whites in this age group, makes this observation:

"This rapid increase in the young Negro population has important implications for the country. This group has the highest unemployment rate in the nation, commits a relatively high proportion of all crimes, and plays the most significant role in civil disorders. By the same token, it is a great reservoir of underused human resources which are vital to the nation."

What is not mentioned is that the 20-year-old of today was the five year old of 1954 and that the 20-year-old of 1975 is today's 14-year-old, and that his younger brothers and sisters are as likely as not to follow in the very same footsteps, for better or worse. School is his all, today.

Does anyone really think that we can keep this youth isolated by race in school and then expect him to take his place in a society which promises equal treatment of all men? A child, sensitized only to one color and one set of attitudes does not emerge to cope successfully with a world his parents never made. This cycle must end.

And it is not only because desegregation will help make our society one but because desegregation is quality education for a minority that has been discriminated against in what is virtually a "second school system." All of the evidence gathered before or since 1954 indicates that it is true that the segregated individual receives an inferior education to the integrated individual.

The Coleman report was commissioned under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to study the equality of equal educational opportunity—or more precisely, the lack of such opportunity—in every section of the country.

Probably the best single test of the value of integration lies in comparing Negro children in totally segregated school situations with those in majority white school situations.

The Coleman report showed that test scores rose among Negro students in classes with 50% or more white students, compared with those Negroes in totally segregated classes. What seemed more important was that, as Coleman said, "Those students who first entered desegregated schools in the early grades generally show slightly higher average scores than the students who first came to desegregated schools in later grades."

If there is one thing the Coleman Report—the second largest social science survey in history—seems to prove, it is that where Federal effort in equalizing education is concerned, the slight changes which have marked most compensatory programs seem to have relatively little effect on disadvantaged pupils. Far more important, implies the report, is the family and socioeconomic background of the child and that of his classmates.

Not only was a disadvantaged child of any race likely to achieve much more in a school full of middle-class pupils than he would in a school full of other disadvantaged youngsters, but—and here is where we take a big swipe at one of the big myths abounding today—the middle-class youngster was *not* likely to suffer from the integrated situation.

It is not hard to take the one necessary next step and say that because most disadvantaged youngsters are from racial minority groups, and most middle-class youngsters are from the white majority population, we may argue that racial integration in schools would do more to lift the educational level of the disadvantaged thousands of children in America today, than any quantity of financial aid directed at schools which maintain the racial status quo.

Recognizing the importance of this process, what are the barriers to progress in desegregation? Certainly, one of the biggest blockades is frustration. Yesterday, the frustration of the white community brought us up short; today, whites are joined by a growing number of Negro citizens whose justified frustration hinders the advancement of desegregation.

To many who have been involved in the civil rights movement, inside or outside the government, the stereotype of resistance to desegregation is the white parent who fears what he calls "mixing," of Negro and white children. That element remains, of course, but there are other barriers as well as the old community attitudes of the white parent. One of these barriers is the frustrated feeling of the white citizen that he is not being supported even when he agrees to cooperate. Too often, a school superintendent, convinced he should go along with the law, agrees to an integration plan, only to see a neighbor school district get away with little or no integration under a Federal court order. Too often, white board members and parents of good will see their effort undermined by a small group out to set up a private school, and thereby evade the requirements of the law. Too often, there appears no support, or worse, local political opposition, to the school board member within his own community, so that the man of courage is actually hurt by his law-abiding actions.

In the North, the disaffection and feeling of frustration of the white man where race relations are concerned, are becoming the subject of entire books. He is the 'forgotten American." He moves his family two doors away from a school, only to find his children bused to a school in another neighborhood. Every frustration, whether it is that of a fatter pay envelope because of inflation, that of his everyday traffic jam, or that of a rise in the crime rate which he cannot control, is translated into racial terms, and has its focus in such an emotional subject as desegregation and any proposal to transport children to achieve that end. He is unhappy, and he is going to let us know it. He is standing in our way today as his Southern counterpart did when the call comes to desegregate.

And the black community is more impatient with this resistance than ever before. The new awareness of self, the new feeling of impatience, has combined to give us at times a less than cooperative Negro community, a community which does not automatically open the door when we say "We want to help you." They have not seen enough benefit from the help in education that was promised 15 years ago in the Supreme Court decision which said that separate but equal schools weren't equal after all.

The frustration of the slowness of desegregation, the lack of strong and consistent support to those who have led the way, the frustration of seeing racial separation increase in the cities instead of diminish, the more subtle but no less cruel forms of racial discrimination in the North, and the failure to meet promise with production throughout the Nation, have led many black and white to follow the path to new forms of separatism—to greater polarization that threatens to tear our society apart.

How do we meet the challenges that each of these resistant groups pose to the law as set forth in Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Supreme Court, and the policy that I believe in?

My obligation in the first instance seems pretty clear, and that is to offer the utmost support to the white school superintendents who are courageous enough to stand up to the fire and obey civil rights law. And the clearest way is to remain consistent within our own program and to enlist the aid of other Federal agencies, from the Justice Department which goes into the courts, to the Model Cities program of HUD, to the Extension Service at Agriculture and others to support the requirements of the 1964 Civil Rights Act when they deal with any and all school districts.

Where the northern white community is concerned, I think there is a lot more education needed, as to what the law requires and how we are going to enforce it. Some of the old myths of what constitutes de facto segregation and what constitutes illegal discriminatory segregation, need drastic revision and more realistic and enlightened attitudes and policies brought to bear.

Where the opposition by the frustrated in the black community is concerned, I think a lot can be done by indeed showing good faith in action, rather than words. I think we have to show that we are willing to wade in where political heat prevails against us, that we are able to achieve results in terms of number of children helped through desegregation.

Bu⁺ that is not all that we must do by the Negro community and its frustration. We will have to understand and react to the cry for more dignity, more attention to the burden which he has borne, not only before 1964, but since then, in the desegregation effort. We should seek a way to desegregate, not close, black schools, to protect not fire black teachers when a system desegregates, to provide curricula which meet the needs of the black community as well as the white and to otherwise realize that the society is pluralistic, not all white, and not all closed up.

The young of all minorities—Indian children, Mexican American children and Negro children—who have been, in effect, put aside by school establishments through the years, must have their even break in a racially heterogeneous classroom.

Much progress has been made—but despite the blood that has been spilled, the battle for equal rights is still young. Although the Office for Civil Rights directed the implementation of over 340 desegregation plans in September, over 156 districts remain untouched by administrative action. Although we have urged districts not to close good facilities, they continue to do so. Although we are now successfully using our Executive Order tool to protect black teachers, complaints continue to come in. Although we have notified five college systems that they must desegregate, few have presented effective plans.

And what of our northern effort? It has become clear to me that the old bugaboo of keeping Federal hands off northern school systems because they are only "de facto" segregated, instead of "de jure" segregated as the result of some official act, is a fraud. There are few if any pure "de facto" situations. Lift the rock of de facto, and all too frequently something ugly and discriminatory crawls out from under it. Sometimes it was years ago that discrimination occurred, but the minority children have suffered since, and that should be undone. Sure, racial housing patterns may coincide with school attendance patterns by race, but which came first and how was the school boundary drawn? What role, if any, did pre-1949 racial covenants in FHA-loan housing play in these housing patterns? There are many avenues which have not been fully explored that I promise you will be, before any northern school system we examine can be called truly "de facto." And despite those who believe the legal requirements are the same, it still takes a lot longer to make an effective case for fund cut-off or successful negotiation for a desegregation plan in the North, but we are going to take the time where necessary. We have been in over 50 districts in the North, and over 12 are now being considered for administrative action. As a result of a 1968–69 National Survey, over 500 northern districts have been targeted as possible problem areas for future investigation. We are beginning a full field review of San Francisco, the first city over 500,000 in population where we expect to stay on the job until we determine that the city school system either is or is not in compliance with Title VI.

Before I try to explore areas of common action with you, let me briefly mention one more aspect of civil rights enforcement in the Federal government which distresses me considerably. I refer, of course, to the seeming unawareness of any civil rights responsibility by any program agency which does not have the words "civil rights" or "equal opportunity" in its title. We have agencies like the Office for Civil Rights and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission, but they cannot carry the entire burden of human rights within government. Some have suggested that the Federal government would be more effective in its approach to civil rights if it created a separate Department of

Human Rights, or something along that line. Such a move may indeed be necessary if program agencies do not get off the hook and recognize the importance of not subsidizing discrimination via the Federal pork barrel.

By any standard applied, it is up to individual program officers within agencies to take upon themselves the responsibility to see what the consequences of their particular program or grant will be, where school integration or any other human rights is concerned.

It is at this point that you—members of the private and quasi-public organization dedicated to equal rights—can play an extremely useful role. For you not only have concern, but the power to transform that concern into political influence. You have become the conscience of our government in the area of equal rights and your responsibilities are greater today than ever before. You must search out agencies which are acting in ways to promote segregation or separatism by race, whether by design or by default, and exert your influence to bring about change. You must seek out the hidden issues—like academic testing for class assignment or college entrance and tax exemption for segregated private schools—and make them the causes that some have already begun to make them for the wrong reasons and for the wrong ends.

Perhaps most difficult, but most needed by all communities in the Nation today and in the coming immediate months and years, you and this government must have the courage to insist upon official and unofficial action at the local level which unifies the community across racial lines instead of dividing it. It is increasingly easier and more popular to condone or promote separatism by and for minorities instead of finding and promoting an equally beneficial integrated alternative. We have made enough progress in civil rights to build on that progress instead of turning our back on it.

There are today from 1 to 4 million Negroes in the United States who hold attitudes indicating "a depth of estrangement and bitterness unique in American history," says Gary T. Marx, a noted student of Negro opinion who just updated an analysis he made two years ago. He reports that in these past two years, the number of bitter black citizens "is growing and increases noticeably among the young and those in the North."

But the real kicker, it seems to me, is that, contrary to much of the talk today about the desire for black separatism, Mr. Marx reports that "Much of the anger which exists remains directed toward inclusion in the system," and that 1967 findings that most Negroes favor integration "would seem still to hold in 1969, if perhaps not as strongly."

The question, then leaps out at us: How much longer can we expect this building anger to have integration as a trade-off element? How much longer before it is not just the small but vocal militant group, but another million and then still another million of the increasingly angry who say the Hell with it, the Hell with your integration and the Hell with your lousy society? As Mr. Marx says:

"Many of the interracial differences with respect to ideas about the treatment of blacks; the amount of progress; the worth of demonstration; integrated schools and housing; the cause, meaning and consequences of riots; and the type of ameliorative action required, are astounding and can lead to deeply pessimistic conclusions.

"They indicate a profound lack of communication and the absence of understanding or compassion among a very large portion of the white public."

It is my strong belief that the Federal government has a clear legal obligation under the Constitution, a moral obligation as a servant of all citizens, white and black alike, to do more than merely mirror the white thinking on the subject of race relations and equal opportunity. It is certainly not our duty to adopt wholesale the black thinking on the racial subject, either, especially when that thinking may be contrary to the Constitution. But it is our duty, affirmatively and aggressively, to make certain that no group of citizens is systematically ostracized from society merely because the majority wishes it so.

This is the foundation of my urgency and the outline of my philosophy. This is why I try to convince any audience I talk to, that desegregation is right, desegregation under law is necessary, and desegregation is a current imperative job—for every single agency of the United States Government, for the education community overall, and for groups such as those you represent. This is the tomorrow we must work hand in hand to achieve or there will be no tomorrow at all.

FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN EDUCATION

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the junior chamber of commerce in Alabama enjoys a well-earned reputation for getting things done. The members of this organization are primarily junior executives and include among its members some of the most intelligent, energetic, and conscientious young men in our State. The people of Alabama admire and respect the junior chamber of commerce and listen attentively to its points of view on all public issues.

Mr. President, the Forum is the official publication of the Mobile, Ala., Jaycees. The November 1969 issue, contains an article entitled "A Jaycee Speaks Out on Federal Interference In Public Education," written by Charles Steiner III. The article suggests that there are many steps that can be taken to restore local control of local public schools. Support of my proposed amendment to the Constitution to effect a return of local control is mentioned as one such step.

Mr. President, I commend this thoughtful article to the consideration of Senators and the public as an indication of a deeply held conviction on the part of responsible leadership in the State of Alabama. The issues presented are, of course, nationwide in scope, and I think that the public generally would profit by the persuasive arguments presented for local control of educational institutions. 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:

A JAYCEE SPEAKS OUT ON FEDERAL INTERFERENCE IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

(By Charles Steiner)

The people of Alabama, the South and throughout the Nation have always preferred to raise the level of their children's education through their own local and state school boards without dependency upon the U.S. Department of Education or the Federal Government itself. When it comes to public education, we of America feel that complete authority over the enrollment and assignment of children in public schools and/or on school buses should lie in the hands of the duly elected county and city school boards which are the truly elected representatives of the states, counties, and cities. We must not permit the U.S. Supreme Court, the HEW or any other federal power to usurp the authority of our elected school officials and make pawns of the American school children. The school board is conscientiously and sincerely trying to solve their problems. To force them to do the impossible would do and is doing nothing but creating chaos and wrecking our total public education system.

The federal government must recognize and respect the vote of the people and give those elected officials the chance to provide the best leadership and public administration possible in public education as well as in law enforcement, welfare programs and hospital administration without federal interference. The real intentions of the federal government, but not that of the American people, is to eliminate all vestiges of a dual school system by closing schools, massive busing of children from their neighborhoods, equalizing student achievements, integrating the races across any boundaries, and making the schools an important agency for solving social problems of the slums. The intention of the people of this country is for "Freedom of Choice" in our schools and for the public to vote on those issues that affect our public education system rather than trust the Supreme Court, HEW, or other federal offices to determine what is best for the people.

We have a responsibility as citizens of America to see that our rights are not violated but are honored according to those laws set down by the Bill of Rights, the U.S. Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. We should not sit idly by, but defend our constitutional system of government and its cherished freedoms to reverse the flow of this destruction of our states rights and of our public education system. Through our heritage, we believe that the right to self-government is based on the inherent right and highest duty of a free people to preserve and protect their God-given freedoms that are enjoyed in America. As Americans, we also believe that the best education for us and our children is one free of political control or government domination. There is no need for central or regional control of our public education system. Its deficiencies can best be understood locally where the people and the elected officials of a community have the best opportunity to judge the problems and progress of its students.

Only through a free public education system can we produce citizens worthy of America who will use their knowledge to better the democratic principles of this nation and who will better their own lives so that future generations may enjoy the freedoms of this country. We, both the federal government and citizens, must have confidence that the people can be trusted to govern themselves, that they are able to provide adequate education for all students and that they can provide the leadership necessary to guide this nation forward. If it takes a constitutional amendment to assure our rights to govern ourselves and administer our schools locally, then we should act now to see that such a step is taken. Thus we will make certain that the people, themselves, and not the federal government or the courts have the final voice in the administration of our cities and of our public school systems. Until we continue to safeguard our cherished rights, we will lose our rights to live as free Americans.

We must not lose patience with our court systems or with the procedure of laws but we must use this system to right the wrongs that unjust laws and decrees have done to destroy our school system and weaken our governments. There are many steps that can be taken. One of them is to seek the support nationwide for the passage of an amendment to the Constitution by U.S. Senator James Allen that relates to powers reserved to the several States. It states that each state shall have the sole and exclusive jurisdiction of the organization and administration of all

public schools and public school systems within the State and that no officer or court of the United States shall have the power to impair or infringe any right so reserved to the States. The free voice of the people should be heard, and the best way is through their votes and the courts to protect their rights as Americans.

What better way can the Jaycees serve their fellow man than through the protection of the rights of all and also to see that our public education system remains the responsibility of the local school boards. This is a choice that has to be made by us if our country is ever to remain free, democratic and independent and if the rights of our citizens are to remain sacred.

DRAFT REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the past week there have been rapid and diverse developments in the general field of draft reform. The National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence published a report which included in it a call for broad reforms; the President signed his draft reform bill and issued an Executive order establishing a lottery; and the Selective Service System last night actually conducted the lottery itself.

Because many Members of Congress were not in Washington over the Thanksgiving holiday and may have missed various of the significant elements of these developments, I have assembled the relevant pieces of information for printing in the RECORD. They are:

Exhibit 1. Excerpt from report of the Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence.

Exhibit 2. Statement by President Nixon on signing the bill.

Exhibit 3. Executive Order 11497.

Exhibit 4. White House fact sheet.

Exhibit 5. Department of Defense fact sheet.

Exhibit 6. Newspaper articles.

I ask unanimous consent that these exhibits be printed in the RECORD.

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

EXHIBIT 1

EXCERPT FROM REPORT OF COMMISSION ON THE CAUSES AND PREVENTION OF VIOLENCE

A significant focal point of dissent by the young has been the issue of draft reform. To many, the draft symbolizes the inflexibility of our institutions and all that is wrong with the government's treatment of the young. Further, the inequities of the system have been set in sharp relief by the reality of the on-going war that many youth believe to be immoral and futile. The "oldest-first" order of draft calls produces a period of prolonged uncertainty for young men that profoundly affects their education, career and marriage decisions—a condition which is made more unacceptable by the lack of uniform deferment and exemption standards and by the wide variation in the exercise of discretion by local boards. Draft reform will not take the sting out of student anti-war protest or other manifestations of student discontent, but it could go far to reduce the tensions and frustrations that now lead some young men to seek refuge abroad and others to destroy Selective Service records, burn draft cards, or disrupt induction centers.

A random lottery system which would subject all to equal treatment at age nineteen, would take the youngest rather than the oldest first, and would reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability from the present seven years to one year, appears to be the fairest and most promising alternative to the existing draft system. Undergraduate deferments would be continued, but with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability would come whenever the deferment expired. It would be far less disruptive in the lives of young men while fully consistent with national security needs. The President has recommended such a proposal to the Congress. We are pleased to note that the Congress has approved the random lottery feature.

We also strongly endorse the balance of President Nixon's proposals for reform of the draft system, which are similar to that recommended in 1967 by the Marshall Commission and the Clark Panel.[1] To the extent these proposals require further legislation, we urge the Congress to enact it.

Assuming the enactment of random selection system, however, the area of discretion for local draft boards is enormous and is likely to remain so.

We therefore urge that renewed attention be given to the recommendations of the Marshall Commission for building a greater measure of due process into the exercise of draft board discretion.

Youth should also be given a role on local draft boards.

We therefore recommend that in exercising his power to appoint the members of local draft boards, the President name at least one person under 30 years of age to each local board.[2]

At present, the Selective Service System calls only about a third of the eligible young men for the draft each year. Reform of the system will not alter this, but by taking the youngest first and by reducing the period of uncertainty from seven years to one, it will free many young men to make firm decisions about their futures. The federal government should do much more to provide these young men, as well as other young men and women in all walks of life, with the opportunities for service to their communities and the nation. As the Peace Corps and VISTA experiences bear out, many young people are eager to assist the less fortunate to achieve social justice and willing to devote a part of their lives to tasks for which the major reward is the satisfaction of helping others.

We do not suggest that voluntary service of this kind should be an alternative to military service. Rather, we suggest that public service opportunities be made available, regardless of military service, to young men and young women, high school and college graduates, inner city, suburban, and rural youth—as justified by the nation's needs.

We are convinced that youth will grasp meaningful opportunities for attacking constructively the problems and injustices that, too often, now drive them to attacks aimed at the destruction of useful institutions, rather than at their reform. But we recognize their skepticism of government-sponsored programs and their increasing unwillingness to become involved in social action programs in which they have no voice. Consequently, we believe that a new and flexible approach to youth service opportunities is required, one that is tailored to individual talents and desires.

We urge the President to seek legislation to expand the opportunities for youth to engage in both full-time and part-time public service, by providing federal financial support to young people who wish to engage in voluntary, non-military service to their communities and to the nation.

We do not suggest the creation of another federally-administered program, or set of programs, comparable to the Peace Corps or VISTA. Instead we suggest that a large number of full- and part-time public service options be opened to youth—opportunities which the youths themselves can be expected to seek out and to improve upon, and which can be filled and administered at the local level if federal financial support is made available. We have in mind such possibilities as teaching and reading assistants, tutors and counselors in the elementary and secondary schools; hospital orderlies and nurses' aides; personnel for neighborhood service and recreation centers; auxiliary aides to local law enforcement and social service agencies; and many others.

The service opportunities would be approved by a central federal agency. The authorizing statute should set general standards of agency approval, eligibility, and levels of compensation. The choice of the particular public service opportunity from the large approved list of public and private institutions and groups should be left to the volunteers, and the initiative, direction and control of the activities would remain entirely with the approved local entity.[3]

The program might be launched to recruit 100,000 young people each year for four or five years, as experience was accumulated. The eventual goal might be as high as 1,000,000 active youth volunteers in service at any given time, depending upon experience and developing national needs. As is now true for Peace Corps and similar existing programs, the compensation to be paid should be set at a student subsistence level and should not be financially competitive with other employment opportunities. As a special inducement, however, we recommend that completion of two years of full-time public service entitle the participant to educational assistance comparable to that available to veterans under the GI Bill of Rights, with lesser amounts of assistance for service periods between six months and two years.[4]

Voluntary public service could contribute to reduction of the large backlog of unmet social needs, and thus could be an important step toward a more humane reordering of national priorities. And youth service could

---

[1] *In Pursuit of Equity: Who Serves When Not All Serves?*, Report of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967); U.S., Congress, Senate, *Report of the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement*, H. Doc. 374, 90th Cong., 2d Sess., 1968. Our recommendations, of course, refer only to the present draft system and are intended to apply only so long as it continues. The question of whether the draft should be replaced for the long term by a form of volunteer service in the armed forces is now under consideration by another Presidential commission.

[2] As suggested by Joseph A. Califano, Jr., in his book *The Student Revolution*, W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., New York 1970. The Marshall Commission found that the average aged local board members was 58. One fifth of all the nearly 17,000 board members were over 70. While twelve were over 90, only one was under 30.

[3] One considerable virtue of the approach to youth service suggested here is that it involves a "market strategy" rather than a "monopoly service" strategy: the multitude of public and private agencies would have to compete for the services of the federally-supported youth workers by offering them meaningful, satisfying opportunities for achievement of desired goals; less successful, unrewarding programs would fail to attract volunteers and hence would not waste the public funds being committed to youth service. *Cf.* the discussion of the importance of market-type incentives for success in public programs in Moynihan, "Toward a National Urban Policy," *The Public Interest* (No. 17, Fall 1969).

[4] Depending on the availability of funds, educational assistance could be limited on the basis of demonstrated need.

signify to the young that our nation is committed to the achievement of social justice, as well as to military security.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the office of the White House Press Secretary, Nov. 26, 1969]

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT SIGNING OF H.R. 14001, AN ACT TO AMEND THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1967

Mr. Secretary, Members of the Senate and House, and Members of the Youth Advisory Committee who are present here today:

I am here for the purpose of signing the draft reform bill, which has been passed by the House and the Senate.

In signing this bill, I think it might be well to refer to a statement that was made over 100 years ago by General Grant with regard to the draft that was then in effect.

He said that the agony of suspense is worse than the effect of the law itself.

As far as this draft reform bill is concerned, it does not remove all of the inequity of the draft, because there will be inequity as long as any of our young men have to serve when others do not have to serve. But the agony of suspense and uncertainty which has hung over our younger generation for seven years can now be reduced to one year, and other very needed reforms in the draft can be made by Executive Order.

In signing the bill, I want to impress upon everybody here that while the Administration took the initiative through the Secretary of Defense's recommendation in sending this bill to the Congress, it could not be here for signature by the President had it not had strong bipartisan support by Members of the Democratic Party in the House and Senate, as well as Members of the Republican Party. This is truly a bipartisan measure and the credit should be taken by both parties as the bill signing occurs.

Finally, I would say that looking to the future, while this measure will remove a great number of inequities and particularly remove the uncertainty to which I refer, we shall not be satisfied until we finally can have the system which I advocated during the campaign of a completely volunteer armed forces. We cannot move to that now because of the requirements for armed services. That is, however, our ultimate goal.

Now I will sign the measure.

EXHIBIT 3

EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 11497—AMENDING THE SELECTIVE SERVICE REGULATIONS TO PRESCRIBE RANDOM SELECTION

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (62 Stat. 604, as amended), I hereby prescribe the following amendments of the Selective Service Regulations prescribed by Executive Orders No. 10001 of September 17, 1948, No. 10202 of January 12, 1951, No. 10292 of September 25, 1951, No. 10659 of February 15, 1956, No. 10735 of October 17, 1957, No. 10984 of January 5, 1962, No. 11098 of March 14, 1963, No. 11119 of September 10, 1963, No. 11241 of August 26, 1965, No. 11360 of June 30, 1967, and constituting portions of Chapter XVI of Title 32 of the Code of Federal Regulations:

1. Section 1631.4, *Calls by the Secretary of Defense,* is amended by revoking paragraphs (b) and (c) and redesignating paragraph (d) as (b).

2. Section 1631.5, *Calls by the Director of Selective Service,* is amended by adding a new paragraph (d), to read as follows:

"(d) The Director of Selective Service shall establish a random selection sequence for induction. Such random selection sequence shall be determined as the President may direct, and shall be applied nationwide. The first sequence shall determine the order of selection of registrants (other than delinquents or volunteers) who prior to January 1, 1970, shall have attained their nineteenth year of age but not their twenty-sixth. New random selection sequences shall be established, in a similar manner, for registrants who attain their nineteenth year of age on or after January 1, 1970. The random sequence number determined for any registrant shall apply to him so long as he remains subject to random selection. A random sequence number established for a registrant shall be equivalent, for purposes of selection, to the same random sequence number established for other registrants in other drawings."

3. Paragraphs (a) and (b) of Section 1631.7, *Action by Local Board Upon Receipt of Notice of Call,* are revoked, paragraph (c) is redesignated as paragraph (b), and a new paragraph (a) is prescribed to read as follows:

"(a) When a call is received by a Notice of Call on Local Board (SSS Form 201) from the State Director of Selective Service for a specified number of men to be delivered for induction, or for a specified number of men in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category to be delivered for induction, the Executive Secretary or clerk, if so authorized, or a local board member shall select and issue orders to report for induction to the number of men required to fill the call from among its registrants who have been classified in Class I-A or Class I-A-O and have been found acceptable for service in the Armed Forces and to whom a Statement of Acceptability (DD Form 62) has been mailed at least 21 days before the date fixed for induction: *Provided,* That any registrant classified in Class I-A or Class I-A-O who is subject to random selection as herein provided, whose random sequence number has been reached, and who would have been ordered to report for induction except for delays due to a pending personal appearance, appeal, preinduction examination, reclassification, or otherwise, shall if and when found acceptable and when such delay is concluded, be ordered to report for induction next after delinquents and volunteers even if the year in which he otherwise would have been ordered to report has ended and even if (in cases of extended liability) he has attained his twenty-sixth birthday: *Provided further,* That a registrant classified in Class I-A or Class I-A-O who has volunteered for induction or who is a delinquent may be selected and ordered to report for induction to fill an induction call notwithstanding the fact that he has not been found acceptable for service in the Armed Forces and regardless of whether or not a Statement of Acceptability (DD Form 62) has been mailed to him. Registrants shall be selected and ordered to report for induction in the following categories and in the order indicated:

"(1) Delinquents who have attained the age of 19 years in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest being selected first.

"(2) Volunteers who have not attained the age of 26 years in the sequence in which they have volunteered for induction.

"(3)(i) *1970.* In the calendar year 1970, non-volunteers born on or after January 1, 1944, and on or before December 31, 1950, who have not attained the 26th anniversary of the dates of their birth, in the order of their random sequence numbers established by random selection procedures prescribed in accordance with paragraph (d) of section 1631.5. The non-volunteers thus subject to selection are designated the 1970 Selection Group and constitute category (3) for 1970. Members of the 1970 Selection Group on December 31, 1970, whose random sequence numbers have not been reached by that date, shall be assigned to the priority group which is immediately below the First Priority Selection Group for 1971.

"(ii) *1971 and Later Years.* For calendar year 1971, and for each subsequent year, a new First Priority Selection Group and lower priority groups shall be established which together will constitute category (3) for that year. The First Priority Selection Group shall consist (A) of nonvolunteers in Class I-A and Class I-A-O who prior to January 1 of each such calendar year have attained the age of 19 years but not of 20 years, and (B) of nonvolunteers who prior to January 1 of each such calendar year have attained the age of 19 but not of 26 years and who during that year are classified into Class I-A or class I-A-O following expiration of their deferments or exemptions or otherwise. Members of each such First Priority Selection Group, who have not attained the 26th anniversary of the dates of their birth, shall be selected in the order of their random sequence numbers. Members of each such First Priority Selection Group on December 31 of the respective calendar year whose random sequence numbers are not reached by that date shall be assigned to successively lower priority groups, so that those who were in the 1970 Selection Group and who move into a lower priority group at the end of 1970 as herein provided will be in the lowest such group, those who were in the 1971 First Priority Selection Group will be in the next to the lowest such group, and so forth. Any registrant who was subject to selection in the 1970 Selection Group or in the First Priority Selection Group for any subsequent year, who thereafter is assigned to a lower priority group in category (3), who while in such a lower priority group receives a deferment or exemption, and who subsequently is reclassified into Class I-A or Class I-A-O, shall be reassigned to the priority group in which he would have been if he had not received such deferment or exemption.

"(iii) *Certain Registrants Married Before August 27, 1965.* Within each group in category (3) there shall be a subgroup consisting of registrants who have a wife whom they married on or before August 26, 1965, and with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. Registrants in any such subgroup shall be in all respects subject to this paragraph, except that they shall be selected after other registrants in the group of which that subgroup is a part.

"(4) Nonvolunteers who attain the age of 19 years during the calendar year but who have not attained the age of 20 years, in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest being selected first.

"(5) Nonvolunteers who have attained the age of 26 years in the order of their dates of birth with the youngest being selected first.

"(6) Nonvolunteers who have attained the age of 18 years and 6 months and who have not attained the age of 19 years in the order of their dates of birth with the oldest being selected first."

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 26, 1969.*

EXHIBIT 4

[From the office of the White House Press Secretary]

NEW DRAFT SELECTION SYSTEM FACT SHEET

This fact sheet describes the major revisions in the draft selection procedures placed into effect by President Nixon under the authority of Public Law 91-124, November 26, 1969. It describes how this new system will work and presents information on the draft outlook for young men in 1970 under this system.

MAJOR CHANGES

The new program accomplishes the following major improvements in draft selection procedures:

1. It reduces the period of prime draft vulnerability, and the uncertainty that accompanies it, from up to 7 years, under the previous system, to only 1 year.

2. It establishes this vulnerability for a fixed time in each young man's life, which will be much less disruptive to him in terms of his personal planning.

3. It establishes a fair and easily understandable method of random selection among such young men, if they are found by their local boards to be available and qualified for service.

4. It undertakes to establish as soon as possible procedures under which a Selective Service registrant may request an Armed Forces examination so that he can know if he is physically and mentally qualified for military service.

These changes are presented in greater detail below.

1. Limited vulnerability

Under the previous draft procedure a young man began his time of maximum vulnerability to the draft at age 19 and, if he did not volunteer for service, remained in that status until he was drafted or reached his 26th birthday. Selection among men in this age group who were found "available and qualified" for service by their draft boards was on an oldest-first basis. Under recent conditions of relatively high draft calls the age of involuntary induction has been low, averaging about 20½ years. However, when draft calls were much smaller, as they had been during the early 1960's, the average draft age had reached nearly 24 years. This had created a long period of uncertainty for young men and had handicapped many of them in attempting to get jobs or training, and made it difficult for them to plan their lives intelligently.

Under the revised system a "First Priority Selection Group" is established which will normally constitute the only group from which men will be called involuntarily into service, other than those delinquent in their obligations under the law, or medical, dental, and allied specialists (who are subject to special calls after they complete their professional training.) Those registrants who are not selected for induction during their 12-month period of exposure will then be placed into a lower priority category and will normally not be vulnerable for induction except under the unlikely circumstances that the First Priority Group is completely exhausted. Thus, under normal conditions a young man will receive an earlier and more decisive answer to his question, "Where do I stand with the draft?" and will be able to plan his life accordingly.

2. The new order of call

Under the new system, as under the previous procedure, the first priorities for induction in any draft board will consist of registrants who are delinquent in their responsibilities under the law and of those volunteering for induction. The principal, or "First Priority Selection Group" for involuntary induction will, however, be limited after 1970 (the initial transitional year) to draft eligible men in their 19th year of age at the beginning of the year and to those men between the ages of 19 and 26 whose deferments expired during the year upon completion of school or for other reasons. The new procedure thus establishes a "youngest first" rather than "oldest first" priority for induction. This will result in a stable and predictable draft age period for each young man—either in the year following his attainment of age 19 or in the year after he leaves school or otherwise ceases to be deferred.

However, in 1970, beginning with the draft call to be filled in January 1970, this First Priority Group will also include all draft eligible men who are in the ages 20 through 25 at the beginning of the year, so that no individual eligible for induction under the previous rules will escape vulnerability simply because of the change to the new system.

3. Random selection

Since more men are classified as available for service each year than are required to fill current or expected draft calls, a fair and understandable procedure is needed to determine whom to call first, whom to call second, and whom not to call at all. Under the authority of the recent amendment to the draft law (P.L. 91–124, November 26, 1969) President Nixon has authorized the Director of Selective Service to place into effect a simple random selection procedure for this purpose, based upon a random sequence of the 365 or 366 days of each year. An initial drawing to be held on December 1, 1969 will establish this random listing of birth dates for individuals who will be in ages 19 through 25 years on December 31, 1969. This sequence will apply nationally to the order of induction to be followed by each local draft board this coming year. Thus, if June 21 is the first day drawn then those in the first priority group, available for induction, whose birthdays are June 21, will be the first to be ordered for induction involuntarily in January 1970 following delinquents and volunteers. If January 12 is the next date drawn, individuals with that birthday would be second in order of call in their respective draft boards.

In the event that two or more men have the same birth date within a local board their sequence of induction will be determined by the first letter of their names (last name and, if necessary, first name) which will be arranged in a random sequence to be established by a supplemental drawing also to be conducted on December 1. Draft eligibles in the "first priority" age group whose numbers have not been reached at the end of the year, will be placed in a lower order of call next year and will be vulnerable for induction only if the First Priority Group of next year is exhausted.

4. Voluntary armed forces examination

The President has directed the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the Selective Service to establish procedures under which registrants of the Selective Service System may request of their Local Board an armed forces qualifying examinations at the earliest feasible time. Local Boards will schedule such examination to be held at an Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station.

Random selection and this new opportunity of a registrant to have a qualifying examination will reduce uncertainty and make it more possible for young men to plan their lives.

THE DRAFT OUTLOOK FOR 1970

Young men who will be vulnerable for induction next year will want to know: Once the birthdate drawing has taken place, and a random sequence has been set, what are my chances of being drafted next year?

The actual chances of being reached for induction for draft-eligible men with a given position on the birthdate list will depend upon many factors, particularly upon future military strength requirements as we progress in our efforts to Vietnamize the war and upon the rate of voluntary enlistments and re-enlistments. Any possible changes in draft deferment policies or procedures, resulting from the current reviews within the Administration or from Congressional reviews scheduled for next year could also affect this outlook.

The Department of Defense has, however, prepared certain estimates based upon the best available information at this time. These esimates show the projected military manpower requirements from the pool of men, age 19–25 years, who will be available for induction during 1970. This pool is estimated at 850,000, including about 500,000 19–25 year olds who would be immediately available at the beginning of the year, if fully examined and processed, and an additional 350,000 who will become available during 1970 when their deferments expire. The DOD has further estimated that a total of 550,000, or 64% of this group, will be required for military service either as volunteers or inductees. This is based on the currently planned military end strength of about 3.2 million in June 1970 and on an assumption that this strength level will be maintained during the period July–December 1970. Based on past experience it is expected that 290,000 of the total number required from this group will volunteer for either active or reserve service. The remaining requirement of about 250,000 would, therefore, have to be met through induction. This represents approximately 45% of the residual manpower pool in 1970, excluding those who will have volunteered for service.

In view of the many uncertainties involved in these estimates, our best judgment at this time is that registrants whose birth dates will appear in the top one-third of the random birth date sequence will have a high probability of being drafted; those in the middle one-third, an average probability of being drafted, and those in the bottom one-third, a relatively low probability of being reached for induction.

EXHIBIT 5

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE FACT SHEET ON SELECTIVE SERVICE MANPOWER POOL PROJECTIONS FOR CALENDER YEAR 1970, NOVEMBER 20, 1969

In Secretary Laird's testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee on H.R. 14001, November 14, 1969, statistics based on the attached table (Table 1) were provided to the Committee.

Secretary Laird emphasized in his testimony that the projections of inductions appearing on this table were derived from the following assumptions:

(1) That the military end strength for the current fiscal year ending on June 30, 1970 would be approximately 3.2 million (based on current budget plans) and

(2) that this strength would be maintained during the period July–December 1970.

Secretary Laird further noted that he considered the resulting draft call estimate a maximum estimate of next year's draft calls.

Based on these assumptions, the attached table shows the projected military manpower requirements from the pool of men aged 19–25 years, who will be available for induction during 1970. These estimates indicate that, of the 850,000 Selective Service registrants in this age group who will be available and qualified for service, a total of 540,000 or 64% will be required for military service, either as volunteers or inductees. It is estimated that about 290,000 of this group will volunteer for service, including 190,000 regular enlistees and 100,000 reserve enlistees. Of the remaining group of 560,000 available for induction, 250,000 or 45% would be required for induction.

Also attached is an additional table (Table 2) showing the estimated status of the total age group of young men who will be age 19 as of January 1, 1970.

TABLE 1.—*Selective Service manpower pool projections for 1970 under random selection system*

1. Estimated selective service manpower pool, ages 19–25, as of Jan. 1, 1970	500,000
(Age 19)	290,000
(Ages 20–25)	210,000
2. Net entrants into pool during 1970 (deferments expiring)	350,000
3. Total pool available for service during 1970 (lines 1 and 2)	850,000
4. Less: estimated volunteers from pool during 1970, total	290,000
Active duty enlistments	190,000
Reserve enlistments	100,000

TABLE 1.—*Selective Service manpower pool projections for 1970 under random selection system*—Continued

5. Pool available for induction during 1970 (line 3–line 4)	560,000
6. Estimated inductions from pool during 1970	250,000
7. Not required for induction, placed in lower priority category on Jan. 1, 1971	310,000
8. Total military accessions as percentage of total pool (lines 4 and 6, as percent of line 3)	64
9. Inductions as percentage of pool available for induction	45

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Selective Service Manpower Pool (line 1). Estimated number of registrants in Class I–A, Available for Service, who would be found qualified for service if fully examined. Excludes I–A registrants whose reclassifications or appeals are pending.

Net Entrants into Pool (line 2). Former students and other registrants reclassified from a deferred status to Class I–A during 1970, less registrants reclassified from I–A to a deferred or exempt status.

Volunteers from Pool. Includes regular enlistments for active service, officer candidate enlistments and enlistments into reserve or National Guard units from Selective Service pool. Excludes voluntary entries into service of individuals below age 19 as of January 1, 1970, as well as accessions into active service of individuals, ages 19–25, who were in a deferred status at time of entry, e.g., ROTC graduates.

TABLE 2.—*Estimated military service status of 19-year-old male population as of January 1, 1970*

[In thousands]

1. Total male population aged 19 (born in 1950)	1,890
2. Less: Not qualified for military service	590
3. Estimated qualified for service (line 1—line 2)	1,300
4. Full-time students and other deferments	700
5. Entered service prior to January 1, 1970	310
6. Available for service as of January 1, 1970 (Line 3—lines 4 and 5)	290

EXHIBIT 6

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1969]

DRAFT BILL SIGNED, LOTTERY STARTS JANUARY 1

President Nixon yesterday signed the draft lottery bill he pushed through a reluctant Congress and immediately ordered the institution of a new lottery system, effective Jan. 1.

The President said the new plan would end "the agony of suspense" that has afflicted young men from 19 to 26 and that beginning in 1971 19-year-olds would be drafted first.

In all probability they would be the only ones subject to the draft, except those whose deferments expire.

Declaring that the reform would not end all inequities, Mr. Nixon said he would not be satisfied until "we have a completely volunteer armed force."

Some experts have predicted that drafted men would not be sent to Vietnam after next year.

Next Monday, the Selective Service System will hold a drawing to determine the order of induction. It will place in a bowl the dates for the 365 days of the year. Fifty young men, one from each state, will be invited to do the drawing.

The White House explained that if June 21 is drawn first, those whose birthday is June 21 will be the first ordered for induction in January. If Jan. 12 is the next date drawn, those whose birthday falls on that date will be inducted next.

Since about 850,000 young men will be in the 1970 draft pool and only about 250,000 will be drafted, it is estimated that those whose birthdays are among the first third of the dates drawn will certainly be drafted, those in the second third will have "an average probability of being drafted" and those in the bottom third a low probability.

The President directed Selective Service to permit a registrant to request a physical examination in advance so that he may know whether he is physically and mentally qualified for service.

The "youngest first" plan, where only 19-year-olds will be eligible unless there is a major emergency, will not begin until 1971.

In 1970, all those between 19 and 26 on Dec. 3, 1969, will be eligible for induction under the previous rules will escape vulnerability because of the change to the new system," the White House said.

The drawing Monday at Selective Service will be public. Immediately after the drawing the order of the 1970 calls by birthdays will be known.

There will be a new drawing each year to determine the order in the future.

A drawing also will be held to determine the order in the event of two or more men within a local board have the same birthday.

Letters of the alphabet will be drawn to determine the order. Thus a person whose last name begins with S might be drawn ahead of a man whose last name begins with A, even if they have the same birthdays.

College deferments will continue for undergraduates. But when an individual's exemption expires he will be classified as a 19-year-old and will have the same chance of being drafted as a 19-year-old.

When the President first requested the lottery and 19-year-old-first plan it appeared that he had little chance of winning congressional approval. But after a long fight the essence of his proposal was approved.

When he signed the bill, he praised Democrats and Republicans for their cooperation and said that the bill would not have passed without bipartisan support.

Another fight on draft reform will be waged next year. The President has ordered a study by the National Security Council on draft reform for the future and the study is expected to be completed this year, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said yesterday.

The all-volunteer army, which Mr. Nixon promised to work for in last year's campaign, is predicated on an end of the Vietnam war. He said yesterday, "We cannot move to that now because of the requirements of our armed services. That is, however, our ultimate goal."

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 27, 1969]

NEW LOTTERY SYSTEM MAY PROVIDE LEGAL WAY TO ESCAPE DRAFT

(By Stan Benjamin)

President Nixon's draft lottery system may give many deferment holders a perfectly legal way to duck the draft entirely, a White House aide acknowledged yesterday.

Peter Flanigan, Nixon's staff expert on the draft plan, conceded in an interview that a deferred draft registrant could choose the year he wants to be most exposed to the draft by deliberately timing the loss of his deferment—by dropping out of school or quitting a job, for example.

And he could do it, Flanigan said, near the end of a year in which it is already apparent his number is not likely to be called.

The result: a loophole big enough to drive a truckload of college students through.

The student could give himself four years to choose from by starting college and his deferment at age 19—when his draft liability begins. If, during one of those four years, it appears from the lottery his number will be bypassed, he could simply drop out of school or fail his courses, join the 1–A pool, and wait out the year for the draft notice he is pretty certain won't come.

CHANCES DIMINISH

When the year runs out, so does his biggest chance of being drafted. For all practical purposes, he's in the clear unless the draft pool is swept by unexpectedly massive draft calls.

An occupational deferment could be managed the same way.

Theoretically, anyone with a deferment has the same opportunity, but only to the extent he can control the circumstances.

Just such a possibility was pointed out to Flanigan last May after Nixon first outlined his draft proposal, and Flanigan commented then. "Those are damn good questions. We haven't got all the details worked out yet."

Asked yesterday if this loophole in the lottery might be abused by registrants seeking to escape the draft, Flanigan replied, "I guess it could."

The plan signed into law by Mr. Nixon yesterday directs the establishment of an order of draft-call each year by scrambling dates and alphabet letters—the dates signifying birthdays, the alphabet, names.

Once a man gets a number that way for any particular year, it determines his place in line for future years as well.

OTHERS BYPASSED

Depending on the size of the draft pool and the size of the draft calls, some portion of those eligible for draft will actually be called each year, while the others will be bypassed and will become progressively less liable in future years as new registrants step forward.

The hitch arises when a man who is deferred loses his deferment and rejoins the 1-A pool. He brings with him the place-in-line number he drew in the year he turned 19—no matter how many years, or new scrambled lists, have gone by.

No matter how late in the year he loses his deferment said Flanigan, he rejoins that year's pool—in effect, his draft exposure became largely retroactive.

A man with a low number probably could not escape the draft unless calls were cut sharply.

But a deferred man with a number higher than, say, the first one-third of the list, could simply wait until late in the year and then drop out of school or quit his job in time for his draft board to reclassify him 1-A, once he knows his number won't come up.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Nov. 28, 1969]

THE LOTTERY IS LAW

It is a shame, of course, that a military draft is necessary in any nation. But the shape of the world (or the misshape of it) compels most countries, and the United States in particular, to maintain a high degree of military force.

This is essential not only for our own safety, but as a deterrent to another global slaughter.

Since this is the case, men of combat age have to be recruited for the armed services. Up to now, the only workable system has been conscription.

But since the armed services didn't need, and couldn't use, all of the men of combat age, many in the nation (and The Washington Daily News and other Scripps-Howard Newspapers especially) long have believed a fairer system of deciding who should go and who should not was seriously needed.

The most practical answer to that problem was a lottery—a device by which those to be called would be chosen at random; so

that every young man at least took the same risk of being inducted.

That system now has been adopted, thanks to President Nixon and a change of mind among the military affairs leaders of Congress. Months and years were wasted getting to this decision, but President Nixon was able to sign the new law Wednesday.

This, combined with the President's decision to call up 19-year-olds first, eliminates much of the hardship, inequity and uncertainty which has prevailed in the draft. It was a simple, small step—but it will mean a lot to the men and families who have to face this problem.

[From the New York Post, Nov. 18, 1969]

DRAFT LOTTERY SET TO GO

WASHINGTON.—The 12,500 young men in the January draft call will be inducted according to "the luck of the draw."

This measure will be the result of a measure, signed by President Nixon, which establishes the first congressionally-authorized draft lottery since March 17, 1942.

Under the lottery plan, there will be two drastic changes affecting millions of young Americans:

¶ The draftees will be called up from each year's group of 19-year-olds.

¶ The order in which eligible 19-year-olds will be called up will be determined by "random selection" or lottery.

All of the student deferments presently in force will be continued. These include student deferments, hardship deferments and occupational deferments (industrial farming, teaching, police force).

The 4000 local draft boards will still continue to provide their quotas of men toward the over-all requirements sent out by Selective Service headquarters, after the manpower need is stated by the Defense Dept.

Instead of drafting the oldest first, however, as they did till now, they will be required to draft only 19-year-olds—with the exception of this first year of the lottery.

HOW IT WORKS

If the new plan works as intended, a youth will be vulnerable to the chance of being called up for only one year. Till now he was vulnerable for seven years, from 18 through 25. Under the new plan, if he is not drafted during his one year of exposure, he will not be called up unless there is a major war.

Under the old plan of drafting the oldest first, the majority of the draftees were 20 and 21.

There will be at least two drawings made in the Selective Service headquarters a few blocks from the White House. The first drawing, called the "birthday lottery" will scramble the sequence of the calendar. There will be 366 capsules—one for each day of the year plus one for Feb. 29—and inside each capsule will be a date.

The first capsule drawn might contain the date of June 1. If it does, every youth who turns 19 on June 1 will be drafted unless he has a deferment, or is unqualified because of physical, mental or moral standards. The 366th capsule drawn might contain the date of, say, Feb. 1. If it does, every boy who becomes 19 on that date knows that he will not be called up unless there is a world war.

This is because the men required for the draft, under a limited war such as in Vietnam, can be supplied by the first 100 or so numbers of the priority sequence. Only about 250,000 are expected to be drafted in 1970 out of a draft pool estimated at 850,000.

The second drawing at Selective Service headquarters will be of 26 capsules, each one containing a letter of the alphabet.

This will scramble the alphabet and establish a new priority sequence to establish the order of call within each birthday group. The priority will be determined by the first letter of a man's last name.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 29, 1969]

LOOPHOLE IN THE DRAFT LOTTERY?

President Nixon acknowledged in signing the bill to permit a Selective Service lottery, that some inequities will remain when the new system is in operation. No law which compels some to render military service and relieves others of that obligation can be entirely fair. The best that can be done, so long as compulsion is necessary, is to make the system operate without favoritism, and use of the combined birthday-alphabet lottery appears to be an appropriate means to that end.

Great care will have to be taken, however, to see that unnecessary inequities do not creep back into the draft. The plan for drafting 19-year-olds first, which will go into effect in 1971, is complicated by the fact that education and job deferments will be granted, and young men who escape inclusion in the prime draft pool at 19 for these reasons will have to face the possibility of being drafted at a later date. Equity demands that after their deferment expires they be exposed to the draft in the so-called prime pool for one year as if they were still 19.

This is the intent of the new arrangement. A question has been raised, however, as to whether deferments can be manipulated so as to grant virtual immunity to the draft. Deferred students and employees will go into the prime draft pool when they lose their deferment. Peter Flanigan of the White House staff dealing with this problem has acknowledged in an interview with the Associated Press that this arrangement may make it possible for a draft-shy student to choose the time of his exposure so as to minimize his liability. In other words, a student, after he learns that his number has been bypassed, could flunk or drop out of college and take his period of exposure to the draft when the chance of his being drafted would be almost nil.

If abuses of this sort should develop under the new system, it could fall into even greater disrepute than its predecessor which is now being discarded. One way of eliminating that risk would be to abolish all deferments for the duration of the war. If that is deemed too drastic it should be possible to require the young man seeking a deferment to specify at that time the year which he would spend in the prime draft pool. Congress will need to take a careful look at this problem when it seeks wider draft reforms next year in accord with the promise of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

[From the Washington Star, Nov. 29, 1969]

DRAFT LOTTERY SET TOMORROW

(By Stan Benjamin)

Tom, Dick and Harry grew up together, went to school together, graduated in the same year—but they may go very separate ways under President Nixon's new draft lottery system.

Tomorrow night the first draft lottery drawing in 27 years will be held; a new drawing will take place every year while this system remains in effect.

Each year a new group of young men will await that drawing, and each year, as the capsules are drawn from the jar, they'll wonder: "What does this do to my future?"

OUTLINES CLEAR

The answer will depend on individual circumstances and a complex of regulations but the general outlines are clear.

Tom, Dick and Harry start out with at least one thing in common: They all must register with their local draft board when they reach the age of 18. What they tell the draft board about themselves will help determine whether they are classified 1–A—"available for military service"—or in one of 16 other classifications of men considered not immediately available.

Let's say Tom and Dick have got jobs, and have nobody to support but themselves. The draft board finds them 1–A.

HARRY IS DEFERRED

Harry, however, is deferred. The draft board is convinced there is good reason not to draft him—at least as long as that reason lasts. Of endless possibilities, the reason may be that he has enrolled in college; perhaps he has a job essential to national security; perhaps he is the sole support of a parent; perhaps he has a trick knee.

The following year, all three youths turn 19. Some time late in that year the Selective Service System in Washington holds the lottery that will affect them.

Each date of the year, including Leap Year's Feb. 29, is written on a slip of paper and placed in a plastic capsule. These 366 capsules are mixed in a large glass jar and then drawn out, one by one.

The first date pulled is labeled number one. The second date pulled becomes number two, and so on up to number 366.

When the new year rolls around, the local draft board starts using this numbered list of dates: all 1–A men whose birthday was drawn first will be the first ones called for service. Then the board goes on to the men whose birthday was drawn second, and so on.

HALFWAY THROUGH LIST

The way draft calls have been adding up in recent years. Most draft boards will probably get all the men they need by the time they are roughly halfway through the list.

Suppose Tom's birthday—a day, for example, in November—is the third or fourth one drawn out of the bowl.

That tells Tom he'd better not make any long-range plans. He's virtually certain to be drafted unless the Army finds something wrong with him when he shows up for his physical.

Dick, on the other hand, has a higher number: let's say, 187, meaning that his birthday was the 187th to come out of the lottery bowl.

Tom is sure to be drafted, and a lot of guys far up the list with numbers in the 200s and 300s probably won't have to go.

WHO WILL BE FIRST?

But Dick is right in the middle. All he can do is sweat out the whole year and see whether the draft calls in his own local board reach his number.

As they climb higher throughout the year, Dick may take a close look and find there are a couple of other guys sharing his birthday and thus his number in line. If it gets that close, who will be the first to go?

That's already decided, too. Selective Service will already have scrambled up alphabet letters, just as it did dates.

NEW GROUP IN FRONT RANK

If necessary, it will use the scrambled alphabet list to decide which man goes first when birthdays coincide, by matching the letters drawn with the initials of the men's last names.

But let's give Dick a break and suppose the draft board gets all its men without reaching him.

Tom and Dick have now faced their "priority" year of exposure to the draft. Tom got drafted. But Dick did not, and the next year a new group of 19-year-olds with their birthdays scrambled in a new lottery will be in the front rank of exposure to the draft.

Dick will then still be legally subject to the draft, but it can't take him unless it first takes all of the new "priority" group, and that's pretty unlikely, short of a huge national mobilization.

Dick can relax and start making long-range plans from then on; he's probably safe from the draft.

He remains subject to it until he reaches the age of 26, but his chance of being called gets smaller each year.

Now what about Harry, the guy who was deferred?

Harry turned 19 the same year as the other two, so he was subject to the same lottery and he, too, got a place-in-line number when his birthday was drawn out of the jar.

But because he is deferred, he does not face the draft when the other two do. He faces it if and when he loses that deferment: when he graduates or drops out of college; loses his "essential" occupation; loses the dependent he had to support; gets his trick knee fixed . . .

When that happens, his draft board may reclassify him 1–A.

Harry then drops into the middle of a "priority" year and is fully exposed to the draft. He drops in, however, with the place in line given to him by the lottery held when he was 19.

If his number then was, for example, 153, he enters the 1–A line at number 153, even several years later.

If that number is reached in the year he re-enters the 1-A pool, Harry gets drafted.

FIRST YEAR DIFFERENT

The Nixon plan is to give every Tom, Dick and Harry his "priority" draft exposure in the year after he turns 19—unless, like Harry, he postpones that exposure through a deferment.

This year, the first lottery year, is a little different because men are eligible for the draft from 19 to 26, and the administration wants today's 20-to-26 group to get its exposure just like the 19-to-20 group.

Thus the first drawing—at 8 p.m. tomorrow—covers every man who reaches 19, but not 26, by or on Dec. 31, 1969.

The draft boards won't start calling men by the lottery list until January, but by late tomorrow night, Tom, Dick and Harry will have a pretty good idea where they stand in 1970.

[From the National Journal, Nov. 29, 1969]

FURTHER DRAFT DEBATE EXPECTED AS PRESIDENT SIGNS REVISIONS

(By Donald May)

The series of steps which President Nixon has taken to revise the draft has not ended the national debate on that subject.

More major national decisions on the draft are yet to be made. The President himself reflected this in signing a draft lottery bill Nov. 26 when he commented:

"While this measure will remove a great number of inequities . . . We will not be satisfied until we can have what I advocated during the campaign, volunteer armed forces."

So far the President has:

Cut draft calls by 50,000 in the final quarter of this year and announced that the call of 35,000 men planned for January will be reduced to 12,500.

Signed—also on Nov. 26—an executive order designed to cut the seven years of draft uncertainty, which men now face under the oldest-first system, to one year by calling 19-year-olds first beginning in January.

Coaxed and prodded through Congress an amendment permitting selection of 19-year-olds by lottery.

Announced that Lieut. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, who has headed the Selective Service System since 1941, will give up that post Feb. 16.

But these steps left draft critics in both houses of Congress calling for more. Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif., urged "total revision." In the House, Rep. Leonard Farbstein, D–N.Y., said "a host of other inequities" remained unsolved, the greatest of which he said was "the draft itself."

Further inquiry: Two Administration studies related to the draft are now in progress:

The President's Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, named in March, and headed by former Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, plans a January report on the possibility of a volunteer force to replace the draft.

A continuing Defense Department study called Project Volunteer, is looking into ways of gradually decreasing reliance on the draft by improving pay, recruiting systems, living accommodations and education opportunities for volunteers.

Divided Congress: The Administration found that it is no easy task obtaining draft legislation from a Congress split between those who want major revision and those who want little or none.

On May 13 the President asked Congress for six-point legislation including the youngest-first system, a lottery and deferment changes.

What happened next varies with the telling. Draft reformers say the measure was blocked by the chairmen of the two Armed Services Committees, Sen. John C. Stennis, D-Miss., and Rep. L. Mendel Rivers, D-S.C. The Stennis-Rivers forces say they didn't want the draft thrown open to helter-skelter revision on the floors of Congress, without full hearings, and while emotions on the draft, Vietnam and the military were running high.

Rivers, who had written much of the existing 1967 draft law which banned a lottery, told the Administration it could make its main changes by executive order without need of legislation.

On Sept. 19 the President yielded to this, announcing that he would handle five of his six points by executive decree, and would ask Congress only for one amendment—to remove the 1967 prohibition against a lottery.

Even getting this much to a vote seems to have taken some Presidential persuasion, as evidenced by the following remark of House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford: "This bill . . . is here only because the distinguished chairman of this committee (Rivers) sat down with the President of the United States and at his request agreed to hold hearings on this proposal and to bring it to the floor, if that was the will of the committee . . ."

On Oct. 13 the President sent a message to Congress outlining legislative priorities and calling for draft legislation "now."

On Oct. 30 the lottery bill reached the House floor under a rule preventing amendment on the floor. Sources said this rule was an essential condition for a vote. The bill passed 382–13.

Enter Sen. Kennedy: Then it almost foundered in the Senate. Under Senate procedure there could be no rule against floor amendment, only a gentlemen's agreement. But Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, D-Mass., wanted to launch a debate on major draft revision.

According to opponents, Sen. Stennis took the position that in that case there could be no bill. Sen. Mike Mansfield, D-Mont., the majority leader, reported on the Senate floor that it appeared the bill could not come up this year for lack of an agreement on limiting amendments.

President Nixon then turned on the heat, and he turned it on Mansfield. "I deeply regret the announced decision of the Democratic leadership to deny the United States Senate an opportunity to consider draft reform until next year," the President said.

There followed a series of Kennedy-Stennis meetings. Yale President Kingman Brewster Jr. attempted—during a hearing—to mediate. He suggested a compromise involving an earlier expiration of the draft law. It was not accepted, but it drew public attention to the need for compromise.

Finally, Kennedy agreed not to start his debate. Stennis agreed to hold draft hearings by Feb. 15. The lottery bill passed the Senate by voice vote Nov. 19.

Revision pressure: The renewed debate, when it comes, is likely to be extensive. This year a dozen draft revision bills were introduced in the Senate. They included a lottery, an extensive revision proposed by Sen. Kennedy, and an all-volunteer force proposed by Sen. Mark O. Hatfield, R-Ore. In the House there were at least 42 draft bills.

Draft reform mail to legislators is reported heavy, and this may have been a factor in decisions in both houses to pass the lottery bill.

Significance: Two million young men reach draft age each year. More than a quarter million are being called this year. Draftees represent 35 per cent of Army forces in Vietnam.

The draft issue is bound up in and has fueled the campus revolt, the Vietnam protest movement and it has touched on the racial issue. There have been charges that the draft discriminates against the poor and blacks. Some have attacked the idea of an all-volunteer force on the grounds it would be heavily black, a premise which proponents do not concede.

For President Nixon the draft is a top priority problem, but one for which proposed solutions run into harsh realities of Pentagon manpower needs and budgets. Soon after he took office, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird, decided an all-volunteer force was too costly to be more than a long-range goal.

One social dimension is a ten-fold increase (from 341 to more than 3,000) in the number of men charged with criminal violations of the draft act between 1965 and 1969. Many are men with otherwise clean records who were influenced by campus protests.

Court cases: The U.S. Supreme Court has several draft cases on its docket raising issues such as:

The constitutionality of "punitive" reclassification of a man to 1–A for failure to carry his draft card—specifically, for turning it in as a form of protest. (No. 71 Gutnecht v US; No. 65 Breen v Selective Service Board No. 16.)

Whether a man who opposes the Vietnam war on non-religious grounds can qualify as a conscientious objector. (No. 305 US v Sisson.)

Draft groups: The increase in draft calls during the Vietnam war has caused rapid expansion of a social phenomenon known as "draft counseling"—similar to tax advice and considered by the Selective Service System as just as legal when properly done.

The Central Committee for conscientious objectors handles between 900 and 1,200 consultations with draft age men per month by mail, phone and interview at its Philadelphia headquarters. It has branches in Chicago and San Francisco.

The interest of a wide variety of groups is shown by a partial list of those which presented information to the Gates commission: American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, National Student Association, Young Americans for Freedom, National Council of Churches, Air Force Association, Council to Repeal the Draft.

Outlook: Among other issues unaffected by the President's actions so far are charges that the more than 4,000 local draft boards operate without uniform criteria and with inadequate judicial review; that men have been drafted as punishment for protest, and that the area of conscientious objection has not been adequately defined.

When the issues next come up in Congress there will be one important difference—1970 will be a Congressional election year.

[From the Boston Globe, Nov. 30, 1969]

HERE'S HOW DRAFT WILL WORK

WASHINGTON.—Tomorrow night the first draft lottery drawing in 27 years will be held. Here's how it will work:

Between 8 p.m. and 10 p.m. at Selective Service headquarters in Washington, a person or persons yet unidentified will draw slips or tags from a new glass bowl. The slips will be numbered from 1 through 366, one for each day of the year, including leap year's Feb. 29.

The order of the drawing will determine the order of induction for young men, found physically and mentally qualified, who were born from Jan. 1, 1944 through Dec. 31, 1950—ages 19 through 25.

Thus if No. 300 is the first number drawn, then all men whose birthdays fall on the 300th day of the year—Oct. 26—will be first to be called for induction. If No. 5 is the second drawn, all men whose birthday is Jan. 5 would be next to be drafted.

Because of the total number of men in the draft pool, it is likely that men whose birthdays are not drawn in the first half of the listing will escape service.

The order of induction established tomorrow night will be valid for one year. The next drawing will be held around Dec. 1, 1970.

Next year, however, after Dec. 1, 1970, only the 19-year-olds or those who become 19 during the year will be placed in the eligible pool, where they will remain for one year only.

College deferments for undergraduate work will still be granted, but when a deferment is ended by dropout or graduation, the deferred student—regardless of age—will enter the 19-year-old eligible group for one year.

When the drawing by calendar days is completed tomorrow night, officials will stage a second drawing from a scrambled list of the 26 letters of the alphabet.

The alphabet sequence thus established will be used by local boards to determine the order of induction within the list of those men having the same birthday. If the first calendar day drawn is 366, and the first letter drawn is B, then the first men to be drafted will be those whose names begin with B who were born on Dec. 31.

Draft boards will then use the first letter of the last name of the inductee at first. But where there is duplication, the boards will then go to the first letter of the first name.

Local boards will continue to register, classify, and defer men at the age of 18. Each month, the boards will notify the state board of the number of men examined and qualified as 1–A, and this total will then be submitted to the national headquarters.

When the Defense Department submits a monthly call to Selective Service headquarters, this request is pro-rated to the states, which in turn pro-rate the quotas to local boards. The national headquarters allows credit to the states for men in service in assigning quotas and, similarly, state boards make such an allowance in fixing quotas for local boards.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 30, 1969]

DRAFT: NOW THE LOTTERY BUT IS IT ENOUGH?

(By Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY)

WASHINGTON.—On Tuesday the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence urged the adoption of broad draft reforms to help "reduce the tensions and frustrations that now lead some young men" to violence. The draft, the commission statement said, is "a significant focal point of dissent" and "symbolizes the inflexibility of our institutions."

On Wednesday, President Nixon took two important steps towards draft reform:

(1) He signed into law a one-sentence bill giving him the authority to establish any sequence he desires for inducting young men into the armed forces; and

(2) He issued an executive order establishing a lottery to determine this sequence, and limiting exposure to the draft to one year (instead of seven years as under the present system).

And tomorrow, the Selective Service System will actually conduct the lottery. It will be the nation's first lottery since World War I, and will determine the order in which 250,000 young men in 1970 will receive Uncle Sam's "greetings."

The lottery is an important reform. It sets up an objective procedure for choosing some few men to be inducted, from among a large group of men all equally eligible. The Department of Defense estimates that 850,000 men will be eligible in 1970, but that it will need to draft only 250,000, or 29 per cent. Since the lottery is inherently objective, it will choose this 29 per cent without regard to race, income, connections or education.

But nearly two million young men turn 19 each year. Why is it that only 850,000 are eligible? First, only 63 per cent of this nearly two million will be able to pass the medical, mental and moral tests. In other words, 32 per cent of our annual crop of 19-year-olds simply do not qualify for military service even if they volunteer. (It is interesting to note that 66 per cent of Negro draftees in Mississippi failed these tests, and 65 per cent in New Jersey and 69 per cent in Oregon; the comparable figures for whites are 40 per cent; 44 per cent; and 44 per cent.)

Thus some 1.4 million men will theoretically be eligible in 1970, from which to choose the necessary 250,000. But for those affluent or clever enough, or well enough advised, to win them, there are deferments—for college, for occupation, for fatherhood, for agriculture, for hardship and so on. Deferments are good insulation against the draft, and one deferment can often be parlayed into another to become a virtual exemption. If only 850,000 are eligible for the draft next year, instead of 1.4 million, it is principally because of the various deferments.

Yet there are no uniform guidelines for most deferments. Instead, each of the nearly 4,100 local boards uses its own interpretation of "community needs" to decide which boys are deferred and which are drafted. Furthermore, if a boy is not rich and clever, there is no due process protection of his interests in the decision-making of the Selective Service System.

Consequently, those who favor a reformed draft urge that these further steps be taken:

Eliminate occupational deferments. The National Security Council and the previous Secretary of Labor have both said there was no national interest requirement in continuing them.

Establish uniform guidelines. Since local boards have virtually no substantive guidelines for their decisions, it is not surprising that variability between the boards is the rule rather than the exception.

Provide due process. The protections so much a part of a democratic society—personal appearance, written opinion, right to counsel, right to call witnesses—are simply unavailable in an appeal of a local board decision. This is shocking and must be reversed.

There are other important reforms many feel are badly needed—streamlining the structure of the draft system, naming members of local boards under 30 years of age, and bringing an end to college deferments in times of war.

There is also the problem of closing the loophole opened by the President's executive order. Under its provisions, a young man with a deferment can choose which year to terminate the deferment and enter the draft pool. He will, in all likelihood, choose a year in which the lottery has made the odds strongly against his being called. Because he can choose which year to terminate his deferment, he can beat the draft, but not everyone can win a deferment.

It would be comfortable if there were no draft, and the manpower needs of the armed forces were met through voluntary enlistments. It is entirely possible, furthermore, to construct a system after Vietnam in which draftees are not necessary, and manpower needs are filled by volunteers.

But there are a number of grave questions about an all-volunteer army.

Would it be an army of professional mercenaries, as such armies are called in other countries?

Would it be all-black and all-poor, as the army induced volunteers through higher pay, and as re-enlistment statistics suggest?

Would it cost from $4- to $17-billion additional each year, as Defense Department studies indicate, and is it worth that allocation of our scarce resources?

Would it act as a stimulus to undertake foreign military adventures, as its leadership cadre sought to give effect to its military training and experience?

Would we lose an important constraint on foreign policy decisions because civilians would not then have to run the risk of involvement in limited military efforts?

Would it widen the gulf between the civilian and the military, as it lost the leaven of being a citizen's army?

And ultimately, how would such an army react in Songmy? How would it react *after* Songmy?

The draft is important not only because it collides with the life of every young man in this country. It is important not only because one out of every three army deaths in Vietnam is a draftee. Its ultimate importance lies in its compulsory nature, which is an abridgement of the traditional democratic freedoms.

If a democracy's citizens are convinced such an abridgement is necessary, then they will tolerate it if it is equitable. But when its necessity rests on an unpopular war, and when it is unfair and discriminatory in application, then it is almost surprising the nation has not seen a repetition of the draft riots which paralyzed New York City for three days just over 100 years ago.

Or have we?

HOW IT WILL WORK

When the Selective Service System conducts its lottery tomorrow, it will pick in random sequence both the days of the year and the letters of the alphabet.

The list it publishes for the days of the year will no longer run straight through Jan. 1 to Dec. 31. Instead the 365 days will appear in random sequence. Similarly, the alphabet will not appear from A to Z, but will also be in random sequence.

These two sequences will determine the order in which eligible men are inducted until the draft requirements for the year are filled. Thus those far down on the list are unlikely to be called at all. If two men from the same local draftboard have the same birthday, but only one is needed, then the random alphabetical sequence controls, calling up the one whose first letter of his last name is listed higher.

Through 1970, the eligible men aged 19 through 25 will be subject to the lottery. Beginning in 1971, only 19-year-olds will be subject to the lottery, plus those whose deferments have expired. Eligibility is limited to one twelve-month period.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 1, 1969]

NEW DRAFT LOTTERY TO START MONDAY

(By George Lardner Jr.)

The shiny plastic capsules look like little containers full of charms that used to sell for a nickel in candy store coin machines.

For some, they promise civilian clothes for life. For others, they mean duty in Vietnam; for still others, a year-long guessing game.

The military draft is going back to the

"fishbowl" lotteries reminiscent of World War I and World War II.

The lottery will start Monday night when 366 blue capsules are dumped into a big glass bowl at the Selective Service System's national headquarters here.

Each will contain a gummed sticker with a date on it, including a Feb. 29 slip for leap year. One by one, they will be plucked out for posting—in the order drawn—on a light blue tote board.

The Nixon administration calls it "the Random Selection sequence" and it has been designed to reduce the period of uncertainty about the draft from seven years to a single year.

The drawing itself will be simple enough. Officials expect it to take only two hours. But the picking order that it establishes can be complicated. In fact, it does not appear to have been entirely settled.

The first steps, however, are clear enough. The dates represent birthdays, and Monday night's lottery will affect some 850,000 young men in the 19-to-26 age group.

Under the new setup, the drawing should determine approximately when they can expect their induction notices, if at all.

If March 3, for example, is the first date drawn, draft-age youth born on that day will be called up first.

Should a local draft board have more than enough men to fill its quota, the lottery will again decide which ones are to be drafted. Once the glass bowl is empty of dates, another 26 capsules—each with a letter of the alphabet—will be dropped into it, stirred with an old butter paddle, and drawn out.

If the first letter is, say, "D," the local draft board's John Doe with a March 3 birthday will be at the top of his draft board's call list for the year 1970.

He may not be called, though, because of a deferment—for college or some other reason. But if the deferment expires before his 26th birthday, he will still be subject to the draft—during the year he becomes 1–A again—before anyone else at his local board because of his ranking in the lottery drawing during his first year of eligibility.

So it will go down the line—birthday by birthday, letter by letter. Those born on the last date scooped out of the glass bowl won't be called unless military requirements rise astronomically over next year's expected draft of 250,000 men.

WAITING IT OUT

But suppose March 3 is pulled out when the bowl is half empty. It is assigned No. 183 on the call list. Without a deferment, all John Doe can do is wait it out for the year and see what happens.

If he gets through the year without a notice from his draft board, he can probably forget about military service. For 1970, his chances are about even. Officials suggest that current draft needs should be exhausted when they get about halfway down the call list.

Monday's drawing, according to one reported breakdown, will fix the order of call for some 400,000 young men who turned 19 this year; another 250,000 between 20 and 26 who have no deferments, and about 200,000 in the same age bracket who do have deferments.

NEW LOTTERY EACH YEAR

After this, the administration plans to hold a new lottery each year for those who turned 19 the year before. Their so-called "priority" exposure to the draft (an unforeseen war could change it all) will last for a year, and no longer, unless they put it off with a deferment.

Each lottery, of course, will establish a fresh priority list of birthdays for that year's draft calls. Those who become 19 during 1970 will get their number in a drawing next fall. Local boards will put primary reliance on that for draft calls in 1971 when 19-year-olds are to be inducted first.

This is where some of the complications come in. Say Aug. 10 is the first date drawn at the lottery for 1971. What happens to those with March 3 birthdays, fixed as No. 1 in the first drawing, whose deferments expire in 1971? Selective Service boards across the country could wind up with an escalating number of No. 1 dates, No. 2 dates, and so forth.

"That's one of the things we are going to have to get straightened out," Capt. William S. Pascoe, Selective Service information chief, said yesterday. "It's a good question. I'm going to write the General (Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey) a note about it."

OTHER ISSUES UNSETTLED

Other issues remain unsettled, too. According to an Associated Press dispatch, quoting White House staff expert Peter Flanigan, a draft-age youth with a college or occupational deferment could wait until the waning months of a calendar year when it is apparent his number will not come up.

The youngster could then drop out of school or quit his job, and end his draft liability within a month or two, Flanigan acknowledged.

But Selective Service officials apparently disagree, contending that the "exposure" is supposed to last a full 12 months, no matter when it starts. "That's another thing we're going to have to get straightened out," Pascoe said.

The problems, however, appear to lie primarily in the years ahead rather than Monday's lottery for 1970. Local draft boards will start calling men by the list it sets Jan. 1.

Should those with top-priority birthdays be passed by in January's call because their local board has more than enough men on the list, they will still be subject to the quotas in the months ahead—until the year is done, Pascoe said.

The drawing itself will be done entirely by young men and women representing the Selective Service Youth Advisory Groups recently organized at President Nixon's behest.

The Illinois contingent, however, is reportedly boycotting the lottery and urging their counterparts in other states and draft regions, such as the District of Columbia, to follow suit.

The 13-member Illinois youth committee was said to feel that Mr. Nixon was trying to compromise their status as gadflies for a better system.

TRADITION STARTED IN 1917

Earlier draft lotteries were launched by high government officials. Secretary of War Newton D. Baker started the tradition in 1917 when he was led blindfolded to a glass container in the old Senate Office Building to pick the first of thousands of draftees for World War I.

The drawing took longer, but it was more clearcut. Officials and some chosen students, simply plucked out gelatin capsules containing the individual draft numbers of men who had just been registered with their local boards.

Two more drawings were held before the war came to an end and the ceremonial bowl was shipped to Independence Hall in Philadelphia until it was called back for another tour of duty.

That began in 1940 with the first peacetime draft in the nation's history. President Franklin D. Roosevelt looked on as Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson hauled out the first number on the stage of the Labor Department's big auditorium.

Two more "fishbowl" drawings were held, in 1941 and again in 1942, before the manpower demands of World War II became so great that the lottery was abandoned.

President Nixon ordered it back into vogue last Wednesday when he signed the law authorizing it and set the stage for Monday's production. It may be the only one that could result in duty in Vietnam for those at the top of the list. Some experts have predicted that drafted men would not be sent there after next year.

As a general rule of thumb, it is estimated that those whose birthdays are among the first third to be drawn will definitely be drafted, those in the next third have "an average probability" of being called, and those in the final third, a low probability.

Gen. Hershey, the controversial, 76-year-old draft director who will be leaving the post in February, ordered a new glass bowl for the occasion. Two feet tall and 16 inches in diameter, it looks like a water cooler without a top. The old "fishbowl" will sit outside in the glass case that now houses it at the Selective Service building here.

Hershey, a spokesman said, didn't want to use it again because it was a symbol of the past.

"The old one was used at the start of wars," the aide explained. "We hope this one is going to be used for the end of war."

[From the New York Times, Dec. 1, 1969]

DRAWING TONIGHT WILL DETERMINE WHO IS DRAFTED

First Lottery Since '42 Set for 8 P.M. in Washington—Affects Calls in '70—Induction by Chance—Men Between 19 and 26 to Be Chosen or Spared by Luck of Their Birthday

(By David E. Rosenbaum)

WASHINGTON, November 30.—A chance drawing tomorrow night will determine which young men of hundreds of thousands will be drafted into military service and which, by luck of birthday, will be left free to work, study and lead uninterrupted civilian lives.

When the lottery is completed late tomorrow night, every man between the ages of 19 and 26 will have a general, though not precise, idea of whether or not he will be drafted.

The lottery, the first since 1942, will begin at 8 P.M. in the small auditorium of the Selective Service System's national headquarters at 1724 F Street in Washington.

On a table at the front of the room will sit a cylindrical glass bowl—looking something like a water-cooler—containing 366 capsules. In each capsule will be a piece of sticky paper with a date written on it.

DATES TO BE POSTED

As the capsules are drawn, the dates will be removed and posted on a board in the order in which they are picked next to a series of numbers ranging from 1 to 366 Potential draftees will be chosen, starting in January, in the order in which their birthdays were drawn.

As an example, if the first date drawn is March 20, every man between 19 and 26 whose birthday is March 20 will be given No. 1, and each draft board will choose all men with No. 1 (who are not deferred or exempt from the draft) before it chooses a man with No. 2.

Administration officials say that, as a general rule for the first lottery, men drawing the lowest third of the numbers—roughly 1 through 122—can be certain that they will be drafted. Men drawing the highest third of the numbers—roughly 244 through 366—can be assured that they will be passed by. For those in the middle, there will be a year of uncertainty.

In addition to the drawing of the 366 dates, the 26 letters of the alphabet will be chosen at random to determine the order of call within a given birthday.

The lottery does not affect deferments or exemptions at all. A man who now has a deferment—because he is a student, because he has a critical occupation, or whatever—can retain his deferment. But he will be assigned a number in tomorrow's lottery, and the number he gets will stay with him. When his deferment lapses, his draft board will be required to select him before it takes a man with a higher number.

SECOND LOTTERY NEXT FALL

Next fall, the birthdays will be reshuffled, and there will be another lottery for 1971. Next year's drawing will affect only men whose 19th birthday is in 1970—in other words, only men born in 1951.

Tomorrow's lottery affects every man born between Jan. 1, 1944, and Dec. 31, 1950. The Government estimates there are 850,000 of these men who are not deferred or exempt from the draft. About 250,000 will be drafted next year. The rest will be free from the draft forever, unless there is a national emergency, or if the law is changed to affect them, which is unlikely.

Tomorrow night, the capsules will be drawn by more than 50 representatives of the Selective Service System's Youth Advisory Councils. At the urging of President Nixon, Selective Service set up the councils this year in each state and territory. The councils consist of youths of draft age. Officials expect the lottery to be finished within two hours.

Officials of the television and radio networks said today that they would not decide until tomorrow how much, if any, of the drawing would be broadcast. A spokesman for the Columbia Broadcasting System said the tentative plans were to break into regular television programs with short announcements on the progress of the lottery.

HOW DEFERMENTS WORK

To show how deferments work under the lottery system, take, for example, the case of John Doe, a college undergraduate with a student deferment and Sept. 12 as a birthday.

If Sept. 12 is the 100th number drawn tomorrow night, John Doe will be assigned No. 100. As long as he retains his deferment—it cannot be done past the age of 24 under the current law affecting student deferments—he will not be drafted, even though all eligible men with No. 100 are taken.

Men in future lotteries with Sept. 12 as a birthday will be assigned another number, maybe higher or maybe lower than 100. But this makes no difference to John Doe. He will always have No. 100, and, in whichever year his deferment lapses, he will be considered with all other men with No. 100.

If John Doe loses his deferment in the middle of the year, it still makes no difference, for in the next draft call after he loses the deferment, his draft board will take him if No. 100 has been reached or passed and not draft him if No. 100 has not been reached in the sequences.

It will still be possible, however, for a man to keep a job deferment—many young men receive them for teaching—until his 26th birthday and avoid the draft entirely.

A POSSIBLE LOOPHOLE

A possible loophole that arises has been discussed in depth within the Government in recent days. A man with a borderline number—one that might be reached in some years and not in others, depending on the size of draft calls—could retain his deferment until late in the year.

If it appears, say in October, that his number was going to be reached, he would retain his deferment and hope that the number was not reached in a subsequent year. If, the next year, it appeared late in the year that his number was not going to be called, he could give up his student or job deferment and enter the draft pool. If the number was not called, he would be free.

Government experts believe, however, that this is really not a loophole. They feel, first of all, that it could only affect a very small number of men, those who had numbers that were likely to be called in some years and not in others.

Secondly, they say, it often takes several months for a draft board to process a man's request that his deferment be dropped and that he be reclassified. By the time it became apparent that his number was not going to be called in a given year, it would probably be too late in the year for him to enter the draftable pool.

If the lottery system of chance seems unfair, it is generally agreed that the random system is more equitable than the old system. Its primary advantage is that it limits to one year the period in which a person is liable to be drafted and it makes that year the one in which his 20th birthday occurs, a time when most men are not set in their careers. If a person wishes, through deferments, to shift his year of liability to a later year, it is by his own choice.

Under the old method, men were susceptible to the draft up to the age of 26, with the oldest men drafted first. Since, in theory, every man at some point became the oldest 25-year-old, every man without a deferment or an exemption was likely to be drafted. Frequently, he was not called until he approached his 26th birthday, a time when his career could be seriously interrupted. And the period of uncertainty lasted for seven years, from his 19th birthday to his 26th.

The National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, appointed by President Johnson in 1966 and headed by Burke G. Marshall, an Assistant Attorney General in the Kennedy Administration, strongly recommended a random selection system. President Johnson endorsed the lottery system in a message to Congress in 1967.

Congress, especially the House Armed Services Committee, was cool to the lottery proposal, however. The main argument was that it would hurt officer procurement. In other words, if a person survived the lottery when he was 19, he would be unlikely to be interested in becoming an officer when he left college.

KENNEDY IN VANGUARD

To keep President Johnson from instituting the lottery by executive action, Congress included in the 1967 draft extension bill a sentence that prohibited the President from establishing a random system without prior Congressional approval.

But pressure for the lottery continued. The drive was led in Congress by Senator Edward M. Kennedy, Democrat of Massachusetts. Gradually, the military decided that a lottery would not severely damage officer programs, and the military saw an advantage in drafting 19- and 20-year-old men, rather than older men whom it considers more difficult to train.

During his election campaign, President Nixon repeatedly advocated an all-volunteer army. Observing that the needs of the Vietnam war made the draft a necessity, he proposed major draft reform legislation—including a lottery—early in his administration.

APPEAL BY NIXON

Since the over-all reform bill was going nowhere in the Armed Services Committees, Mr. Nixon asked Congress in September to pass a bill that would remove the prohibition against the establishment of a lottery on his own.

While there was general support of this legislation from Senator John C. Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, and Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat of South Carolina, who are chairmen of the two Armed Services Committees, supporters of a wider reform opposed the new bill. Led by Senator Kennedy, they argued that passage of the lottery this year would preclude substantial reforms of the system next year.

A turning point came early this month when Kingman Brewster, Jr., the president of Yale University, testified before the Senate committee. He said: "I think this bright, cynical generation of students is not going to appreciate the fact that the opportunity for meaningful reform fell by the wayside because of a desire to do more than could be realistically done this session."

Senator Kennedy was apparently convinced. He obtained an agreement from Senator Stennis to hold extensive draft hearings next year, and the bill easily passed the House and Senate. President Nixon signed the legislation last Wednesday and issued an executive order implementing the lottery.

A lottery draft system is not something new in American history. In 1917, shortly after the United States entered World War I, draftees were chosen by lot. Again in 1940, through 1942, draftees were chosen by means of a lottery.

In both World War I and World War II, the random selection system was abandoned when military needs became so great that all eligible men were inducted into the service.

[From the Boston Evening Globe, Dec. 1, 1969]

DRAFT LOTTERY BEGINS TONIGHT AT 8; 56 YOUTHS TO DRAW

WASHINGTON.—At 8 p.m. tonight, a young man will step up to a glass jar at Selective Service headquarters, stick his hand down among 366 plastic capsules and draw one out to begin the nation's first draft lottery since the dark days of World War II.

It will be a picture from the history books—like the one showing War Secretary Henry L. Stimson pulling a green capsule from a "fishbowl" in 1940—or the one depicting a blindfolded War Secretary Newton D. Baker reaching into the same fishbowl in 1917.

But there will be an important difference. Tonight's scene, in more or less the same form, will be repeated every year from now on, unless the law is changed or President Nixon fulfills his announced desire for an all-volunteer army.

And the concept of tonight's drawing is unlike all the previous in an attempt to come up with as fair a lottery as has been devised.

There will be 56 youth representatives at the drawing. They will draw, and continue drawing, until all 366 capsules have been opened. Each capsule contains a date of the year, including Feb. 29 even if there is no Feb. 29 in the year's calendar. The dates are placed on a list in the order drawn, and men will be called for induction in the order that the date of their birth falls on that list.

Thus if Feb. 8 is the first date drawn, all men whose birthdates are Feb. 8 will be at the top of the heap for callup during 1970. Those whose birthdates fall in the middle of the list will face uncertainty as to whether they will be called, and those at the bottom will be almost assured they will not be called up.

Those affected by tonight's drawing are all nondeferred men who will have turned 19 by the end of 1969, up to and including all who will still be aged 25 when the year ends. Those who turn 19 or lose deferment by, for example, graduating from college, at any time during 1970, will have to wait for the lottery at the end of that year to enter the pool.

From 1971 onward, the lottery pool will include only those who turned 19 the year before, or those whose deferments have been removed.

Although the change in selection is a new one, the draft is an old practice in the United States. In colonial times villages were authorized to force men of the towns to train for defense against the Indians. And the first Federal draft, imposed by President Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War, produced riots among the poor because the rich were allowed to buy their way out.

World War I brought the first national draft system, with each man from the ages of 21 to 30 assigned a draft number. It was from among 10,500 such numbers that the blindfolded Baker pulled the first one, No. 258.

A similar assigned number system was used when Stimson reached into the jar on Oct. 29, 1940, and pulled out No. 158. That drawing lasted 17 hours and was followed by two others, the last one on March 7, 1942.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 1, 1969]

DRAFT LOTTERY: AREA'S ELIGIBLE MEN PONDER THEIR FUTURE

(By B. D. Colen)

For 850,000 young American males, 8 p.m. tonight is the hour of decision.

At that hour, their weeks, months, and for some, years of indecision about and evasion of the Selective Service System will come to a head.

Tonight is the night when, one by one, 366 clear plastic capsules, each containing a slip of paper with a date on it, will be drawn from a large glass jar. The order in which the dates are drawn will determine a young man's chances of being drafted during his years of eligibility. Those whose birthdays are drawn first will be first eligible.

For Robert Gill, a 21-year-old George Washington University senior, tonight presents special problems. He has a student deferment from his Lyons, Kansas, draft board, but he is considering enlisting in the Army. His luck in the draw tonight may help him make up his mind.

"I'm still thinking about enlisting," he said as he sat studying yesterday afternoon in the GW library reading room. "I'd like to get into a program like the Army foreign language school."

Gill is opposed to the war in Vietnam and marched during the Oct. 15 Moratorium but he doesn't agree with those who say "that all war is bad or the military per se is evil." The draft lottery, he said, "is quite a bit better than the old system," because it lets a person know where he stands.

Tom Costello, a 21-year-old waiter at Apple Pie, a Georgetown restaurant, was sitting in a Wisconsin Avenue bar yesterday afternoon talking to friends.

A Georgetown University graduate with a 1-A draft classification, Costello said he was "evading the draft" when asked what he does for a living. "I've put my physical off four times," he said. "I applied for a job with the D.C. police as a deferment, but I made the mistake of telling them that I smoked grass once. I shouldn't have been so honest."

Though the drawing means a great deal to him, the dark-haired young man was unaware of the fact that the drawing is taking place tonight. "They pick them tomorrow?" he asked, his face registering surprise. "I feel much better now. My problems might be solved tomorrow. But of course they might be multiplied."

Mike Ester, a GW senior whose deferment from his Alameda County, Calif., draft board expires in June, discussed the new lottery system as he stood with a friend, Sandra Altman, in front of the reserve desk in GW's library.

"I'm a big fan of the lottery," he said with a smile. "It's almost like a quiz show. It's different." Ester said he wasn't particularly nervous about tonight's event. His future, he said, "is up for grabs, but it (the lottery) gives you a certain amount of time to play with. There's a degree of certainty."

But Ester is not completely happy with the lottery system. It is comparable, he said, to the lottery described by Shirley Jackson in her short story of the same name. In "The Lottery," villagers drew lots each year to see which one of their fellows they would stone to death as a sacrifice.

Sandra Altman, Ester's friend, called the draft lottery "freaky It's this whole probability thing," she said. "It can determine your life or death."

But Ester was thinking about the outcome. And that outcome, he said, may involve a move to Canada.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 2, 1969]

LUCK-OF-THE-DRAW DRAFT PLAN BEGINS; 2 WEEKS TO SET UP NEW PLAN HERE

(By Matthew V. Storin)

WASHINGTON.—The nation initiated its new draft lottery last night which determined that young men born on Sept. 14 in the years 1944 through 1950 will be the first called to military service next year.

Rep. Alexander Pirnie (R-New York) reached into a huge glass beaker and drew the first birthdate in a ceremony at Selective Service Headquarters here.

The new system, established by Congressional action and a presidential order this year, is designed to draft 19-year-olds first. The present system first takes the oldest available men below age 26.

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, who will leave his post next February, presided over the ceremony in a small conference room jammed with newsmen, cameras, microphones and Selective Service employees.

After the selection of the first birthdate, subsequent dates were drawn to determine the priority for drafting all eligible young men between the ages of 19 and 26 in 1970.

The event was not without the protest that has marked the history of military conscription in this country.

Fourteen members of the Youth Advisory Committee signed a statement expressing "deep concern" over handling of the drawing.

Larry McKibben of Iowa, held up the proceedings to read the statement, which protested the "total exclusion of two individuals who did not wish to actually draw numbers." The delegates from Michigan and Alaska were not among the advisory members who drew.

Rep. Pirnie was chosen to draw the first birthdate because he is senior Republican member of a House subcommittee on the draft. He had not been listed on the program for the ceremony and his appearance was a surprise to some middle-echelon Selective Service officials.

The glass beaker, which rested upon a small stool from one of the filing rooms in the headquarters, contained 366 blue plastic capsules. Each capsule enclosed a date, including Feb. 29 for leap years.

Those born within the first third of the birthdates drawn last night will almost certainly be called to the service in 1970.

If an individual qualifies for a temporary deferment he will be liable to the draft when the deferment ends. He will retain the priority number which was drawn for his birthdate last night.

Young people who will not become 19 until 1971, however, will have their draft status determined by another draw next year.

Those whose birthdates were in the middle third drawn last night, will retain some chance of being called, depending on the available manpower within their own draft boards, officials said.

Those drawn in the last third can be reasonably sure they will not be called. Under the new system, if a man is not called in his first year of eligibility, his name goes to the bottom of the Selective Service, where it would only be called up in times of national emergency.

The order of call for eligible men having the same birthdate was determined by a drawing of the alphabet last night.

The ceremony began at 8:02 p.m. after Gen. Hershey asked for silence in the crowded room. After a brief invocation by Marine Col. Robert H. Rankin, Gen. Hershey introduced Pirnie. Without saying a word, the lawmaker from Utica, N.Y., reached in for the first blue capsule.

There were no smiles from the participants. Col. Daniel O. Omer called out the results, "Sept. 14."

The draw proceeded rapidly thereafter. The remainder of the dates were drawn by 51 members of the Youth Advisory Committee from throughout the nation.

Massachusetts was represented by Lawrence DiCara, 20, a junior at Harvard. He was the 38th member of the committee to draw. It was likely that those having the birthdates drawn by DiCara would not be called. Before the ceremony, DiCara said: "It makes me feel good that I'm drawing near the end."

But the Dorchester resident said he was not particularly anxious about the drawing because, "the numbers are going to be picked anyway, whether I do it or not."

The representatives of Michigan and Alaska were said by fellow advisory members to have refused to participate after arriving here earlier Monday. The two youths who were not identified by Selective Service officials, reportedly had not been aware of the role they would play in the lottery.

DiCara said some of the participants were concerned that their "hands would be dirty" after drawing capsules that would decide the futures of hundreds of thousands of fellow young people.

The Massachusetts representative said he is against the war in Vietnam and would like to see the pace of troop withdrawals speeded up.

"But I was brought up to believe that when you agree to do something, then you go ahead and do it," DiCara said.

DiCara's birthdate, Apr. 30, was the 208th drawn, which left him likely to be called when his student deferment expires.

When David L. Fowler of Washington came to the lottery beaker to draw his capsules, he said he could not take part and walked on.

John R. Lyne of Kentucky flashed the "V" sign for peace as he drew each of his capsules.

THE LIST: ORDER OF DATES CHOSEN IN LOTTERY

Here's how you stand in the draft for 1970.

Find the date of your birth. Look at the number beside it. That's your position in the draft call.

A number from 1 to 122 means you'll probably be called. A number from 123 to 244 means you may or may not be called. A number from 245 to 366 means you are unlikely to be called.

January 1	305th
January 2	159th
January 3	251st
January 4	215th
January 5	101st
January 6	224th
January 7	306th
January 8	199th
January 9	194th
January 10	325th
January 11	329th
January 12	221st
January 13	318th
January 14	238th
January 15	17th
January 16	121st
January 17	235th
January 18	140th
January 19	58th
January 20	280th
January 21	186th
January 22	337th
January 23	118th
January 24	59th
January 25	52d
January 26	92d
January 27	355th
January 28	77th
January 29	349th
January 30	164th
January 31	211th
February 1	86th
February 2	144th
February 3	297th
February 4	210th
February 5	214th
February 6	347th
February 7	91st

February 8	181st	May 8	321st	August 7	168th
February 9	338th	May 9	197th	August 8	48th
February 10	216th	May 10	65th	August 9	106th
February 11	150th	May 11	37th	August 10	21st
February 12	68th	May 12	133d	August 11	324th
February 13	152d	May 13	295th	August 12	142d
February 14	4th	May 14	178th	August 13	307th
February 15	89th	May 15	130th	August 14	198th
February 16	212th	May 16	55th	August 15	102d
February 17	189th	May 17	112th	August 16	44th
February 18	292d	May 18	278th	August 17	154th
February 19	25th	May 19	75th	August 18	141st
February 20	302d	May 20	183d	August 19	311th
February 21	363d	May 21	250th	August 20	344th
February 22	290th	May 22	326th	August 21	291st
February 23	57th	May 23	319th	August 22	339th
February 24	236th	May 24	31st	August 23	116th
February 25	179th	May 25	361st	August 24	36th
February 26	365th	May 26	357th	August 25	286th
February 27	205th	May 27	296th	August 26	245th
February 28	299th	May 28	308th	August 27	352d
February 29	285th	May 29	226th	August 28	67th
March 1	108th	May 30	103d	August 29	61st
March 2	29th	May 31	313th	August 30	333d
March 3	267th	June 1	249th	August 31	11th
March 4	275th	June 2	228th	September 1	225th
March 5	293d	June 3	301st	September 2	161st
March 6	139th	June 4	20th	September 3	49th
March 7	122d	June 5	28th	September 4	232d
March 8	213th	June 6	110th	September 5	82d
March 9	317th	June 7	85th	September 6	6th
March 10	323d	June 8	366th	September 7	8th
March 11	136th	June 9	335th	September 8	184th
March 12	300th	June 10	206th	September 9	263d
March 13	259th	June 11	134th	September 10	71st
March 14	354th	June 12	272d	September 11	158th
March 15	169th	June 13	69th	September 12	242d
March 16	166th	June 14	356th	September 13	175th
March 17	33d	June 15	180th	September 14	1st
March 18	332d	June 16	274th	September 15	113th
March 19	200th	June 17	73d	September 16	207th
March 20	239th	June 18	341st	September 17	255th
March 21	334th	June 19	104th	September 18	246th
March 22	265th	June 20	360th	September 19	177th
March 23	256th	June 21	60th	September 20	63d
March 24	258th	June 22	247th	September 21	204th
March 25	343d	June 23	109th	September 22	160th
March 26	170th	June 24	358th	September 23	119th
March 27	268th	June 25	137th	September 24	195th
March 28	223d	June 26	22d	September 25	149th
March 29	362d	June 27	64th	September 26	18th
March 30	217th	June 28	222d	September 27	233d
March 31	30th	June 29	353d	September 28	257th
April 1	32d	June 30	209th	September 29	151st
April 2	271st	July 1	93d	September 30	315th
April 3	83d	July 2	350th	October 1	359th
April 4	81st	July 3	115th	October 2	125th
April 5	269th	July 4	279th	October 3	244th
April 6	253d	July 5	188th	October 4	202d
April 7	147th	July 6	327th	October 5	24th
April 8	312th	July 7	50th	Ocotber 6	87th
April 9	219th	July 8	13th	October 7	234th
April 10	218th	July 9	277th	October 8	283d
April 11	14th	July 10	284th	October 9	342d
April 12	346th	July 11	248th	October 10	220th
April 13	124th	July 12	15th	October 11	237th
April 14	231st	July 13	42d	October 12	72d
April 15	273d	July 14	331st	October 13	138th
April 16	148th	July 15	322d	October 14	294th
April 17	260th	July 16	120th	October 15	171st
April 18	90th	July 17	98th	October 16	254th
April 19	336th	July 18	190th	October 17	288th
April 20	345th	July 19	227th	October 18	5th
April 21	62d	July 20	187th	October 19	241st
April 22	316th	July 21	27th	October 20	192d
April 23	252d	July 22	153d	October 21	243d
April 24	2d	July 23	172d	October 22	117th
April 25	351st	July 24	23d	October 23	201st
April 26	340th	July 25	67th	October 24	196th
April 27	74th	July 26	303d	October 25	176th
April 28	262d	July 27	289th	October 26	7th
April 29	191st	July 28	88th	October 27	246th
April 30	208th	July 29	270th	October 28	94th
May 1	330th	July 30	287th	October 29	229th
May 2	298th	July 31	193d	October 30	38th
May 3	40th	August 1	111th	October 31	79th
May 4	276th	August 2	45th	November 1	19th
May 5	364th	August 3	261st	November 2	34th
May 6	155th	August 4	145th	November 3	348th
May 7	35th	August 5	54th	November 4	266th
		August 6	114th	November 5	310th

November 6	76th
November 7	51st
November 8	97th
November 9	80th
November 10	282d
November 11	46th
November 12	66th
November 13	126th
November 14	127th
November 15	131st
November 16	107th
November 17	143d
November 18	146th
November 19	203d
November 20	185th
November 21	156th
November 22	9th
November 23	182d
November 24	230th
November 25	132d
November 26	309th
November 27	47th
November 28	281st
November 29	99th
November 30	174th
December 1	129th
December 2	328th
December 3	157th
December 4	165th
December 5	56th
December 6	10th
December 7	12th
December 8	105th
December 9	43d
December 10	41st
December 11	39th
December 12	314th
December 13	163d
December 14	26th
December 15	320th
December 16	96th
December 17	304th
December 18	128th
December 19	240th
December 20	135th
December 21	70th
December 22	53d
December 23	162d
December 24	95th
December 25	84th
December 26	173d
December 27	78th
December 28	123d
December 29	16th
December 30	3d
December 31	100th

ORDER OF INITIALS

If two or more men registered with any local draft board have the same birthday, they will be subject to call in an order determined by a second lottery held last night, in which letters of the alphabet were drawn.

Here is the order:

1. J; 2. G; 3. D; 4. X; 5. N; 6. O; 7. Z; 8. T; 9. W.

10. P; 11. Q; 12. Y; 13. U; 14. C; 15. F; 16. I; 17. K; 18. H.

19. S; 20. L; 21. M; 22. A; 23. R; 24. E; 25. B; 26. V.

WHAT YOUR DRAFT CHANCES ARE

WASHINGTON.—The birthday lottery drawing involves you if you were born between Jan. 1, 1944, and Dec. 31, 1950.

If your birthday was drawn in the first 122 numbers and you have no deferment it is almost certain you will be called in 1970.

If your birthday was drawn between number 123 through 244, the odds are 50–50 that you'll receive your draft notice. There are varying factors, such as the quotas assigned to your local board, deferments, and your birthday comes high or low on this middle grouping.

If your birthday is drawn in the bottom third, from 245 through 366, there is small likelihood you will be summoned in the draft and you can probably plan your life and career in the knowledge you will have no military service requirement barring national emergencies.

If you are temporarily deferred because of college, your exempt status continues but the priority level in which your birthday falls in the drawing will be effective for the year in which your exemption expires.

Thus, if you should graduate or drop out of college in 1973, if your birthday was the 15th number drawn in yesterday's lottery, you would be placed in the 15th level of call-ups in 1974 even though a different birthday was drawn 15th for that year.

YOUNG MEN LISTEN—FUTURES IN BOWL

(By William A. Davis)

Not since television took over American living rooms 20 years ago has a radio program had so rapt an audience as last night's "lottery show."

The listeners, mostly males between the ages of 19 and 26, sat frozen to their radios waiting for their birthdays to be called and their numbers to come up.

A Brighton man, Timothy Koster, 20, of Sutherland road, didn't have very long to wait.

His birthdate, Sept. 14, was the first one plucked from the "fishbowl" by Cong. Alexander Pirnie (R-N.Y.) and assigned to the callup number: "001."

A freshman at Boston University's College of Business Administration, Koster says he lacks sufficient credits to receive a student deferment and will be eligible for the draft in January.

"I will refuse induction," he said. "I've been against violence all my life and against war in general." Koster said he had planned to apply for a conscientious objector deferment. "I don't think there is much chance of getting one now," he said last night.

Koster said he had also considered emigrating to Canada but rejected the idea of permanent exile. Told that the average sentence for refusing induction is now two to three years, he said: "Maybe Canada would not be so bad."

Listening to the lottery broadcast with Koster was his older brother, Allan, 22, a senior at BU.

"When they pulled my brother's number—I had to laugh," he said, "anybody who came up number one is a loser."

Allan didn't laugh for long.

His own birthdate, June 27, was the 64th called. Since anyone whose number was in the first third of the 366 called is almost certain to be drafted he expects to be called up when he graduates in June.

"I consider myself just as much of a loser as my brother," the older Koster said, "although I'm not drafted yet."

"My brother is totally non-violent—but I'm not," he said, "I could never morally refuse on the grounds of non-violence like my brother . . . it's a hard decision. I'll really have to think about it."

All around Boston, young men settled down in front of radio when the lottery—which was not televised—began at 8 p.m. (With a prayer by a former Marine Corps chaplain.)

At BU's George Sherman Student Union, knots of students sat in the corridors and listened to the drawing, which was piped over the loudspeaker system by the campus radio station, WBOR.

The earlier numbers provoked groans and cries of "Oh, No"—the later ones gleeful shouts of "Whoopee."

"I guess it beats the election returns," said John Cogar of College Park, Md.

Neal Stillman of Portland, Me., paced up and down as the list of numbers droned on. "I can't listen to this, it make me sick," he said as he walked away—to return seconds later.

"Are you worried?" he was asked. "Damn right I'm worried," he growled.

A Harvard junior, Howe McCarthy of San Francisco, Calif. found out that he has the luckiest birthday of them all, June 8—the very last number called.

McCarthy's interest in the lottery was only curiosity since he's not likely to be drafted. An Army veteran, he spent a year as a first lieutenant with the 9th Infantry Division in Vietnam.

SEGREGATION IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in order to put before the Senate all the facts necessary for full consideration of amendments I intend to offer to the Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill, I present today information relative to the school system of the State of New Jersey.

These facts show there is segregation in the public schools of New Jersey that equals, if not surpasses, segregation in many of the schools that are now under the most demanding orders of HEW and the courts in the South.

I emphasize that if segregation is wrong in the public schools of the South, it is wrong in the public schools of all other States.

This opinion is shared by Mr. Leon Panetta, Director, Office for Civil Rights of HEW.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Committee on April 30—page 1061, House Appropriations Committee hearings, HEW 1970—Mr. Panetta made the following statement:

> I talked with a number of people who feel that the Civil Rights Act only aims at the dual school structure and that it really only aims at the Southern situation. It does not say that and I think it talks in terms of discrimination per se, which can occur anywhere regardless of geographic boundaries.

However, Mr. Panetta also said of civil rights enforcement in northern public schools, "there never really was a northern program until the last year."

I emphasize this, Mr. President, and also point out that even within the last year little, if anything, has been done to effectively remove segregation in the North.

For instance, since the civil rights law was passed as of October 16 of this year, in the North only 46 of 7,015 compliance agreements filed have been given a preliminary check by HEW.

In the South, 2,994 districts have filed form 441 and all have been checked, 100 percent. That is according to the records; that is not an estimate. It is according to the records; 1,107 districts have filed form 441–B outlining a voluntary desegregation plan.

In the North only, six out of 7,015 total districts of the North have been sent letters of noncompliance.

In the South, 568 out of 1,107 school districts of the South have been sent letters of noncompliance.

In the North and West, only one out of 7,015 school districts have been the subject of administrative action by HEW.

The tragedy of this so-called crusade against discrimination on a sectional basis is that it is within itself discrimination against a geographical section of the United States.

It might be claimed that segregation in New Jersey is accidental and not the result of official State and local government action. Such, however, is not the case as it has been made clear by the

Civil Rights Commission and their report on racial isolation, 1967, at page 42.

According to the Civil Rights Commission, the official policy that had the effect of law in the State of New Jersey as late as 1930 was to operate separate but equal schools when, in the judgment of the board of education, it was best to do so.

In New Jersey, separate schools for Negroes were maintained well into the 20th century despite an 1881 statute prohibiting the exclusion of children from schools on the basis of race. In 1923, the State commissioner of education ruled that local school authorities could provide special schools for Negroes in their residential areas, and allow the transfer of white students from these schools to white schools. The ruling was reaffirmed in 1930. As late as 1940, there were at least 70 separate schools for Negroes in New Jersey.

NEW JERSEY

In New Jersey, according to the 1968–69 HEW school survey, there was a total of 1,234,470 students in the elementary and secondary schools. Of this total, 986,448, or 79 percent, of total enrollment were white, 200,117, or 16 percent, were Negro, and the remaining 5 percent was made up of other minority groups.

HEW's IBM data reflects that there are 24 cities or townships in New Jersey which have one or more schools where Negro students make up 80 percent or more of the total school enrollment, and in these 24 school districts are enrolled 78.7 percent of the total Negro student enrollment in the State of New Jersey. In these 24 cities or school districts, there are 162 schools where the Negro student enrollment is 80 to 100 percent. There are 90,966 Negro students, or 45.4 percent of all Negro students in the State of New Jersey, in these 162 schools. There are 87,645—or 43.8 percent—of the Negro students in the State of New Jersey in 115 schools that are 90 to 100 percent segregated, and there are 68,184—or 34 percent of New Jersey's Negro student population—in 83 schools which are 95 to 100 percent segregated.

For example, Atlantic City has a total school enrollment of 8,605 students, of which 5,357, or 62.3 percent are Negro, and 3,064, or 35.6 percent are white. Atlantic City has five schools with a total enrollment of 2,888, which are practically 100 percent Negro, with 2,883 Negro students and five Spanish Americans. In other words, 53.8 percent of Atlantic City's Negro student population are segregated in five all-Negro schools. There are another four schools, with a total enrollment of 1,829, which are majority Negro schools—from 68.3 to 75.7 percent. There are five majority white schools with a total enrollment of 3,888, of which 2,600 are white, which is 84.8 percent of the total white enrollment. In other words, approximately 15 percent of the white students in Atlantic City attend majority Negro schools, 23.3 percent of the total Negro enrollment attend majority white schools. This would appear to be a rather segregated situation.

The Camden, N.J., school district has a total enrollment of 20,236 in 31 schools, of which 11,909, or 58.9 percent are Negro students; 6,420, or 31.7 percent are white; and 1,907, or 9.4 percent come from other minority groups. Two schools with a total enrollment 835 have a total minority group enrollment—765 Negroes, 69 Spanish Americans, and one American Indian. There are another seven schools with a total enrollment of 4,300, of which 3,765 are Negroes, 427 are Spanish Americans, 98 are white students—1.5 percent of the total white student enrollment in Camden—and 10 are Oriental students. These seven schools are made up of 95.3 to 98.5 percent minority enrollment. There are another five schools in the 90–95-percent minority enrollment bracket, which have a total enrollment of 3,831 students, of which 2,806 are Negroes, 750 are Spanish Americans, 269—4.2 percent of total white enrollment—are white, four are Orientals, and two are American Indians. There are eight additional majority Negro schools with a total enrollment of 4,784, 3,575 of which are Negroes, 848 are white—3.2 percent of total white enrollment—359 are Spanish Americans, and two are Orientals in these eight schools.

In total there are 22 Negro majority schools with a total enrollment of 13,750, and 1,215 white students—18.9 percent of total white student enrollment—attend these Negro schools in Camden.

There are nine majority white schools with a total enrollment of 6,486, of which 5,205 are white, 998 are Negroes, 274 are listed as Spanish Americans, and nine are from other minority groups.

Overall, 8.3 percent of the Negro students in Camden attend majority white schools and 91.7 percent attend majority Negro schools. 81.1 percent of the total white students attend schools that are majority white and 18.9 percent attend schools where the minority groups are in the majority.

Newark, N.J., is the largest city in the State. It has a total school enrollment of 75,960 in 80 schools, of which 55,057—or 72.5 percent—are Negro students, 13,716—or 18.1 percent—are white, and 7,187—or 9.4 percent—are made up of other minorities, classified by HEW as Spanish Americans, Orientals, and American Indians.

There are 10 schools with a total enrollment of 10,963, which are 100 percent minority segregated—10,607 Negro students and 356 Spanish American. There are 13 schools with a total enrollment of 21,360 that are 99 to 99.9 percent minority segregated. These 13 schools are made up of 20,577 Negro students, 682 Spanish Americans, 94 whites—0.6 percent of total white enrollment—and seven other minority group students. Accordingly, 31,184, or 56.6 percent of the total Negro enrollment are in 23 schools which are 99 percent and 100 percent segregated. There are an additional 15 schools with a total enrollment of 11,712 which are 95.9 to 98.9 percent minority enrollment. There are 10,262 Negro students and 363 white students—2.6 percent of the total white student enrollment—in these schools. It follows that 41,446, or 75.2 percent of total Negro enrollment are in 38 schools that are 95.9 to 100 percent segregated. There are six schools with an aggregate enrollment of 7,194 which are 91.4 to 94.9 percent segregated, there being 5,385 Negro students and 504 white students—3.6 percent of total white student enrollment—with the balance being made up of other minority group students. There are six schools with a total enrollment of 2,410 in the 80- to 90-percent segregated bracket. There are 361 white students in these six schools, 1,555 Negro students, and 487 Spanish Americans. There is a total enrollment of 12,189 students in the remaining 15 majority Negro schools, ranging between 50.2 percent and 79.2 percent minority enrollment.

In all, 53,583, or 97.3 percent of the total Negro student enrollment are in 65 majority Negro schools.

There are 10 majority white schools with a total enrollment of 9,832, of which 8,111 are white, 1,174 are Negro, 516 are Spanish American, and 31 are Orientals. On the basis of these IBM figures, 2.1 percent of the total Negro student enrollment go to majority white schools and 97.3 percent attend majority Negro schools; 59.1 percent of the total white student enrollment attend majority white schools which are 94.1 percent to 65 percent white.

Trenton, the capital of New Jersey, has a total school enrollment of 16,865, of which 11,143, or 66.1 percent are Negro, 4,881, or 28.9 percent, are white, and 5 percent are made up of other minority groups.

In the Negro majority schools there are two schools with a total enrollment of 1,320 that are 99.5 percent and 98.2 percent minority segregated; three schools with a total enrollment of 2,341 that are 95.2 to 97.5 percent minority segregated; seven schools with a total enrollment of 4,442 that are from 80.3 to 94.9 percent minority segregated; and four schools with a total enrollment of 6,492 that are from 52 to 73.1 percent minority segregated.

In the majority white schools, there are five schools with a total enrollment of 2,270, of which 1,789 are white, 357 are Negro, 122 are Spanish American, and two are from other minority groups. The 357 Negro students attending majority white schools represent 3.2 percent of the total Negro enrollment, and the 1,789 white students attending majority white schools represent 36.7 percent of the total white enrollment, with the balance attending majority black schools.

In New Jersey there are a number of smaller cities or towns which have a predominantly white population but have one or two schools that are 90- to 100-percent Negro. For example, the school district of the township of Union, N.J., has a total public school student population of 8,719, of which 7,718 or 88.5 percent are white and 986 or 11.3 percent are Negro students, yet there is one public school of 390 students which is 94.9-percent Negro. It is my understanding that this is the only school district in New Jersey in which the Department of HEW has conducted a thorough survey and negotiated desegregation, and I think this may demonstrate the timidity with which HEW has approached the business of desegregating schools in the North. It is my further understanding that there were indications of gerrymandering in this district but the HEW, after over a year's investigation and

negotiation, gave the school district permission to desegregate in two steps over a 2-year period.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD information relative to New Jersey.

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

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL

DISTRICT: ATLANTIC CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 14. CITY: ATLANTIC CITY. COUNTY: 1 ATLANTIC COUNTY. ASSURANCE: 441

	Students—							Weight:	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	1.0—grades	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	2	5,357	15	167	5,541	3,064	8,605		0	143	0	0	143	208	351
Percent	0.0	62.3	0.2	1.9	64.4	35.6	100.0		0.0	40.7	0.0	0.0	40.7	59.3	100.0
West side (14)	0	211	0	0	211	0	211	011110000000000 (100.0)	0	7	0	0	7	0	7
New Jersey Avenue School (10).	0	766	0	0	766	0	766	011111110000001 (100.0)	0	23	0	0	23	5	28
Pennsylvania Avenue School (11).	0	235	0	0	235	0	235	011111000000000 (100.0)	0	7	0	0	7	1	8
Indiana Avenue School (7).	0	1,078	0	5	1,083	0	1,083	011111110000001 (100.0)	0	30	0	0	30	6	36
Madison Avenue School (8).	0	593	0	0	593	0	593	011111100000000 (100.0)	0	17	0	0	17	3	20
Central Junior High School (4).	0	414	0	4	418	134	552	000000000100001 (75.7)	0	12	0	0	12	20	32
Chelsea Junior High School (3).	0	356	2	10	368	126	494	000000001000000 (74.5)	0	6	0	0	6	15	21
Massachusetts Avenue School (9).	0	428	0	123	551	191	742	011111110000001 (74.3)	0	10	0	0	10	14	24
Children's Seashore House (5).	0	25	0	3	28	13	41	000000000000001 (68.3)	0	1	0	0	1	5	6
Venice Park School (13).	0	45	0	1	46	71	117	011111110000000 (39.3)	0	1	0	0	1	3	4
Atlantic City High School (1).	2	1,087	6	11	1,106	1,825	2,931	000000000011110 (37.7)	0	22	0	0	22	110	132
Chelsea Heights School (6).	0	30	0	5	35	135	170	011111110000000 (20.6)	0	1	0	0	1	6	7
Brighton Avenue School (2).	0	65	7	5	77	371	448	011111110000001 (17.2)	0	4	0	0	4	12	16
Richmond Avenue School (12).	0	24	0	0	24	198	222	011111110000001 (10.8)	0	2	0	0	2	8	10

DISTRICT: ENGLEWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 8. REPRESENTING: 8. CITY: ENGLEWOOD. COUNTY: 2 BERGEN

Number	1	1,921	12	94	2,028	2,107	4,135		0	44	0	3	47	179	226
Percent	0.0	46.5	0.3	2.3	49.0	51.0	100.0		0.0	19.5	0.0	1.3	20.8	79.2	100.0
Liberty School (5)	0	31	0	0	31	3	34	000001111000000 (91.2)	0	2	0	0	2	4	6
Cleveland (4)	0	274	0	16	290	230	520	011111000000001 (55.8)	0	8	0	0	8	19	27
Engle School (3)	0	164	0	4	168	146	314	000000100000000 (53.5)	0	6	0	0	6	6	12
Englewood Middle School (2).	0	418	4	15	437	389	826	000000011100000 (52.9)	0	8	0	2	10	43	53
Lincoln Early School (6).	0	246	0	15	261	254	515	111110000000001 (50.7)	0	6	0	0	6	13	19
Donald A. Quarles (7)	1	147	1	4	153	172	325	011111000000001 (47.1)	0	3	0	0	3	13	16
Roosevelt Elementary School (8).	0	175	2	7	184	241	425	011111000000001 (43.3)	0	2	0	0	2	15	17
Dwight Morrow High School (1).	0	466	5	33	504	672	1,176	000000000011110 (42.9)	0	9	0	1	10	66	76

DISTRICT: HACKENSACK PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 7. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: HACKENSACK. COUNTY: 2.

Number	9	1,416	20	266	1,711	4,277	5,988		0	17	0	6	23	291	314
Percent	0.2	23.6	0.3	4.4	28.6	71.4	100.0		0.0	5.4	0.0	1.9	7.3	92.7	100.0
Beach Street School (2).	0	202	0	5	207	8	215	111000000000000 (96.3)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
Broadway School (1)	0	190	0	84	274	272	546	111111100000001 (50.2)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29
Hackensack Middle School (6).	0	277	6	71	354	735	1,089	000000011100001 (32.5)	0	7	0	2	9	57	66
Fanny Meyer Hillers (5).	0	166	1	15	182	509	691	111111100000000 (26.3)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Fairmount School (3)	3	205	1	12	221	643	864	111111100000000 (25.6)	0	2	0	0	2	30	32
Jackson Avenue No. 6 (4).	0	31	0	4	35	152	187	111111100000001 (18.7)	0	2	0	0	2	15	17
Hackensack High School (7).	6	345	12	75	438	1,958	2,396	000000000011111 (18.3)	0	4	0	4	8	128	136

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: CAMDEN CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 31. REPRESENTING: 31. CITY: CAMDEN. COUNTY: 4 CAMDEN

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	6	11,909	22	1,879	13,816	6,420	20,236		1	355	3	5	364	477	841
Percent	0.0	58.9	0.1	9.3	68.3	31.7	100.0		0.1	42.2	0.4	0.6	43.3	56.7	100.0
Charles Sumner (27)	0	647	0	1	648	0	648	011111110000001 (100.0)	0	19	0	0	19	6	25
J. S. Read School (24)	1	118	0	68	187	0	187	011110000000000 (100.0)	0	4	1	0	5	2	7
John Greenleaf Whittier (29).	0	646	0	3	649	10	659	011111111100000 (98.5)	0	19	0	0	19	7	26
Powell School (23)	0	280	0	10	290	5	295	011111110000000 (98.3)	0	9	0	0	9	3	12
Parkside Elementary School (22).	0	718	0	0	718	13	731	011111110000000 (98.2)	0	13	0	0	13	11	24
Broadway Elementary School (9).	0	429	6	41	476	9	485	011111110000001 (98.1)	0	15	0	0	15	3	18
Lanning Square School (17).	0	547	0	277	824	20	844	011111110000000 (97.6)	0	21	0	1	22	8	30
Bergen Square Elementary School (7)	0	767	4	91	862	22	884	011111110000000 (97.5)	0	11	0	0	11	20	31
Richard Fetters (16)	0	378	0	5	383	19	402	011111110000000 (95.3)	0	16	0	0	16	2	18
Northeast (21)	0	202	0	113	315	18	333	010111000000001 (94.6)	0	6	0	0	6	6	12
Pyne Poynt Junior High School (5)	0	908	2	316	1,226	73	1,299	000000111110001 (94.4)	0	29	0	1	30	34	64
William J. Sewell (25)	0	257	0	99	356	24	380	010111000000001 (93.7)	0	7	0	0	7	6	13
Cooper B. Hatch Junior High School (4).	2	928	2	13	945	75	1,020	000000111110000 (92.6)	0	19	0	0	19	26	45
Coopers Poynt (13)	0	511	0	209	720	79	799	011111110000001 (90.1)	0	14	0	1	15	16	31
Camden High School (1).	0	1,441	2	91	1,534	177	1,711	000000000011110 (89.7)	0	29	0	1	30	64	94
Lincoln Elementary (18).	0	315	0	11	326	42	368	011111100000000 (88.6)	0	5	0	0	5	7	12
Cooper-Grant School (12).	0	203	0	204	407	55	462	011111110000001 (88.1)	0	11	0	1	12	9	21
Camden Junior Vocational (10).	0	148	0	9	157	30	187	000000000000001 (84.0)	0	10	1	0	11	2	13
H. L. Bonsall (8)	0	565	0	6	571	132	703	011111111100001 (81.2)	0	15	0	0	15	14	29
J. W. Mickle (20)	0	484	0	13	497	143	640	011111111100000 (77.7)	1	12	0	0	13	11	24
H. B. Wilson Elementary School (30).	0	385	0	24	409	242	651	011111110000000 (62.8)	0	9	0	0	9	15	24
Catto Opportunity (11)	0	34	0	1	35	27	62	000000000000001 (56.5)	0	4	0	0	4	4	8
Cramer Elementary School (14).	1	240	1	38	280	468	748	011111110000000 (37.4)	0	9	1	0	10	12	22
Woodrow Wilson High School (2).	0	339	5	88	432	1,076	1,508	000000000011110 (28.6)	0	13	0	0	13	71	84
Thomas H. Dudley (15)	0	84	0	31	115	336	451	011111000000000 (25.5)	0	7	0	0	7	8	15
Washington Elementary (28).	1	50	0	36	87	326	413	011111000000000 (21.1)	0	5	0	0	5	9	14
Davis School (3)	0	129	0	17	146	851	997	011111111100001 (14.6)	0	12	0	0	12	27	39
Francis X McGraw (19)	0	44	0	16	60	386	446	011111110000001 (13.5)	0	2	0	0	2	13	15
Veterans Memorial Junior High School (6).	0	49	0	28	77	627	704	000000111110000 (10.9)	0	5	0	0	5	25	30
Yorkship (31)	1	62	0	9	72	604	676	011111111100001 (10.7)	0	3	0	0	3	21	24
H. C. Sharp (26)	0	1	0	11	12	531	543	011111110000000 (2.2)	0	2	0	0	2	15	17

DISTRICT: VINELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. REPRESENTING: 20. CITY: VINELAND. COUNTY: 6 CUMBERLAND.

Number	3	888	3	1,200	2,094	7,485	9,579		1	20	1	1	23	349	372
Percent	0.0	9.3	0.0	12.5	21.9	78.1	100.0		0.3	5.4	0.3	0.3	6.2	93.8	100.0
Dr. William Mennies (13).	0	28	0	170	198	24	222	011111000000000 (89.2)	0	3	0	0	3	5	8
Maurice Fels School (11).	0	5	0	104	109	14	123	011110000000000 (88.6)	0	0	1	0	1	3	4
Chestnut and West (6)	0	6	0	15	21	11	32	000000000000001 (65.6)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
H. L. Reber (16)	0	142	0	158	300	188	488	011111110000000 (61.5)	0	0	0	0	1	17	18

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: VINELAND CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. REPRESENTING: 20. CITY: VINELAND. COUNTY: 6 CUMBERLAND—Continued

	Students—								Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0—grades	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
South Vineland (17)	0	20	0	29	49	33	82	000000000000001 (59.8)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Spring Road School (18)	0	8	0	7	15	12	27	000000000000001 (55.6)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Max Leuchter (12)	0	54	0	40	94	140	234	011111000000000 (40.2)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Park and East (15)	0	12	0	35	47	77	124	011110000000000 (37.9)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Dr. George Cunningham School (7)	0	35	0	173	208	460	668	011111110000000 (31.1)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
Solve E. D'Ippolito School (8)	0	161	0	76	237	678	915	011111110000000 (25.9)	0	2	0	0	2	28	30
Dr. John H. Winslow Annex (20)	0	1	0	7	8	23	31	000000000000001 (25.8)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Landis Junior High School (2)	0	87	0	159	246	714	960	000000001110001 (25.6)	0	4	0	1	5	40	45
Dane Barse (4)	0	50	0	66	116	620	736	011111110000000 (15.8)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Vineland Senior High School (1)	3	200	3	84	290	1,958	2,248	000000000001111 (12.9)	1	5	0	0	6	101	107
Memorial Junior High School (3)	0	48	0	43	91	944	1,035	000000001110001 (8.8)	0	0	0	0	0	42	42
East Vineland School (9)	0	3	0	7	10	131	141	011110000000000 (7.1)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Oak and Main (14)	0	3	0	5	8	179	187	011111000000000 (4.3)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Edward R. Johnstone School (10)	0	10	0	11	21	512	533	011111110000000 (3.9)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Dr. John H. Winslow Elementary School (19)	0	15	0	11	26	635	661	011111110000000 (3.9)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Butler Avenue (5)	0	0	0	0	0	132	132	011110000000000 (0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

DISTRICT: EAST ORANGE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 14. CITY: EAST ORANGE. COUNTY: 7 ESSEX.

Number	1	8,769	34	65	8,869	2,273	11,142		0	126	4	0	130	412	542
Percent	0.0	78.7	0.3	0.6	79.6	20.4	100.0		0.0	23.2	0.7	0.0	24.0	76.0	100.0
Henry E. Kentopp (7)	0	931	2	5	938	7	945	011110000000000 (99.3)	0	11	0	0	11	19	30
Stockton (11)	0	356	2	1	359	4	363	000001100000000 (98.9)	0	7	0	0	7	8	15
Rutledge Avenue Project (13)	0	74	0	0	74	1	75	000000100000001 (98.7)	0	9	0	0	9	4	13
Lincoln (9)	0	648	0	0	648	16	664	011111110000001 (97.6)	0	12	0	0	12	29	41
Vernon L. Davey Junior High School (2)	0	745	1	2	748	26	774	000000001100000 (96.6)	0	17	1	0	18	20	38
Intermediate School (8)	0	177	0	1	178	7	185	000000001100000 (96.2)	0	5	0	0	5	18	23
Nassau (10)	0	549	0	5	554	37	591	011111110000000 (93.7)	0	4	0	0	4	15	19
Elmwood School (5)	0	784	4	0	788	59	847	011111110000000 (93.0)	0	7	0	0	7	24	31
East Orange High School (1)	0	1,878	8	9	1,895	144	2,039	000000000011111 (92.9)	0	25	1	0	26	99	125
Washington (12)	0	458	1	5	464	77	541	011111110000001 (85.8)	0	5	0	0	5	20	25
Ashland (3)	0	848	2	5	855	172	1,027	011111111100000 (83.3)	0	15	1	0	16	32	48
Columbian (4)	0	803	1	15	819	425	1,244	011111111100000 (65.8)	0	4	0	0	4	41	45
Clifford J. Scott High School (14)	1	259	2	8	270	629	899	000000000011111 (30.0)	0	3	1	0	4	44	48
Franklin (6)	0	259	11	9	279	669	948	011111111100000 (29.4)	0	2	0	0	2	39	41

DISTRICT: ESSEX COUNTY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 5. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: EAST ORANGE. COUNTY: 7 ESSEX. WEIGHT 1.3

Number	0	1,043	2	141	1,186	1,474	2,660	Teachers	0	15	0	0	15	128	143
Percent	0.0	39.2	0.1	5.3	44.6	55.4	100.0	Percent	0.0	10.5	0.0	0.0	10.5	89.5	100.0
Essex County Vocational-Technical High School (3)	0	478	0	43	521	61	582	000000000011111 (89.5)	0	6	0	0	6	30	36
Essex County Adult Technical School (5)	0	25	0	4	29	19	48	000000000000001 (60.4)	0	1	0	0	1	2	3
Essex County Vocational-Technical (Irvington) (4)	0	202	0	34	236	305	541	000000000011110 (43.6)	0	1	0	0	1	29	30

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: ESSEX COUNTY VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 5. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: EAST ORANGE COUNTY: 7 ESSEX. WEIGHT 1.3—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Essex County Vocational-Technical High School (1).	0	290	2	25	317	594	911	000000000011111 (34.8)	0	4	0	0	4	41	45
Essex County Vocational-Technical High School (2).	0	48	0	35	83	495	578	000000000011111 (14.4)	0	3	0	0	3	26	29

DISTRICT: THE MONTCLAIR PULBIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 13. REPRESENTING: 13. CITY: MONTCLAIR. COUNTY: 7 ESSEX

Number	3	2,847	24	3	2,877	5,039	7,916		0	42	0	3	45	320	365
Percent	0.0	36.0	0.3	0.0	36.3	63.7	100.0		0.0	11.5	0.0	0.8	12.3	87.7	100.0
Glenfield (3)	0	538	0	0	538	25	563	111111110000001 (95.6)	0	9	0	0	9	12	21
Nishuane (9)	0	503	4	0	507	208	715	011111110000000 (70.9)	0	2	0	0	2	27	29
Minnie A. Lucey School (7).	0	24	0	0	24	14	38	000000000000001 (63.2)	0	1	0	0	1	3	4
Rand (11)	0	92	1	0	93	145	238	010000110000000 (39.1)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
Montclair High School (5).	3	808	5	1	817	1,450	2,267	000000000011111 (36.0)	0	11	0	2	13	108	121
Hillside (6)	0	335	6	0	341	644	985	011111111100001 (6.34)	0	8	0	1	9	43	52
Grove St. (4)	0	115	0	0	115	235	350	011111110000000 (32.9)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Watchung (13)	0	114	1	0	115	383	498	011111000000000 (23.1)	0	2	0	0	2	17	19
Southwest (12)	0	44	0	0	44	150	194	011111000000000 (22.7)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8
Mt. Hebron (8)	0	191	2	0	193	691	884	0 1111111100000 (21.8)	0	3	0	0	3	38	41
Edgemont (2)	0	76	5	2	83	342	425	011111000000000 (19.5)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16
Bradford (1)	0	5	0	0	5	345	350	011111110000001 (1.4)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Northeast (10)	0	2	0	0	2	407	409	011111110000000 (0.5)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15

DISTRICT: NEWARK NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 80. REPRESENTING: 80. CITY: NEWARK. COUNTY: 7 ESSEX COUNTY

Number	1	54,757	140	7,046	62,244	13,716	75,960		0	1,024	6	12	1,042	2,145	3,187
Percent	0.0	72.5	0.2	9.3	81.9	18.1	100.0		0.0	32.1	0.2	0.4	32.7	67.3	100.0
Morton Street School (49).	0	1,069	0	24	1,093	0	1,093	011111110000001 (100.0)	0	23	0	0	23	17	40
Woodland Avenue (79)	0	75	0	1	76	0	76	000000000000001 (100.0)	0	6	0	0	6	0	6
Central High School (3)	0	1,323	1	48	1,372	0	1,372	000000000011110 (100.0)	0	22	0	1	23	48	71
Waverly Avenue School (66).	0	646	0	15	661	0	661	011111110000000 (100.0)	0	13	0	0	13	10	23
Belmont Runyon School (19).	0	913	0	60	973	0	973	011111000000000 (100.0)	0	15	0	0	15	15	30
Avon Avenues (18)	0	1,276	0	6	1,282	0	1,282	011111110000001 (100.0)	0	13	0	0	13	27	40
Quitman Street School. (54)	0	1,903	0	131	2,034	0	2,034	011111110000000 (100.0)	0	34	0	0	34	32	66
Central Accredited Evening High School. (9)	0	84	0	0	84	0	84	000000000000001 (100.0)	0	2	0	0	2	1	3
Madison (44)	0	1,600	0	30	1,630	0	1,630	011111110000000 (100.0)	0	16	0	0	16	53	69
Bergen Street (20)	0	1,718	0	40	1,758	0	1,758	011111100000000 (100.0)	0	13	0	0	13	38	51
Clinton Place Junior High School. (11)	0	1,551	0	19	1,570	1	1,571	000000001110000 (99.9)	0	32	0	0	32	49	81
Camden Street School. (25)	0	1,459	0	61	1,520	2	1,522	111111110000000 (99.9)	0	37	1	1	39	26	65
7th Avenue Junior High School. (12)	0	712	0	15	727	1	728	000000001110001 (99.9)	0	26	0	0	26	15	41
Cleveland School experimental (29).	0	1,115	0	9	1,124	2	1,126	111111110000000 (99.8)	0	28	0	0	28	13	41
18th Ave (32)	0	1,091	0	5	1,096	2	1,098	011111110000001 (99.8)	0	20	0	0	20	25	45
Newton St. 580 (51)	0	781	4	34	819	2	821	011111111100001 (99.8)	0	11	0	0	11	24	35
Robert Treat School (56).	0	1,150	0	20	1,170	3	1,173	011111111000001 (99.7)	0	35	0	0	35	9	44
Peshine Ave School (53).	0	1,676	0	6	1,682	5	1,687	011110111100001 (99.7)	0	23	0	0	23	34	57

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: NEWARK, NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 80: REPRESENTING: 80. CITY: NEWARK. COUNTY: ESSEX COUNTY—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Hawthorne Ave. School (40).	1	1,360	0	43	1,404	5	1,409	011111111100000 (99.6)	0	16	0	0	16	28	44
West Kinney Junior High (14).	0	1,339	0	55	1,394	5	1,399	000000001110001 (99.6)	0	38	0	0	38	33	71
Miller St. School (48)	0	1,491	0	150	1,641	8	1,649	011111111100000 (99.5)	0	31	1	0	32	43	75
Charlton St. (28)	0	1,209	0	4	1,213	6	1,219	011111111100001 (99.5)	0	26	0	0	26	19	45
Clinton Ave Annex (30)	0	197	0	1	198	1	199	0000010000000000 (99.5)	0	3	0	0	3	7	10
14th Ave School (36)	0	826	0	93	919	5	924	011111111100000 (99.5)	0	0	0	0	0	30	30
South Side High School (5).	0	1,594	0	15	1,609	12	1,621	000000000011110 (99.3)	0	18	0	0	18	68	86
15th Ave School (34)	0	1,580	0	86	1,666	15	1,681	011111101100000 (99.1)	0	12	0	0	12	49	61
Bragaw Ave (21)	0	1,197	2	48	1,247	13	1,260	011111111100001 (99.0)	0	19	0	0	19	30	49
Warren St School (65)	0	549	0	18	567	6	573	011111110000000 (99.0)	0	12	0	0	12	9	21
Wickliffe St (78)	0	84	0	3	87	1	88	0000000000000001 (98.9)	0	2	0	0	2	4	6
S. 10th St School (61)	0	662	0	105	767	10	777	011111100000000 (98.7)	0	17	0	0	17	9	26
South Market St (77)	0	113	1	12	126	2	128	0000000000000001 (98.4)	0	1	0	0	1	3	4
Hudson Street School (41).	0	420	0	19	439	12	451	000000110000000 (97.3)	0	7	0	0	7	9	16
Roseville Avenue (57)	0	385	1	16	402	11	413	011111110000000 (97.3)	0	7	0	0	7	5	12
Burnet Street School (24).	0	638	4	119	761	22	783	001111111100000 (97.2)	0	11	0	1	12	18	30
Montgomery Pre-vocational (75).	0	652	0	36	688	20	708	0000000000000001 (97.2)	0	27	0	0	27	30	57
Central Avenue Elementary School (26).	0	475	0	123	598	18	616	011111111100000 (97.1)	0	13	0	1	14	15	29
South 8th Street (59)	0	1,962	7	52	2,021	61	2,082	011111111100001 (97.1)	0	39	0	0	39	54	93
Sussex Avenue (64)	0	1,018	0	64	1,082	35	1,117	011111111100000 (96.9)	0	16	0	0	16	24	40
Maple Avenue School (45).	0	1,062	0	17	1,079	38	1,117	011001111100000 (96.6)	0	12	0	0	12	24	36
Broadway Elementary (23).	0	584	1	419	1,004	39	1,043	011111110000001 (96.3)	0	7	1	2	10	25	35
Bragaw Avenue Annex (22).	0	222	0	6	228	9	237	000000110000000 (96.2)	0	5	0	0	5	3	8
West Side High School (8).	0	1,520	1	76	1,597	65	1,662	000000000011110 (96.1)	0	18	0	0	18	69	87
Maple Avenue Annex (46).	0	465	0	5	470	20	490	000111000000000 (95.9)	0	3	1	0	4	13	17
Girls Trade School (74).	0	177	0	10	187	10	197	0000000000000001 (94.9)	0	12	0	0	12	3	15
Weequahic High (7)	0	2,192	8	0	2,200	149	2,349	000000000011110 (93.7)	0	29	0	0	29	102	131
Chancellor Avenue School (27).	0	1,225	10	23	1,258	90	1,348	011111111100001 (93.3)	0	12	0	0	12	35	47
South 17th Street School (60).	0	1,069	6	221	1,296	93	1,389	011111110000000 (93.3)	0	10	1	0	11	35	46
South Street School (58).	0	198	4	123	325	28	353	011111000000000 (92.1)	0	8	0	0	8	6	14
McKinley School (47)	0	524	4	896	1,424	1	1,558	011111110000001 (91.4)	0	9	0	0	9	38	47
Boylan Street (70)	0	77	0	12	89	10	99	001111111100001 (89.9)	0	3	0	0	3	9	12
Arlington Avenue (69)	0	70	0	22	92	14	106	000000000000001 (86.8)	0	3	0	0	3	5	8
Dayton Street (31)	0	733	0	416	1,149	182	1,331	011111111100001 (86.3)	0	17	0	0	17	30	47
Education Center for Youth (80).	0	65	0	20	85	15	100	0000000000000001 (85.0)	0	2	0	0	2	5	7
Arts High School (1)	0	573	7	15	595	131	726	000000000011110 (82.0)	0	6	0	0	6	35	41
Alyea Street (68)	0	37	0	2	39	9	48	0000000000000001 (81.3)	0	2	0	0	2	8	10
Abington Avenue School (15).	0	568	0	33	601	158	759	011111111100000 (79.2)	0	4	0	0	4	27	31
Speedway Avenue School (62).	0	163	0	8	171	45	216	011110000000001 (79.2)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
Elliott Street Visually Handicapped (73).	0	30	0	8	38	11	49	0000000000000001 (77.6)	0	3	0	0	3	4	7
South Eleventh Street School (76).	0	154	0	26	180	56	236	0000000000000001 (76.3)	0	9	0	0	9	18	27

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: NEWARK, NEW JERSEY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 80: REPRESENTING: 80. CITY: NEWARK. COUNTY: ESSEX COUNTY—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0— grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Summer Avenue School (63).	0	340	6	453	799	335	1,134	011111110000000 (70.5)	0	3	0	0	3	37	40
Garfield (38)	0	647	2	128	777	360	1,137	011111111100001 (68.3)	0	11	0	0	11	30	41
Franklin (37)	0	377	0	329	706	362	1,068	011111110000001 (66.1)	0	8	0	0	8	33	41
Hawkins Street (39)	0	494	0	204	698	359	1,057	011111111100000 (66.0.	0	13	0	0	13	20	33
Lafayette Street (42)	0	120	16	700	836	436	1,272	011111111100001 (65.7)	0	8	0	0	8	12	40
Broadway Junior High (10).	0	371	4	268	643	382	1,025	000000001110000 (62.7)	0	15	0	0	15	45	60
Barringer High School (2).	0	1,250	9	214	1,473	887	2,360	000000000011110 (62.4)	0	20	0	0	20	123	143
Branch Brook School (71).	0	63	0	16	79	57	136	011111111111110 (58.1)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Bruce Street School (72).	0	43	0	16	59	48	107	111111111100001 (55.1)	0	3	0	0	3	13	16
Oliver Street School (52).	0	394	0	116	510	454	964	011111111100001 (52.9)	0	14	0	0	14	21	35
Webster Junior High School (13).	0	183	11	142	336	333	669	000000001110000 (50.2)	0	7	0	1	8	29	37
Elliott Street (33)	0	57	2	131	190	353	543	011111110000001 (35.0)	0	4	0	0	4	19	23
Ann Street School (17)	0	108	0	146	254	789	1,043	011111111100001 (24.4)	0	5	0	0	5	32	37
East Side High School (4).	0	369	0	102	471	1,510	1,981	000000000011110 (23.8)	0	12	0	5	17	86	103
Mount Vernon (50)	0	170	11	8	189	872	1,061	011111111100001 (17.8)	0	7	0	0	7	29	36
Vailsburg High (6)	0	195	7	28	230	1,190	1,420	000000000011110 (16.2)	0	10	0	0	10	69	79
Wilson Avenue School (67).	0	86	2	25	113	784	897	011111111100001 (12.6)	0	7	0	0	7	24	31
Alexander Street School (16).		94	7	19	120	858	978	011111111100000 (12.3)	0	7	0	0	7	21	28
First Avenue (35)	0	42	0	18	60	542	602	011111111100000 (10.0)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
Ridge Street (55)	0	14	1	34	49	490	539	011111110000000 (9.1)	0	4	0	0	4	13	17
Lincoln (43)	0	39	1	5	45	723	768	011111111100000 (5.9)	0	4	1	0	5	18	23

DISTRICT: ORANGE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 9. REPRESENTING: 9. CITY: ORANGE. COUNTY: 7

Number	4	2,808	19	25	2,856	1,477	4,333		0	35	0	0	35	147	182
Percent	0.1	64.8	0.4	0.6	65.9	34.1	100.0		0	19.2	0	0	19.2	80.8	100.0
Oakwood Avenue School (6).	0	177	0	0	177	2	179	011100000000000 (98.9)	0	2	0	0	2	5	7
Forest Street School (3).	0	292	2	9	303	35	338	011111110000000 (89.6)	0	3	0	0	3	8	11
Lincoln Avenue School (4).	0	541	0	0	541	193	734	011111110000001 (73.7)	0	5	0	0	5	28	33
Central (7)	0	257	4	3	264	102	366	000000001100000 (72.1)	0	2	0	0	2	12	14
Park Avenue (1)	0	343	3	0	346	155	501	011111100000000 (69.1)	0	5	0	0	5	12	17
Tremont Avenue (9)	2	141	1	3	147	84	231	000000011100000 (63.6)	0	2	0	0	2	6	8
Orange High School (8)	2	566	5	9	582	395	977	000000000011111 (59.6)	0	6	0	0	6	52	58
Heywood Avenue School (5).	0	211	4	1	216	202	418	011111110000000 (51.7)	0	4	0	0	4	10	14
Cleveland Street School (2).	0	280	0	0	280	309	589	011111110000000 (47.5)	0	6	0	0	6	14	20

DISTRICT: JERSEY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 36. REPRESENTING: 36. CITY: JERSEY CITY. COUNTY: 9 HUDSON

Number	10	15,998	97	4,521	20,626	16,457	37,083		1	191	2	0	194	1,300	1,494
Percent	0.0	43.1	0.3	12.2	55.6	44.4	100.0		0.1	12.8	0.1	0.0	13.0	87.0	100.0
School No. 14 (13)	0	990	0	1	991	0	991	011111111100000 (100.0)	0	17	0	0	17	21	38
School No. 29 (25)	0	922	0	3	925	4	929	011111111100000 (99.6)	0	1	0	0	1	29	30
School No. 22 (19)	0	1,833	0	66	1,899	27	1,926	011111111100000 (98.6)	0	33	0	0	33	47	80
Kennedy School No. 9 (10).	0	793	0	457	1,250	49	1,299	011111111100000 (96.2)	0	10	0	0	10	47	57
School No. 3 (7)	0	328	2	622	952	39	991	011111111100000 (96.1)	0	6	0	0	6	28	34

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: JERSEY CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 36. REPRESENTING: 36. CITY: JERSEY CITY. COUNTY: 9 HUDSON—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
School No. 2 (6)	0	76	0	360	436	18	454	011111000000000 (96.0)	0	5	0	0	5	10	15
School No. 12 (12)	0	794	0	23	817	36	853	011111111100000 (95.8)	0	10	0	0	10	24	34
School No. 15 (14)	0	1,052	0	21	1,073	55	1,128	011111111100000 (95.1)	0	4	0	0	4	42	46
School No. 41 (35)	1	1,033	2	21	1,057	64	1,121	011111111100000 (94.3)	1	7	0	0	8	30	38
Cornelia F. Bradford School No. 16 (15)	0	174	1	239	414	32	446	011111111100000 (92.8)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
School No. 37 (31)	0	368	0	785	1,153	134	1,287	011111111100001 (89.6)	0	16	0	0	16	36	52
School No. 35 (30)	0	257	0	17	274	96	370	011110000000000 (74.1)	0	1	0	0	1	9	10
School No. 24 (11)	0	932	8	19	959	339	1,298	011111111100000 (73.9)	0	6	1	0	7	38	45
Lincoln High School (2)	0	1,091	3	32	1,126	422	1,548	000000000011110 (72.7)	0	8	1	0	9	66	75
School No. 18 (17)	0	175	4	23	202	76	278	011110000000000 (72.7)	0	1	0	0	1	9	10
School No. 5 (8)	0	183	0	271	454	192	646	011111111100001 (70.3)	0	2	0	0	2	28	30
Dr. Charles P. DeFuccio School No. 39 (33)	1	508	9	166	684	325	1,009	011111111100001 (67.8)	0	8	0	0	8	33	41
James J. Ferris High School (3)	1	384	2	507	894	572	1,466	000000000011110 (61.0)	0	7	0	0	7	70	77
School No. 34 (29)	0	611	5	39	655	422	1,077	011111111100000 (60.8)	0	3	0	0	3	34	37
School No. 23 (20)	1	471	2	197	671	573	1,244	011111111100001 (53.9)	0	6	0	0	6	43	49
School No. 31 (27)	0	58	0	21	79	86	165	000000000000001 (47.9)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Alexander D. Sullivan School No. 30 (26)	0	346	0	18	364	409	773	011111111100001 (47.1)	0	5	0	0	5	26	31
Henry Snyder High School (4)	1	1,013	9	38	1,061	1,809	2,870	000000000011110 (37.0)	0	7	0	0	7	131	138
School No. 20 (18)	0	287	6	12	305	556	861	011111111100000 (35.4)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29
School No. 11 (11)	0	130	8	54	192	382	574	011111111100000 (33.4)	0	2	0	0	2	23	25
School No. 38 James F. Murray School (32)	0	326	0	11	337	710	1,047	011111111100000 (32.2)	0	1	0	0	1	35	36
Ezra L. Nolan School No. 40 (34)	0	335	6	44	385	840	1,225	011111111100001 (31.4)	0	5	0	0	5	38	43
Joseph H. Brensinger School No. 17 (16)	2	131	5	44	182	491	673	011111111100000 (27.0)	0	1	0	0	1	23	24
School No. 33 (28)	1	75	4	20	100	343	443	011111100000000 (22.6)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Jotham W. Wakeman School No. 6 (36)	1	81	6	99	187	969	1,156	011111111100001 (16.2)	0	2	0	0	2	45	47
William L. Dickinson High School (1)	1	212	12	90	315	2,776	3,091	000000000011110 (10.2)	0	8	0	0	8	131	139
School No. 8 (9)	0	13	0	106	119	1,125	1,244	011111111100000 (9.6)	0	4	0	0	4	40	44
Bureau of Special Services. (5)	0	2	0	0	2	24	26	000000000000001 (7.7)	0	0	0	0	0	4	46
School No. 27 (23)	0	4	0	48	52	814	866	011111111100000 (6.0)	0	2	0	0	2	26	28
School No. 28 (24)	0	5	3	26	34	744	788	011111111100000 (4.4)	0	1	0	0	1	24	25
School No. 25 (22)	0	5	0	21	26	904	930	011111111100000 (2.8)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33

DISTRICT: TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 21. REPRESENTING: 21. CITY: TRENTON. COUNTY: 11 MERCER.

Number	8	11,143	13	820	11,984	4,881	16,865		0	206	2	1	209	577	786
Percent	0.0	66.1	0.1	4.9	71.1	28.9	100.0		0.0	26.2	0.3	0.1	26.6	73.4	100.0
Monument School (15)	0	419	0	8	427	2	429	011111110000001 (99.5)	0	10	0	0	10	8	18
Junior No. 5 (6)	2	778	0	95	875	16	891	011111111110001 (98.2)	0	33	0	0	33	20	53
Cook (9)	0	448	0	24	472	12	484	011111000000001 (97.5)	0	6	0	0	6	12	18
Grant (11)	0	817	2	110	929	45	974	111111110000001 (95.4)	0	16	0	0	16	20	36
Jefferson (14)	0	810	1	30	841	42	883	011111110000000 (95.2)	0	17	0	0	17	15	32
Parker (17)	3	601	1	107	712	38	750	011111110000001 (94.9)	0	11	0	0	11	21	32
Cadwalder (7)	0	462	0	33	495	29	524	011111100000000 (94.5)	0	4	0	0	4	17	21
Woodrow Wilson (21)	0	354	0	18	372	26	398	011111110000000 (93.5)	0	5	0	0	5	11	16
Junior School No. 1 (2)	0	902	1	20	923	65	988	000000011110000 (93.4)	0	34	0	0	34	24	58
Gregory (12)	0	493	0	26	519	81	600	011111110000000 (86.5)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: TRENTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 21. REPRESENTING: 21. CITY: TRENTON. COUNTY: 11 MERCER—Continued

	Students—							Weight:	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	1.0—grades	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Columbus (8)	0	362	0	7	369	87	456	011111110000001 (80.9)	0	11	0	0	11	12	23
Stokes (19)	0	559	0	24	583	143	726	011111110000000 (80.3)	0	6	0	0	6	22	28
Junior No. 3 (4)	1	836	4	30	871	321	1,192	000000001110001 (73.1)	0	8	0	1	9	48	57
Robbins (18)	0	384	1	52	437	224	661	011111110000001 (66.1)	0	6	0	0	6	18	24
Trenton Central High and Vocational (1).	1	1,776	0	76	1,853	1,198	3,051	000000000001111 (60.7)	0	19	0	0	19	144	163
Junior No. 2 (3)	0	785	2	38	825	763	1,588	011111111110000 (52.0)	0	6	0	0	6	63	6
Mott (16)	0	51	0	74	125	226	351	011111110000001 (35.6)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Junior High School No. 4 (5).	1	221	1	33	256	563	819	000000001110001 (31.3)	0	7	2	0	9	45	54
Franklin (10)	0	66	0	1	67	394	461	011111110000001 (14.5)	0	3	0	0	3	20	23
Harrison (13)	0	5	0	13	18	262	280	011111110000001 (6.4)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
Washington (20)	0	14	0	1	15	344	359	011111110000000 (4.2)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19

DISTRICT: NEW BRUNSWICK PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: NEW BRUNSWICK. COUNTY: 12 MIDDLESEX COUNTY

Number	0	2,675	29	516	3,220	3,432	6,652		0	42	1	2	45	263	308
Percent	0	40.2	0.4	7.8	48.4	51.6	100.0		0	13.6	0.3	0.6	14.6	85.4	100.0
Lord Stirling (4)	0	396	0	61	457	26	483	111111100000001 (94.6)	0	8	0	0	8	13	21
Bayard (2)	0	126	0	101	227	13	240	111111100000001 (94.6)	0	4	0	0	4	6	10
Nathan Hale Elementary School (6).	0	428	0	44	472	43	515	111111100000001 (91.7)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
McKinley School (5)	0	179	0	4	183	26	209	111100000000000 (87.6)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
Roosevelt Intermediate School (9).	0	390	3	69	462	354	816	000000011000001 (56.6)	0	10	0	0	10	23	33
Washington School (7)	0	127	4	79	210	171	381	011111100000001 (55.1)		0	0	0	0	17	17
New Brunswick Junior High School (10).	0	360	2	57	419	467	886	000000000110000 (47.3)	0	7	0	1	8	47	55
Livingston School (1)	0	146	4	41	191	295	486	011111100000000 (39.3)	0	3	0	0	3	14	17
Lincoln School (3)	0	130	1	22	153	251	404	011111100000001 (37.9)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
New Brunswick Senior High School (11).	0	393	15	38	446	1,576	2,022	000000000001110 (22.1)	0	4	1	1	6	92	98
Woodrow Wilson (8)	0	0	0	0	0	210	210	011111100000000 (0.0)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9

DISTRICT: PERTH AMBOY PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: PERTH AMBOY. COUNTY: 12 MIDDLESEX.

Number	0	771	10	2,061	2,842	3,633	6,475		0	3	0	3	6	289	295
Percent	0.0	11.9	0.2	31.8	43.9	56.1	100.0		0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	2.0	98.0	100.0
School No. 5 (3)	0	60	0	233	293	53	346	011111100000000 (84.7)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13
School No. 10 (7)	0	125	1	361	487	227	714	011111100000001 (68.2)	0	0		1	1	28	29
School No. 2 (2)	0	21	2	127	150	71	221	011111100000000 (67.9)	0	0		0	0	11	11
School No. 1 (1)	0	34	0	115	149	115	264	011111100000000 (56.4)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
School No. 9 (6)	0	83	0	110	193	155	348	011111100000000 (55.5)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Grammar School (8)	0	79	0	306	385	321	706	000000011100001 (54.5)	0	0	0	2	2	31	33
Samuel E. Shull School (9).	0	117	1	249	367	644	1,011	011111111100001 (36.3)	0	1	0	0	1	53	54
James J. Flynn School (10).	0	50	0	91	141	250	391	011111100000001 (36.1)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Perth Amboy High School (11).	0	181	5	353	539	1,323	1,862	000000000011110 (28.9)	0	0	0	0	0	85	85
School No. 7 (4)	0	11	1	70	82	204	286	011111100000000 (28.7)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
School No. 8 (5)	0	10	0	46	56	270	326	011111110000001 (17.2)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15

DISTRICT: ASBURY PARK CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 4. REPRESENTING: 4. CITY: ASBURY PARK. COUNTY: 13 MONMOUTH COUNTY

Bangs Avenue Elementary School (3).	0	941	0	20	961	13	974	011110001100001 (98.7)	0	29	0	0	29	19	48
Bradley Elementary School (1).	0	344	0	16	360	233	593	011111111100000 (60.7)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: ASBURY PARK CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 4. RERESENTING: 4. CITY: ASBURY PARK. COUNTY: 13 MONMOUTH COUNTY—Continued

	Students—								Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0—grades	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Bond Street Elementary School (2).	0	321	3	54	378	259	637	011111111100001 (59.3)	0	11	0	0	11	18	29
Asbury Park High School (4).	0	546	0	24	570	766	1,336	000000000011110 (42.7)	0	6	0	0	6	68	74

DISTRICT: LONG BRANCH PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: LONG BRANCH. COUNTY: 13 MONMOUTH

Number	6	1,538	52	290	1,886	3,755	5,641		0	23	0	0	23	236	259
Percent	0.1	27.3	0.9	5.1	33.4	66.6	100.0		0.0	8.9	0.0	0.0	8.9	91.1	100.0
Liberty Street School (8).	0	201	0	29	230	23	253	011111000000000 (90.9)	0	2	0	0	2	9	11
Garfield (5)	0	233	8	88	329	204	533	011111110000000 (61.7)	0	4	0	0	4	21	2
Gregory (10)	0	264	7	13	284	214	498	011111110000000 (57.0)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
North Long Branch (6)	0	109	4	1	114	128	242	000011110000000 (47.1)	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Lenna W. Conrow (7)	0	102	1	5	108	137	245	011100000000000 (44.1)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Morris Avenue (3)	0	76	0	28	104	244	348	011111111000001 (29.9)	0	4	0	0	4	11	15
Long Branch Junior High School (2).	6	274	8	43	331	925	1,256	000000001110001 (26.4)	0	4	0	0	4	63	67
Long Branch High School (1).	0	246	3	35	284	934	1,218	000000000001111 (23.3)	0	2	0	0	2	62	64
Broadway (4)	0	14	8	36	58	259	317	011111110000001 (18.3)	0	2	0	0	2	10	12
West End School (9)	0	19	9	10	38	355	393	011111110000000 (9.7)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Elberon Elementary (11).	0	0	4	2	6	332	338	011111110000000 (1.8)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13

DISTRICT: TOWNSHIP OF NEPTUNE PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: NEPTUNE. COUNTY: 13 MONMOUTH

Number	0	2,544	10	82	2,636	4,914	7,550		0	51	0	0	51	274	325
Percent	0.0	33.7	0.1	1.1	34.9	65.1	100.0		0.0	15.7	0.0	0.0	15.7	84.3	100.0
Whitesville (7)	0	183	0	1	184	4	188	011111000000000 (97.9)	0	5	0	0	5	3	8
Bradley Park (10)	0	216	0	27	243	177	420	011111000000000 (57.9)	0	6	0	0	6	12	18
Ridge Avenue Middle (4).	0	268	1	6	275	283	558	010000110000000 (49.3)	0	6	0	0	6	13	19
Gables Elementary School (5).	0	107	0	0	107	156	263	011111000000001 (40.7)	0	5	0	0	5	8	13
Green Grove (11)	0	220	5	7	232	442	674	011111000000000 (34.4)	0	4	0	0	4	20	24
Neptune Senior High School (1).	0	490	2	7	499	1,054	1,553	000000000001111 (32.1)	0	3	0	0	3	80	83
Neptune Junior High School (2).	0	553	1	17	571	1,234	1,805	000000001110000 (31.6)	0	10	0	0	10	77	87
Ocean Grove Middle School (3).	0	192	1	14	207	451	658	000000110000000 (31.5)	0	5	0	0	5	18	23
Summerfield (8)	0	215	0	0	215	539	754	011111000000000 (28.5)	0	5	0	0	5	21	26
Ocean Grove School (6).	0	39	0	3	42	119	161	011111000000000 (26.1)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Shark River Hills School (9).	0	61	0	0	61	455	516	011111000000000 (11.8)	0	2	0	0	2	17	19

DISTRICT: PASSAIC PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: PASSAIC. COUNTY: 16 PASSAIC

Number	1	2,632	30	1,833	4,496	4,055	8,551		0	52	0	0	52	286	338
Percent	0.0	30.8	0.4	21.4	52.6	47.4	100.0		0.0	15.4	0.0	0.0	15.4	84.6	100.0
Lafayette School No. 6 (5).	0	289	0	210	499	30	529	011111100000000 (94.3)	0	5	0	0	5	12	17
Pulaski School No. 8 (7).	0	335	0	321	656	55	711	011111110000000 (92.3)	0	6	0	0	6	16	22
Grant School No. 7 (6)	0	200	0	22	222	30	252	011110000000001 (88.1)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8
Memorial School No. 11 (10).	1	651	10	377	1,039	367	1,406	011111111100001 (73.9)	0	11	0	0	11	38	49
Columbia School No. (8)	0	159	0	124	283	106	389	011111110000000 (72.8)	0	3	0	0	3	13	16
Roosevelt School No. 10 (9)	0	218	2	257	477	239	716	011111110000001 (66.6)	0	2	0	0	2	27	29

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: PASSAIC PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: PASSAIC. COUNTY: 16 PASSAIC—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Wilson Junior High School No. 12 (11)	0	272	0	246	518	269	787	0000000011100001 (65.8)	0	9	0	0	9	23	32
Senior High School (1)	0	359	4	174	537	1,203	1,740	000000000000111 (30.9)	0	6	0	0	6	76	82
Thomas Jefferson School No. 1 (2)	0	53	2	56	111	456	567	011111110000001 (19.6)	0	3	0	0	3	22	25
Lincoln Junior High School No. 4 (4)	0	72	4	31	107	663	770	0000000011100001 (13.9)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33
Franklin School No. 3 (3)	0	24	8	15	47	637	684	011111110000001 (6.9)	0	6	0	0	6	19	25

DISTRICT: PATERSON BOARD OF EDUCATION. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 29. REPRESENTING: 29. CITY: PATERSON. COUNTY: 16.

Number	0	11,479	28	4,240	15,747	9,740	25,487		0	271	1	5	277	812	1,089
Percent	0.0	45.0	0.1	16.6	61.8	38.2	100.0		0.0	24.9	0.1	0.5	25.4	74.6	100.0
School No. 6 (8)	0	1,179	0	86	1,265	12	1,277	011111111100000 (99.1)	0	23	0	0	23	30	53
Public school No. 11 (13)	0	291	0	305	596	11	607	011111110000000 (98.2)	0	7	0	1	8	11	19
No. 28 (29)	0	643	0	74	717	18	735	011111111100000 (97.6)	0	22	0	0	22	18	40
No. 4 (6)	0	736	1	115	852	37	889	011111111000000 (95.8)	0	21	0	0	21	20	41
School No. 10 (12)	0	1,009	0	165	1,174	104	1,278	011111111100000 (91.9)	0	22	0	1	23	27	50
Number 15 (17)	0	536	7	532	1,075	108	1,183	011111111100001 (90.9)	0	8	0	0	8	47	55
No. 3 (5)	0	187	0	368	555	58	613	011111000000001 (90.5)	0	9	1	1	11	15	26
No. 13 (15)	0	540	0	176	716	128	844	011111111100000 (84.8)	0	8	0	0	8	26	34
Martin Luther King School (3).	0	759	0	197	956	227	1,183	000000001100000 (80.8)	0	8	0	0	8	26	34
Public School No. 12 (14).	0	789	0	95	884	218	1,102	011111111100000 (80.2)	0	16	0	0	16	26	42
No. 8 (10)	0	244	0	304	548	140	688	011111111100000 (79.7)	0	9	0	0	9	21	30
School No. 22 (24)	0	100	0	12	112	31	143	000000000000001 (78.3)	0	9	0	0	9	8	17
Public School No. 2 (4)	0	115	6	350	471	133	604	011111111100000 (78.0)	0	11	0	0	11	25	36
School No. 21 (23)	0	632	1	133	766	250	1,016	010000000100000 (75.4)	0	9	0	0	9	34	43
Public School No. 24 (25).	0	249	1	183	433	247	680	011111111100000 (63.7)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22
Eastside High School (2).	0	983	2	147	1,132	1,029	2,161	000000000011111 (52.4)	0	19	0	1	20	93	113
Public School No. 25 (26).	0	312	1	97	410	390	800	011111111100000 (51.3)	0	4	0	0	4	31	35
No. 14 (16)	0	120	0	23	143	177	320	011111000000000 (44.7)	0	1	0	0	1	11	12
John F. Kennedy High School (1).	0	766	0	294	1,060	1,329	2,389	000000000011111 (44.4)	0	21	0	1	22	110	132
School No. 26 (27)	0	250	2	50	302	397	699	011111111100000 (43.2)	0	2	0	0	2	24	26
No. 17 210 (19)	0	115	0	18	133	182	315	011110000000000 (42.2)	0	2	0	0	2	8	10
No. 20 (22)	0	259	4	76	339	487	826	011111111100000 (41.0)	0	4	0	0	4	26	30
No. 16 (18)	0	51	3	57	111	167	278	011111100000000 (39.9)	0	6	0	0	6	5	11
No. 18 (20)	0	173	0	130	303	639	942	011111111100000 (32.2)	0	5	0	0	5	30	35
No. 5 (7)	0	276	0	80	356	848	1,204	011111111100000 (29.6)	0	6	0	0	6	43	49
School No. 7 (9)	0	90	0	37	127	381	508	011111111100001 (25.0)	0	4	0	0	4	14	18
No. 9 (11)	0	33	0	125	158	731	889	011111111100001 (17.8)	0	8	0	0	8	23	31
Public School No. 9 (21).	0	39	0	4	43	444	487	011111110000000 (8.8)	0	3	0	0	3	15	18
Public School No. 27 (28).	0	3	0	7	10	817	827	011111111100001 (1.2)	0	2	0	0	2	25	27

DISTRICT: ELIZABETH PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 25. REPRESENTING: 25. CITY: ELIZABETH. COUNTY: 20 UNION.

Number	3	5,357	46	1,838	7,244	8,179	15,423		0	113	0	0	113	549	662
Percent	0.0	34.7	0.3	11.9	47.0	53.0	100.0		0.0	17.1	0.0	0.0	17.1	82.9	100.0
John Marshall School No. 20 (15).	0	520	0	30	550	23	573	111111110000000 (96.0)	0	5	0	0	5	17	22
Winfield Scott School No. 2 (2).	0	447	1	45	493	25	518	111111110000000 (95.2)	0	7	0	0	7	11	18

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: ELIZABETH PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 25. REPRESENTING: 25. CITY: ELIZABETH. COUNTY: 20 UNION—Continued

	Students—								Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0—grades	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Benjamin Franklin No. 13 (8).	0	427	1	141	569	29	598	011111110000000 (95.2)	0	5	0	0	5	18	23
George Washington School No. 1 (1).	0	561	0	190	751	112	863	111111110000000 (87.0)	0	6	0	0	6	23	29
Elias Boudinot School No. 9 (5).	0	296	0	20	316	64	380	011111110000000 (83.2)	0	4	0	0	4	10	14
Continental School No. 3 (3).	0	224	0	117	341	105	446	011111110000001 (76.5)	0	3	0	0	3	15	18
Marquis de Lafayette School No. 6 (4).	0	377	7	65	449	161	610	011111000000001 (73.6)	0	6	0	0	6	15	21
William Penn School No. 11 (6).	0	117	0	81	198	82	280	011111110000001 (70.7)	0	2	0	0	2	9	11
Grover Cleveland Junior High School No. 1 (19).	0	669	1	154	824	407	1,231	000000001110001 (66.9)	0	14	0	0	14	56	70
Marquis de Lafayette Junior High School No. 3 (21).	2	256	4	78	340	273	613	000000001110001 (55.5)	0	11	0	0	11	24	35
William F. Halloran School No. 22 (17).	0	149	0	24	173	156	329	000111110000001 (52.6)	0	2	0	0	2	12	14
Christopher Columbus School No. 15 (10).	0	109	0	80	189	226	415	011111110000001 (45.5)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
Nicholas Murray Butler School No. 23 (18).	0	101	5	38	144	285	429	011111110000000 (33.6)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Madison-Monroe School No. 16 (11).	0	43	2	108	153	303	456	011111110000000 (33.6)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Battin Senior High School (24).	1	329	6	162	498	1,025	1,523	000000000001111 (32.7)	0	9	0	0	9	55	64
Thomas Jefferson Senior High School (23).	0	269	8	125	402	831	1,233	000000000001111 (32.6)	0	13	0	0	13	47	60
Thomas A. Edison Vocational and Technical High (25).	0	143	0	64	207	452	659	000000000001110 (31.4)	0	4	0	0	4	32	6
Alexander Hamilton Junior High School No. 2 (20).	0	138	6	78	222	738	960	000000001110000 (23.1)	0	3	0	0	3	43	46
Theodore Roosevelt Junior High School No. 4 (22).	0	71	0	20	91	438	529	000000001110001 (17.2)	0	10	0	0	10	18	28
Woodrow Wilson School No. 19 (14).	0	39	0	39	78	420	498	011111110000001 (15.7)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
Victor Mravlag School No. 21 (16).	0	25	0	12	37	234	271	011111110000001 (13.7)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Abraham Lincoln School No. 14 (9).	0	18	4	82	104	701	805	011111110000001 (12.9)	0	3	0	0	3	26	29
Theodore Roosevelt School No. 17 (12).	0	10	0	26	36	284	320	011111110000000 (11.3)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Robert Morris School No. 18 (13).	0	1	1	27	29	295	324	011111110000000 (9.0)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Elmora School No. 12 (7).	0	18	0	32	50	510	560	011111110000001 (8.9)	0	3	0	0	3	19	22

DISTRICT: LINDEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 14. CITY: LINDEN. COUNTY: 20. ASSURANCE: 441

Number	2	1,519	10	95	1,626	5,898	7,524		0	21	0	1	22	326	348
Percent	0.2	20.2	0.1	1.3	21.6	78.4	100.0		0.0	6.0	0.0	0.3	6.3	93.7	100.0
No. 5 (9)	0	395	0	2	397	74	471	011111110000000 (84.3)	0	4	0	0	4	19	23
School No. 4 annex (8)	0	113	0	6	119	118	237	011100000000000 (50.2)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
School No. 4 (7)	0	173	0	10	183	201	384	001111110000000 (47.7)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
No. 2 (5)	0	133	0	13	146	298	444	011111110000000 (32.9)	0	2	0	0	2	16	18
Joseph E. Soehl Junior High School (2).	2	233	3	15	253	580	833	000000001110000 (30.4)	0	3	0	0	3	42	45
No. 3 (6)	0	25	0	19	44	220	264	011111110000000 (16.7)		1	0	0	1	12	13
Linden High School (1)	0	219	2	9	230	1,582	1,812	000000000001110 (12.7)	0	3	0	1	4	84	88
Myles J. McManus Junior High School (3).	0	104	2	6	112	814	926	000000001110001 (12.1)	0	5	0	0	5	40	45

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: LINDEN PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 14. CITY: LINDEN. COUNTY: 20. ASSURANCE: 441—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0—grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Highland Avenue School No. 10 (14).	0	47	0	0	47	421	468	010000010000001 (10.0)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
No. 1 (4)	0	28	1	4	33	352	385	011111110000001 (8.6)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
No. 8 (12)	0	22	0	8	30	376	406	011111110000000 (7.4)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Deerfield Terrace School No. 9 (3).	0	23	0	1	24	383	407	011111110000001 (5.9)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
No. 6 (10)	0	4	2	0	6	359	365	011111110000000 (1.6)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
No. 7 (11)	0	0	0	2	2	120	122	011111110000001 (1.6)	0	1	0	0	1	6	7

DISTRICT: PLAINFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 15. REPRESENTING: 15. CITY: PLAINFIELD. COUNTY: 20 UNION

Number	5	5,463	28	189	5,685	3,486	9,171		0	76	1	1	78	331	409
Percent	0.1	59.6	0.3	2.1	62.0	38.0	100.0		0.0	18.6	0.2	0.2	19.1	80.9	100.0
Clinton (4)	0	374	0	5	379	34	413	011111000000000 (91.8)	0	4	0	0	4	10	14
Stillman (10)	0	249	1	25	275	42	317	011111000000000 (86.8)	0	4	0	0	4	9	13
Bryant (2)	0	106	1	3	110	19	129	010000000000001 (85.3)	0	1	0	0	1	6	7
Washington (11)	2	511	0	9	522	159	681	010000110000000 (76.7)	0	4	0	0	4	19	23
Lincoln (9)	0	65	0	2	67	22	89	000000000000001 (75.3)	0	2	0	0	2	6	8
Jefferson (8)	0	308	0	13	321	116	437	011111000000001 (73.5)	0	4	0	0	4	15	19
Woodland (12)	1	262	2	7	272	122	394	011111000000001 (69.0)	0	4	0	0	4	12	16
Emerson (6)	0	555	4	30	589	267	856	010000110000001 (68.8)	0	10	0	0	10	21	31
Hubbard Junior High School (13).	0	605	2	15	622	313	935	000000001110000 (66.5)	0	11	0	0	11	33	44
Barlow (1)	0	196	0	14	210	138	348	011111000000000 (60.3)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Evergreen (7)	0	359	3	6	368	299	667	011111000000000 (55.2)	0	4	0	0	4	21	25
Cook (5)	1	295	0	4	300	276	576	011111000000000 (52.1)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
Maxson Junior High School (14).	0	513	3	24	540	500	1,040	000000001110001 (51.9)	0	11	0	0	11	38	49
Cedarbrook (3)	0	297	8	8	313	310	623	011111000000000 (50.2)	0	3	0	0	3	20	23
Plainfield High School (15).	1	768	4	24	797	869	1,666	000000000001111 (47.8)	0	10	1	1	12	90	102

DISTRICT: ROSELLE. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 6. REPRESENTING: 6. CITY: ROSELLE. COUNTY: 20 UNION

Number	1	1,226	15	67	1,309	2,261	3,570		0	17	0	1	18	148	166
Percent	0.0	34.3	0.4	1.9	36.7	63.3	100.0		0.0	10.2	0.0	0.6	10.8	89.2	100.0
Lincoln (5)	0	438	1	11	450	47	497	011111110000000 (90.5)	0	4	0	0	4	16	20
Locust School (1)	0	225	0	4	229	280	509	011111111000000 (45.0)	0	2	0	0	2	17	19
Abraham Clark High School (2).	0	412	6	33	451	866	1,317	000000000000000 (34.2)	0	7	0	1	8	73	81
Grace Wilday (4)	0	48	0	3	51	160	211	011111111000001 (24.2)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
Harrison (6)	1	56	3	13	73	487	560	011111111000001 (13.0)	0	2	0	0	2	15	17
Washington Elementary (3).	0	47	5	3	55	421	476	011111111000000 (11.6)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18

DISTRICT: TOWNSHIP OF UNION PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 10. REPRESENTING: 10. CITY: UNION. COUNTY: 20 UNION COUNTY

Number	0	986	12	3	1,001	7,718	8,719		0	16	1	0	17	395	412
Percent	0.0	11.3	0.1	0.0	11.5	88.5	100.0		0.0	3.9	0.2	0.0	4.1	95.9	100.0
Jefferson School (3)	0	370	0	0	370	20	390	111111110000000 (94.9)	0	5	0	0	5	17	22
Burnet Junior High School (8).	0	221	2	0	223	962	1,185	000000001110000 (18.8)	0	5	1	0	6	57	63
Livingston School (4)	0	56	2	0	58	620	678	011111110000000 (8.6)	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
Connecticut Farms School (1).	0	52	0	0	52	584	636	011111110000000 (8.2)	0	1	0	0	1	27	28
Union High School (10)	0	169	0	0	169	2,053	2,222	000000000001110 (7.6)	0	1	0	0	1	107	108
Hamilton School (2)	0	18	2	0	20	348	368	011111110000000 (5.4)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Washington (5)	0	34	1	0	35	731	766	011111110000000 (4.6)	0	0	0	0	0	32	32

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

NEW JERSEY STATE TOTAL—Continued

DISTRICT: TOWNSHIP OF UNION PUBLIC SCHOOLS. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 10. REPRESENTING: 10. CITY: UNION. COUNTY: 20 UNION COUNTY—Continued

	Students—							Weight: 1.0— grades	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Franklin School (6)	0	25	0	2	27	646	673	011111110000000 (4.0)	0	2	0	0	2	29	31
Battle Hill School (7)	0	23	4	0	27	823	850	011111110000000 (3.2)	0	1	0	0	1	32	33
Kawameeh Junior High School (9)	0	18	1	1	20	931	951	000000001110000 (2.1)	0	1	0	0	1	51	52

INDIANA STATE TOTAL

[Number of districts: 321. Representing: 488. Number of schools: 1,907. Representing: 2,266]

	American Indian	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Others	Total
Students	258	200,117	2,932	44,675	247,982	986,488	1,234,470
Representing	311	208,479	3,254	46,063	258,106	1,143,807	1,401,907
Teachers	9	4,005	75	146	4,235	50,930	55,165
Representing	9	4,147	82	160	4,398	58,215	62,613

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on November 26, 1969, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 121) to authorize appropriations for expenses of the National Council on Indian Opportunity.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 118) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Tahoe regional planning compact, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior and others to cooperate with the planning agency thereby created, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2751. An act to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard;

H.R. 3813. An act to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis;

H.R. 4248. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize civilians employed by the Department of Defense to administer oaths while conducting official investigations;

H.R. 4302. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code, section 753, to authorize payment by the United States of fees charged by court reporters for furnishing certain transcripts in proceedings under the Criminal Justice Act;

H.R. 5278. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the Benbrook Water and Sewer Authority for the use of water supply storage in the Benbrook Reservoir;

H.R. 6006. An act to amend section 710(f) of title 32, United States Code, to permit certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force, or National Guard, to act as inspecting officers;

H.R. 6265. An act to provide that a headstone or marker be furnished at Government expense for the unmarked grave of any Medal of Honor recipient;

H.R. 8019. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a Regular component of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9052. An act to amend section 716 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the interservice transfers of officers of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 9485. An act to remove the $10,000 limit on deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict;

H.R. 9486. An act to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict;

H.R. 9677. An act to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served;

H.R. 11265. An act to provide for crediting service as an aviation midshipman for purposes of retirement for nonregular service under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and for pay purposes under title 37, United States Code;

H.R. 12785. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Southern Ute Tribe approximately 214.37 acres of land;

H.R. 12941. An act to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13756. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for U.S. property, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14118. An act to amend section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 14485. An act to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system;

H.R. 14517. An act to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14571. An act to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S.J. Res. 143) extending the duration of copyright protection in certain cases.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2751. An act to amend section 715 of title 32, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of contributory negligence on claims involving members of the National Guard;

H.R. 4248. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize civilians employed by the Department of Defense to administer

oaths while conducting official investigations;

H.R. 4302. An act to amend title 28 of the United States Code, section 753, to authorize payment by the United States of fees charged by court reporters for furnishing certain transcripts in proceedings under the Criminal Justice Act;

H.R. 9677. An act to amend section 1866 of title 28, United States Code, prescribing the manner in which summonses for jury duty may be served; and

H.R. 14118. An act to amend section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 3813. An act to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis;

H.R. 6006. An act to amend section 710(f) of title 32, United States Code, to permit certain commissioned officers of the Army or Air Force, or National Guard, to act as inspecting officers;

H.R. 6265. An act to provide that a headstone or marker be furnished at Government expense for the unmarked grave of any Medal of Honor recipient;

H.R. 8019. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to provide for the payment of uniform allowances to certain persons originally appointed, temporarily or permanently, as commissioned or warrant officers in a Regular component of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 9052. An act to amend section 716 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the interservice transfers of officers of the Coast Guard;

H.R. 9485. An act to remove the $10,000 limit on deposits under section 1035 of title 10, United States Code, in the case of any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict;

H.R. 9486. An act to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide that a family separation allowance shall be paid to any member of a uniformed service who is a prisoner of war, missing in action, or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict;

H.R. 11265. An act to provide for crediting service as an aviation midshipman for purposes of retirement for nonregular service under chapter 67 of title 10, United States Code, and for pay purposes under title 37, United States Code;

H.R. 12941. An act to authorize the release of 4,180,000 pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile;

H.R. 13756. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, with respect to accountability and responsibility for United States property, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 14571. An act to amend the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement Act of 1964 for Certain Employees, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 5278. An act to amend the act of July 24, 1956, to authorize the Secretary of the Army to contract with the Benbrook Water and Sewer Authority for the use of water supply storage in the Benbrook Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 12785. An act to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Southern Ute Tribe approximately 214.37 acres of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 14485. An act to amend sections 501 and 504 of title 18, United States Code, so as to strengthen the law relating to the counterfeiting of postage meter stamps or other improper uses of the metered mail system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 14517. An act to provide temporary authority to expedite procedures for consideration and approval of projects drawing upon more than one Federal assistance program, to simplify requirements for the operation of those projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the clerk will report the unfinished business.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

CAPITOL GUIDE SERVICE—RECONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, last night, after announcing that there would be no more rollcall votes, the Senate adopted an amendment sponsored by the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and me. I understand that some Senators have complained about that, due to the fact that they did not think any business would be transacted. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the action taken last night on that amendment be reconsidered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the vote by which the amendment was agreed to is reconsidered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I withdraw the amendment at this time, but, at the same time, lest there be any misunderstanding in the future, I think Senators who are interested in the pending bill will be well advised to be on the floor, because amendments are going to be brought up, they are going to be voted on, and as long as the Senate is in session we are going to be working on the bill. If Senators who have amendments are not present, we are going to get third reading of the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I concur fully in the remarks made by the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance. It is our business to attend to the people's business, and this bill will have a very important effect on the people's welfare. I would hope that all Members of the Senate would take to heart what the Senator from Delaware has said, and will be present on the floor, or available on short notice, because it is the intention to try to finish this bill as expeditiously as possible. There will be no delay, I want to assure Senators, as far as the joint leadership of the Senate is concerned, and I am sure there will be no delay, either, as far as the Senate as a whole is concerned.

There is a lot of business to attend to. We are going to be in session every day, including Saturday, beginning at 10 o'clock. All Senators have been put on notice to that effect. If they have any engagements, I suggest that they postpone them, cancel them, or obtain a leave of absence, as I intend to, if necessary, late Saturday afternoon in order to go to St. Mary's College in Notre Dame, at South Bend, Ind., where my wife is to receive an honorary degree from her alma mater. I would not want to miss that for anything in the world.

We have the pending bill, a most important measure, before us. We still have six appropriation bills to be considered. Hopefully we will have a narcotics control bill, a pornography control bill, and a crime bill to consider. We should be prepared to face up to our responsibilities by being in attendance in this Chamber as much as possible, so that we can expedite the business of the people as a whole.

The joint leadership is not fooling when it says we will likely be in session up to December 23. If need be, we will come back the day after Christmas and stay until the New Year to try to take care of the Senate's business. I do not know how much plainer we can make it, but we have a heavy schedule backing up, and it behooves us to face up to our responsibilities and do what the people pay us to do, which is to attend to business.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

To make the record clear, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) has offered the pending amendment. I understand, in order to accommodate some Members on our side of the aisle as well as on the other side of the aisle, since we could not get a time limitation, there is more or less a gentlemen's agreement that we will vote on the amendment around 4 or 4:30 this afternoon. In the meantime, if the debate lags, rather than talk needlessly, with the consent of the Senator from Tennessee we may lay that amendment aside, which is normally done, and consider some less controversial amendments, act on them, and then go back to the consideration of that amendment.

I think Senators should be on notice that the business before the Senate is the tax bill, and if we are going to proceed with it as expeditiously as possible, Senators who are interested in what happens here should be on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the pending amendment would raise the personal exemption for each taxpayer and dependent from $600 under the present law to $1,000 by 1973, proceeding in seriatim increases by $100 per year. That is, the pending amendment would raise the $600 personal exemption of present law to $700 next year, to $800 the year there following, to $900 the year there following, and to $1,000 for the year 1973 and thereafter.

This, Mr. President, is offered as a substitute for the rate changes on personal income contained in the bill, with the single exception that my amendment adopts the change unanimously agreed to in the committee with regard to unmarried taxpayers.

This amendment offers a fundamental choice to the Senate—a choice between types of tax reductions. It may well be that the bill should contain no tax reductions, and I think I might prefer no tax reductions to the type proposed in the committee bill. But that is not the question posed by the pending amendment. The pending amendment poses a choice between two types of tax reduction—between tax reduction by a decrease in tax rates, on the one hand, and tax reduction by means of raising the personal exemption for each taxpayer and dependent on the other.

Therefore, Mr. President, the amendment is simple. It is easily understood. Every mother in America—or at least, in my view, almost every mother in America—understands the personal exemption.

The personal exemption in our tax laws is not new. Indeed, it is as old as the present income tax law itself. After the adoption of the 16th amendment, which was brought about under the leadership of my distinguished former fellow townsman, then Representative, Cordell Hull, Congress enacted, in 1913, the first modern U.S. income tax. That first modern income tax law embraced the theory of a personal exemption. The personal exemption was then $3,000 for a single taxpayer and $4,000 for a married couple.

The exemption has been changed from time to time. In 1940, the personal exemption for a man and wife was $2,000.

During World War II, when too many dollars were chasing scarce commodities, Congress lowered the personal exemption for each taxpayer and dependent to $500, primarily for the purpose of reducing purchasing power because there were simply not enough goods to go around. There it remained until 1948, when it was increased to $600. There it remains in the law today—at $600—and there it is proposed by the administration and the committee bill to leave it: at $600, $50 per month.

What is the theory of the personal exemption, Mr. President? It is that a taxpayer should be permitted sufficient income for himself and his dependents upon which to live at a minimum level of decency before the Federal income tax begins to take a bite of his income. I think this is a sound theory. I do not hear any Senator denying that it is a sound theory. I believe it is socially sound. I believe it is fiscally sound. I am sure it is politically sound.

So, the question is with me the proper amount of the exemption. I must acknowledge that a few people of antediluvian turn of mind do in fact question the whole point of a personal exemption from the heavy hand of Federal income taxes.

I have even heard some individuals or read of some individuals suggesting that the theory is phony. But, we shall not waste time upon that.

I believe the Senate accepts the theory of a personal exemption. Even the administration recommends continuing the present $600 level, although in the letter of Assistant Secretary Cohen, inserted in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, the able chairman of the committee, there is some questioning of the theory, though not a frontal attack. So, unless there is argument about the justification of a personal exemption at some level, I shall not discuss it. However, if someone wishes to debate that matter, I would be happy to engage him. Since I have heard no Senator raise that question, however, I proceed to the adequacy of the personal exemption—a reasonable level of personal exemption.

What is reasonable? What is fair? Mr. President, our Federal Government has engaged in a number of studies to give us some guideposts. The Department of Labor has over a period of years conducted a study to determine the amount of income needed for a "moderate standard of living" for families of different sizes. And what is the definition the Federal Government uses for a "moderate standard of living?" It is one that "provides for the maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities."

Is that a fair definition? Does the Senate wish to deny American families a sufficient income for the maintenance of health and social well-being, for the nurture of children? Does the Senate really wish to levy the heavy hand of an income tax on income below this level and this participation in community activities?

I doubt if the Senate wishes to do that. And what amount does the Federal Government after years of study estimate would be an income necessary to maintain a "moderate standard of living?"

I do not have the 1969 figure. It may be available before the debate is concluded. I do have the estimate for 1968. It is $9,484. That supplemented a 1966 estimate of $9,191.

Mr. President, the cost of living has increased more rapidly this year than at any time during the last decade. So one can assume that the estimate of an income necessary for a family of four to maintain a moderate standard of living in October 1968 being $9,484, that estimate of necessity would be approaching $10,000 in December 1969.

I do have a more recent estimate by the Federal Government with respect to the poverty level. Surely the Senate does not want to start levying taxes upon the income of a family that is in poverty, officially declared, upon the income of a family counting the pennies, the nickels, and the dimes trying to emerge from poverty.

The Nixon administration did accommodate those of us who are urging an increase in the exemption. I am not sure it was done for that purpose. But they did accommodate us and accommodate the American people with a release of information on last Sunday. Based upon the increased cost of living, the poverty level of a family of four was officially announced last Sunday to be $3,600.

Mr. President, the U.S. Treasury Department seems not to have learned about that. I do not understand how to explain this cacophony of contradiction. But we have one department of the administration recommending relief payments to a family of four with $3,600 income, and another department of the Government submitting yesterday to the Senate a letter vigorously attacking the pending amendment that would give a family of four next year an exemption from Federal income tax of $3,800. Meanwhile, the cost of living continues to rise.

The Senate is offered a choice, a choice which is meaningful to millions of American families, particularly those with children to feed, cloth, and educate.

I am not here primarily to discuss economic theory, though I would, with some trepidation, venture into such a colloquy if someone wishes to challenge my amendment on such a basis. I am talking about the cost of living. I am talking about bread and meat, clothing and shelter, the opportunity for the little girl to take a music lesson once a week, the opportunity for people to live above the poverty level without Federal taxation, and the opportunity of American families to have a moderate standard of living without an undue tax burden.

Mr. President, it is this group of American families, seeking to nurture their children, seeking to have a part in community activities, seeking to have a moderate, decent standard of living, who are pressured from the bottom and the top, who are having difficulty making ends meet. It is for them I speak.

I ask now, as I asked the Senate last week: Who can live on $50 a month? Who can support a wife on $50 a month? Who can provide for the nurture of children for $50 a month? This is the question that goes to the adequacy of the personal exemption.

Though I did not vote for it, the Senate raised the salary of Senators to $42,500 a year, and during the course of the debate I heard a number of Senators state with what great difficulty they were getting along on $30,000 a year. Perhaps they know, then, what one can do with $50 a month. Perhaps they know that a $600 personal exemption is not adequate for one either to escape the poverty level or to achieve a moderate standard of living. And what is the definition of that, by our own National Government? A moderate standard of living is one that "provides

for the maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities."

Mr. President, I wish to attack the form of tax relief that the administration proposes, acknowledging that there is some economic question about tax reduction. But I deny that there is justification for the kind of tax reduction proposed in the pending bill, and I refer particularly to the rate changes. What are the rate changes? The bottom rate, which under present law is 14 percent, is changed to 13 percent. That is the provision of the pending bill. A one percentage point reduction in tax rates at the low-income level.

What would that mean, Mr. President? To a man who has a tax liability of $500, this means a $5 per year reduction in his taxes. How can he, with $5 a year, even buy ice cream for the children, let alone provide for the maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities?

Let us take the next rate. The next rate is changed from 15 percent to 14 percent—again, a one percentage point change in the rates on the small amounts.

Perhaps I am talking in figures that some of my colleagues will think are too small. Let us take the man who owes $1,000 in tax liability. This would give him a tax reduction of $10. Oh, we are getting somewhere now! For $10 the children might go to a movie now and then; or, if they are trying to escape poverty, they might buy a few more chicken necks to make soup. Perhaps this sounds a little stark. But go to the grocery store and keep your eyes open and see what the families with small incomes are buying. They do not buy steak and roasts. They buy scraps, necks, and feet, and wings now and then.

But perhaps this kind of talk is out of place in the Senate. I am sure it will be out of place in the United States Treasury, from the letter that Assistant Secretary Cohen submitted to the Senate yesterday. There is a disturbing assumption in that letter, which Senators will find printed in the RECORD—an assumption that underlies the Treasury assertion that fiscal responsibility requires that this bill, a tax reform and tax relief bill, not the budget, be a balanced revenue package.

That assumption is that providing decent housing, education, food, and clothing is so low on our scale of social values that if these necessities of life cannot be provided out of tax reform revenues, then our Government cannot afford to provide them for general tax revenues.

The Treasury again entertains that an SST is more important than a child's education, that an ABM has a higher social priority than a decent home, than clothing, and that a healthy diet for a child ranks below oil wells, railroad boxcars, and bankers' profits on our scale of national social values.

Yes, Mr. President, I am going to challenge with every ounce of vigor I can muster the assumptions and the basic theses of justification, of priorities, in our system contained in the Treasury letter.

All of these items to which I have referred are, by the assumptions of Secretary Cohen's letter, given a higher claim on the tax revenues of the U.S. Government. But if someone comes along and speaks for the fathers and mothers, the wage earners who are trying to buy or build a house and raise their children with a moderate standard of living, providing for their health and social well-being, then we have to produce a balanced revenue bill or else face the charge of fiscal irresponsibility.

I did not hear the Treasury claiming fiscal irresponsibility with respect to the new loopholes proposed in the bill. Indeed, the Treasury was proposing many of them. I did not hear the Treasury worrying about spending too much money when we considered the deployment of an ABM system. These projects now have first call ahead of the needs of food, clothing, and shelter for every taxpayer, his wife, and children.

It is certainly true that tax expenditures through deductions and exemptions are as much fiscal expenditures of the Government as though Congress appropriated the funds. I stand ready to affirm that belief by making decent provision for the necessities of life for the men, women, and children of our Nation through an increase in personal exemptions and this has a higher personal priority and it should make a sterner demand on our consciences than all the railroad boxcars, the SST's and, yes, even the superhighways that we are building.

I charge that the Treasury is guilty of fiscal myopia. The rule of fiscal irresponsibility rests in assuring our people, all the people, of a fair tax-free allowance for the necessities of life. My amendment passes that test; the bill and Treasury recommendation does not. The Treasury officials have consistently opposed my proposal to increase the personal exemption on the primary ground that it is not possible to raise a personal exemption to $1,000 due to fiscal needs. Thus, they assert that a $1,000 personal exemption would produce a long-term revenue shortfall within the bill, within the tax bill, within the tax reform and tax relief bill, of $8.1 billion.

Mr. President, the outgo and income of the U.S. Treasury are affected by other things. Where is the drive for economy? As I walked across to the Capitol from the Senate Office Building I observed seven men planting one little tree on the Capitol grounds. Maybe that is too small an item to refer to in this debate that affects billions of dollars and millions of people, but it is symbolic. Where were the Treasury officials, and my colleagues who are concerned with fiscal responsibility, when we voted on the amendment to cut the space program by a mere $100 million?

There are other places we can economize to greater advantage with less hurt to our society than to deny a fair personal exemption for the cost of supporting a wife, providing a house, providing food, providing clothing, and providing education for the children. To what would we attach a higher priority? I would have difficulty finding a higher priority myself, but by the letter of Secretary Cohen this is the place to economize.

Again I ask, and I shall continue to ask throughout the day: Who can live on $50 a month? Is there any Senator here who wishes to say he or one of his constitutents could maintain a decent standard of living on $50 a month? Who can support a wife for $50 a month? I know colleagues may tire of hearing me ask the question.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. I yield. I hope I am not irritating my colleague.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Senator is not irritating me; I am in agreement with the argument the Senator makes. I would like to address a number of inquiries to the Senator from Tennessee. When the Senator talks about living on $50 a month, is it not true that the $600 exemption was established in 1948?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The purchasing power of today's dollar as I understand from the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, is such that a taxpayer today would have to have $929 to have the equivalent of $600 in 1948. Is that correct.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct, except that that estimate was arrived at in October and the figure has increased since October.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Let us say that even if it were $929, that is a great deal of difference, if we talk about a minimum exemption to permit an individual to keep body and soul together. Certainly, to try to stay with the $600 exemption at the present time would be grossly unfair; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. This is the estimate supplied by an agency of the Government.

Mr. RIBICOFF. The Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Mr. GORE. Once again, may I say, we have the Secretary of the Treasury advancing $600 as an adequate amount; indeed, in the executive session of the committee he said to me that by the statistics of other agencies of the Government, he had become convinced it was not possible to warrant—I have forgotten his exact words—I believe he said that an increase in personal exemption beyond $600 was not warranted. Then, as the Senator will recall, I said that I do not believe any mother in America would agree with him. Yet, while we have the Department of the Treasury insisting that $600 a year is adequate, we have this official estimate of the Bureau of Labor Statistics that $929 is necessary for a minimum of existence in October of this year.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not a fact that the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee would remove twice as many people from the taxrolls as the committee amendment?

Mr. GORE. Yes, that is correct. I assert that that is one of its strong points.

Mr. RIBICOFF. In other words, what the Senator is trying to do, as I have tried to follow his excellent argument, is to concentrate tax relief provisions in the lowest income brackets instead of the highest income tax brackets.

Mr. GORE. This amendment and the committee bill provide fairly well for

those at the poverty level insofar as taxation is concerned, but it is the group with an income of $5,000 to $15,000 that is so harshly pressed and for whom my amendment would maximize relief.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I think that could be highlighted. The committee bill gives more dollars in tax relief to the 95,000 taxpayers who earn more than $100,000 a year than to the 30 million taxpayers who earn less than $7,000 a year; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. Yes, through rate reductions.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct.

Mr. GORE. Incidentally, if my calculations are correct—I do not find them just now, but if we desired—would the Senator repeat the statement he just made?

Mr. RIBICOFF. The committee bill gives more dollars in tax relief to the 95,000 taxpayers who earn more than $100,000 a year than to the 30 million taxpayers who earn less than $7,000 a year.

Mr. GORE. Last night, as I was studying this proposition, I made a little calculation. If we divide the $641 million of tax reduction provided by the bill, by the 95,000 who would receive it, we find an average tax reduction for that group, with $100,000 and more of taxable income, of $6,756 each.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Take another——

Mr. GORE. May I just go one step further?

Mr. RIBICOFF. Yes.

Mr. GORE. I also divided the 30 million taxpayers with incomes under $7,000 into the same amount—divided the same dollar amount by these 30 million taxpayers, and I find an average tax reduction for that lower income group of $20.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Nine out of 10 Americans make less than $15,000 a year. The committee bill would give these taxpayers only two-thirds of the tax relief. The Gore proposal would give the nine-tenths of all taxpayers, who earn less than $15,000 a year, 80 percent of tax relief; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. Correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Thus, basically, what the Senator from Tennessee is trying to do is to give the most relief in dollars to the greatest number of American taxpayers.

Mr. GORE. With particular emphasis on those with the most dependents to support.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is correct. One thing further that I think should be highlighted in the work of the Senator from Tennessee is a pertinent set of figures. As I understand the Gore proposal, a family of four would be permitted to retain $5,000 tax free when the Senator's amendment becomes fully effective in 1973.

Mr. GORE. Correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And this family, if its total earnings were, say, $7,500, would have its Federal income taxes reduced by almost one-half, whereas the committee bill would reduce them only by 7 percent.

Mr. GORE. Correct.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Thus, the concern of the Senator from Tennessee is basically with the majority of taxpayers and families in the United States.

Mr. GORE. That is correct. Again, let me say, with particular reference to those families with children, who desire to provide for the maintenance of health and social well-being for their families, the nurture of the children, and to participate in community activities.

Mr. RIBICOFF. That is what we are really trying to do, to build up our country instead of watching it disintegrate—with its families disintegrating the way they have been.

Mr. GORE. I am not sure whether the Senator was present when I cited the estimate of the Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, of the amount necessary for a family of four to maintain a moderate standard of living. It was $9,484 in 1968. I do not have the estimate yet for 1969.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have followed with great interest the criticism that the Senator from Tennessee is undergoing by many of those who have always held the Senator in high regard. It is rather amusing to watch them praise the Senator from Tennessee and then talk about the dastardly deeds he is seeking to accomplish through his amendment.

I believe they fail to understand what the Senator from Tennessee is really driving at. It is true that in the Senator's proposal, like the entire proposal, we are reordering the priorities in this country. I had hoped that the administration would have taken the lead in trying to show what this country actually needs in the way of priorities. But it has failed to do that. It has failed to take on this fight.

But the House and Senate, in the tax bill, have not come up with a bill that is only tax reform. A tax relief bill as well as tax reform bill has been brought to the floor of the Senate. Taking the tax relief bill as a basis of what the Senate is really acting upon, what the Senator from Tennessee is actually doing is examining most carefully the tax relief proposals of the pending bill and saying to the American people, "Let us see where the basic needs are. Let us see where the relief is needed. Let us come up with a proposal that will do the most for the people that need it the most in the United States." The Senator from Tennessee is being criticized when I think the Senator from Tennessee should be commended for the job he is doing to highlight his proposal.

I am honored, and I consider it a privilege, to cosponsor the Senator's amendment. I hope the Senator's amendment will prevail when we vote on it this afternoon.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful, indeed, to my able and distinguished colleague. As Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in a previous administration, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut is as well—I dare say more adequately—informed and equipped as any other Member of this body to measure and consider the standards and the needs of a decent social existence in our country.

I would like to inquire of him if he concurs in the estimate of the Bureau of Labor Statistics that somewhere near the $10,000 income level is necessary for a family of four to enjoy a moderate standard of living in this affluent society of ours.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I do not think there is any question about that. I certainly agree.

I think what the Senator is doing has even greater relevance to some of the problems that we have in America that I do not see anyone addressing himself to. Much is needed in this country for the lower income groups, the people under the poverty line. We are not going to be able to solve those problems unless we take into account the problems of the lower-middle income groups, because that is where the problems are. The lower income groups, including blacks reaching for a greater part of American affluence, all finding themselves in conflict with another part of our society. Whether one calls it the silent majority, the blue collar class, the white collar class, or the lower middle-income groups, unless we recognize the problems of this group in trying to keep body and soul together, to maintain their respectability, and to educate their children, we are going to find continued resistance in American society in trying to enact legislation to provide funds to lift up from the doldrums of our society those in poverty and those whose skins are black.

We make a great mistake in paying very little attention to the lower middle-income groups. Our society is rich enough and affluent enough to make sure that we solve the problems of the lower income groups, but, at the same time, we must remove the great conflicts that exist now, all over this country, between the lower income groups and the lower middle-income groups, who feel that no one gives a damn, so to speak, as to where they are going and what their problems are.

What the Senator from Tennessee is doing is a matter of great statesmanship, because in his amendment he recognizes that unless we ameliorate the problems of the lower middle-income groups—the $7,000, $8,000, $9,000, $10,000, $12,000, $15,000 group in our society, who represent nine-tenths of the American people—we are going to be hard pressed and hard put to put into effect the great reforms, social and economic, that this country needs.

Therefore, we must pay great attention to the Senator's proposal, because one of the few ways in which we can help solve the problems of the lower middle-income groups is by removing one of their greatest burdens—the disproportionate share that they pay by way of taxes for the running of our Government. Once we can solve that pressing problem, it is my opinion we can start moving in to take care of some of the problems of the lower income groups, which we in the Senate, in the House, and in the executive branch, have an obligation to achieve and accomplish.

Mr. GORE. I thank my distinguished colleague for that eloquent statement. I

concur in the sentiments he has expressed.

I wish to make further reference to his adversion to the disproportionate burden of taxation that falls upon the middle-income group. The changes in tax rate contained in the pending bill would make that burden worse instead of better. The top bracket rates were reduced drastically in 1964—far too much in my opinion at that time, and I still hold that opinion. The top rate was reduced from 91 percent to 70 percent—21 percentage points. And now the top rate is proposed to be reduced to 65 percent.

But that does not tell the whole story. By changing the brackets as well as the rates, the tax cut on some of the high-bracket incomes will be as much as 8 percentage points. If the bill should be adopted, I say to my distinguished colleague from Connecticut, then progressivity, the principle of graduation, the principle that people should pay taxes according to their ability to pay, that the more one earns, the more he pays, will all but be abolished beyond the income level of $50,000.

It is astounding to me that a Democratic Congress would consider, in a 5-year time bracket, the destruction of progressivity in our income taxes beyond the $50,000 level.

Oh, there is a place where the progressivity is very steep—very steep—as provided by the bill. From a taxable income level of $500 to $10,000, the progressivity is 100 percent. That is, the rate changes in the bill provide that from the rate of taxation on $500 of taxable income to $10,000 of taxable income, the rates are doubled—a 100-percent increase in rates.

Let us take another level. From the level of the tax rates on $100,000 of taxable income to $200,000 of taxable income, the rate increase is how much? Not up there at 100 percent. The increase is only 5 percent.

How does a Senator justify, or could anybody justify, in the name of progressivity, in the name of graduation in our income tax law, a progression of 100 percent on $9,500 in income, and 5 percent on an additional $100,000 income—that is, additional after one has attained the first $100,000?

Mr. RIBICOFF. I would say the Senator is absolutely right, and his amendment tends to bring a sense of sanity and an overdue sense of fairness to our tax laws. The proposal of the Senator from Tennessee certainly deserves the overwhelming support of this body.

Mr. President, we have the opportunity to reduce significantly the tax burden on the most overtaxed segment of our society—those in the middle- and low-income brackets.

Fairness alone dictates tax relief for those millions of Americans.

Last year the average citizen paid $163 in local taxes, $198 to his State government and then had to turn over $741 to the Federal Government.

The most effective tax relief we can provide is to increase the personal exemption and raise the minimum standard deduction. These reductions will remove the largest number of low-income taxpayers from the tax roles entirely and substantially reduce the overall tax on those most in need of this reduction.

The personal exemption now allowed each taxpayer is $600. This figure was set in 1948.

Despite a steady increase for the last 20 years in the price of goods and services, the personal exemption has remained the same.

Mr. President, the personal exemption is founded on the theory that every man is entitled to a tax-free sum of money to meet his most basic living expenses.

No one can possibly exist on $600 at today's prices.

In 1948 a loaf of bread cost 14 cents; a half a gallon of milk cost 43 cents. These are the prices of a bygone era, the last remaining vestige of which is the $600 exemption.

To equal the purchasing power of $600 in October, 1948, the personal exemption today would have to be $929. Thus a family of four would need exemptions of $3,716 to equal the $2,400 they received in 1948.

Mr. President, I support the amendment to the pending tax reform legislation increasing the personal exemption and the minimum standard deduction.

Under the bill reported by the Finance Committee, the 11 percent of Americans who earn over $15,000 receive one-third of the tax relief. This is unfair.

The amendment proposed by Senator GORE, which I am cosponsoring, would increase the tax relief afforded to the 9 out of 10 Americans who make less than $15,000. The Finance Committee bill would afford these people 66 percent of the relief. The Gore amendment would increase this to 81 percent.

Additionally, the Gore proposal would completely remove substantially more of the low-income poor from the tax rolls.

Under the Gore proposal, when it becomes fully effective, a family of four will be permitted to retain $5,000 tax free.

The taxes of this family if it earned $7,500 would be reduced by 47 percent under this proposal as compared to a reduction of less than 7 percent under the bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

I believe the proposal before this Senate is a sensible and responsible means to enact tax fairness. I urge its adoption.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. This colloquy punctuates the assertion I made earlier that even though we were unable to raise the personal exemption, I would still oppose the tax relief as proposed by the rate changes in the bill. It is regressive. It makes the tax burden disproportionately worse instead of better.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator tell us what the amount of the exemption is to be increased to ultimately?

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator mean by my amendment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. The personal exemption would reach the level of $1,000 for each taxpayer and dependent in the year 1973, progressing by $100 per year.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator knows that I have a deep concern over this progressivity, and I am sure he and I share a concern about regressive taxation. It is for that reason that I am troubled over the increase in the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000, because I can visualize it working out most inequitably.

A wealthy taxpayer, in a 70-percent income tax bracket, with a $1,000 personal exemption, would have a $700 tax benefit under the Senator's amendment; and a taxpayer down in the 20-percent bracket, a low-income taxpayer, would end up with only a $200 tax benefit. That seems to me to be an approach which is along the lines of letting the rich get richer and the poor get poorer. How does the Senator answer that problem?

Mr. GORE. Well, if we were considering an increase in the personal exemption or the provision of a tax credit for each dependent, without either being offered as a substitute for provisions in the bill that provide far greater relief for those in the upper-income brackets, then the answer would be of one order. But that is not the case. If the Senator asks me to compare a tax credit for each taxpayer and dependent with a personal exemption for each taxpayer and dependent, then I would say, as a tax purist, that we would need to consider it on its merits—and it does have merits, which I do not deny and do not wish to deny.

But if we concluded that a tax credit was the proper way to provide this tax relief for dependents, or for each taxpayer and each dependent, instead of a personal exemption, then it would seem that we should repeal the $600 exemption. And one can make a case for that.

Actually, a tax credit is, perhaps, from the standpoint of tax purists, more justifiable. But we do not operate in a vacuum. We begin from where we are. There is no provision in the tax law, in my opinion, that is more widely understood by the American people than the personal exemption. As I said earlier, before the able Senator entered the Chamber, this principle was incorporated in the first modern income tax law in 1913. It is a part of our economic and tax law fabric. The simplest way, I think the most widely accepted way, certainly the most widely understood way to provide tax relief for those with the largest families, is to increase that personal exemption.

If that be the case, then I come to this further facet of the question of the able Senator: Does it provide more relief for those with high incomes than for those with low incomes? This depends upon whether you consider an exemption provided at the bottom of one's income, before Federal taxation begins to apply, or whether you consider it as a reduction from the top income. Mathematically, it amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. Just one moment. Mathematically it amounts to the same thing. It means that a $100 added exemption for a taxpayer in the 20-percent bracket means less than a $100 added exemption for a taxpayer in the 50-percent bracket.

I think, however, that we must never lose sight of the fact that what I am offering here is substitution for tax rate changes which provide many times more

tax relief for those in the upper brackets than my amendment would provide.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. GORE. Now I yield.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator has just made a very important point, when he refers to other things in his amendment which are going to provide overall relief. I think the Senator will appreciate the fact that the average taxpayer is not too concerned about what you call this deduction or what you call that item; what he is really concerned about is how much that tax bill that he is going to have to pay amounts to. The Senator quite correctly interprets that attitude of the average taxpayer when he alludes to other rate changes that he is providing in his amendment, which are going to cause the taxpayers to pay less in taxes, certainly in the lower and low-middle income areas—areas I might say, toward which I am just as much interested in doing equity as is the Senator from Tennessee.

So I do not think we should be too concerned about the fact that this personal exemption has been hanging around on the income tax laws for a good many years. After all, this is supposed to be a tax reform bill; and if the personal exemption is out of date, if by increasing it we are going to be doing inequity by giving high-bracket taxpayers a better tax break than low-bracket taxpayers, maybe we ought to reform it and get rid of it.

The Senator points out that this tax credit—which is no original idea of mine; it has been on our statute books, in the case of the Iowa income tax law, for years—is a very fair way of handling this matter; and if a taxpayer ends up paying less tax because he has a tax credit of $150, for example, to take off his tax bill for himself and his wife and each of his children, it would seem to me that that, coupled with some rate changes, would really do a job of tax reform.

The Senator knows that in the committee we got fairly close together one morning in trying to come up with a better way of doing equity; certainly, to looking at the children as being proper objects of uniform treatment under tax law. To me a child, whether that child comes from a poor family or a wealthy family, ought to have the same status in the eyes of our income tax law.

I think it is wrong when a child who comes from a wealthy family represents in the eyes of the tax law a tax benefit for his parents amounting to $700, 70 percent of $1,000, and a child of a poor or low-income family that is in the 20-percent bracket only receives $200 recognition under the tax law.

Maybe this has been sticking around for a long time in the tax law. However, if we are really to accomplish some tax reform, this is a good way to get rid of the inequity once and for all.

I am in great sympathy with many things that the Senator is trying to do. I wish there were some way we could possibly modify the amendment, at least as far as children are concerned, to include a tax credit. I am sure that it could be worked out so that the tax bill the taxpayer would have to pay would be no greater, and perhaps less, for most people.

As I recall when we had a comparison by the Treasury Department, the difference in the impact between a $780 personal exemption and, I believe, a $180 income tax credit, on the low- and middle-income groups was much more beneficial in the case of tax credit.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator makes an able argument. He presented his case and this argument to the Senate Finance Committee. As the Senator will recall, I voted for each of the amendments the Senator offered in this regard. Unfortunately, the amendments did not receive majority support or a vote very close to a majority. The Senate Committee voted more closely upon an increase in the personal exemption, one vote being a tie vote, 8 to 8.

I think that illustrates the depth to which a personal exemption is imbedded in our tax law, in our social consciousness, and in our political concepts.

To further illustrate that, I know of no one other than the able senior Senator from Iowa, who has introduced a bill to substitute credit for an increase in the exemption. There may be some. I have not heard of them.

I do know that a number of Members of the Senate, several Members on the Senator's side of the aisle, have introduced bills this year to increase the personal exemption.

I refer, for instance, to the able minority leader, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who has introduced a bill to raise the personal exemption to $1,000.

I refer to my able and distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), who has introduced a bill to increase the personal exemption to $1,200.

And there are also a number of Senators on my side of the aisle. I do not now have particularly in mind all of those on both sides of the aisle who have introduced such bills. However, there are a number of them. That seems to me to further illustrate the extent to which the Senators and the people understand the personal exemption. And to further illustrate the fact, as the Senator may have noticed, I introduced in the RECORD letters of petition to the Senate delivered to me by three Members of the House of Representatives, two Democrats and one Republican, containing the names of far more than one-half of the membership of the other body, petitioning the Senate to increase the personal exemption.

When we add to that the fact that this is understood by the American people, and then consider that one of the goals of tax reform should be simplification and public understanding, I believe that the argument is then overwhelmingly in favor of proceeding with the approach of increasing the personal exemption.

I close my response to the able Senator from Iowa by saying that I recognize how the Senator feels about this.

I applaud his concern for equitable treatment of the family with children to nurture and educate. However, since his tax credit approach does not offer an opportunity of success in my opinion, I earnestly plead with him to join with me, as I joined with him, in providing this relief by the route which I believe has the chance of success.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his response. However, I think it gets down to this. Just because there may be a number of people who advocate an increase in the personal exemption regardless of the fact that it would give a bigger tax break for higher rather than for lower taxpayers and just because one could regard this as emanating from people who favor regressive taxation does not make it fair and does not make it right.

The Senator talks about people understanding this. I repeat that I think what people understand is what their tax bill is. And if their tax bill is going to be less because they are given a better understanding of rates and a tax credit off their tax bill, which would be better than what they are getting now by taking $600 off taxable income, I would think the taxpayer would be delighted, and especially the low-income people.

Possibly some of the higher bracket taxpayers would not like it as well because they would not get as much break with a $150 tax credit as they would with a $600 personal exemption. The $150 tax credit would take $150 off their bill, whereas if they are in the 70-percent bracket, a $600 personal exemption would mean a $420 deduction from the tax bill. So, naturally, some higher bracket taxpayers are not going to be happy with a tax credit. However, that does not mean that we should in turn give them a $700 tax break with a $1,000 exemption, when the people in the low-income bracket, paying 15 or 20 percent, would end up with a crumb from the table.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not accept the argument of the able Senator that an increase in the personal exemption is regressive.

I believe in the principle that has been a part of our tax law since 1913, that a minimum amount of income should be free from tax and that if one accepts this as a fair and socially, politically acceptable principle, then he can hardly deny the rich this stated minimum, the benefit of this principle, any more than he can withhold it and deny it to the poor.

I think it is a fair principle to allow every American citizen, rich or poor, a minimum for existence for himself and his dependents before the Federal income tax begins to lie. That is the principle on which the personal exemption is based.

I do not accept the theory of the Senator that this principle is regressive. I think it is quite sound, and whether or not the taxes are regressive or progressive depends upon the rate schedules applied to the income beyond this level. beyond this minimum level.

I wish to place in the RECORD at this point a table which shows that the pending bill would, in fact, be regressive. Tax rate reductions are small at the bottom, with largest reductions at the level of

$50,000 a year and upward. Beyond $50,000, the percentage of tax reduction provided by the committee bill, by the change in the rate schedule, goes up instead of down.

I ask unanimous consent to have the table printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF TAX REDUCTION UNDER PERSONAL EXEMPTION PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270

Tax reduction for family of 4

[Assumes nonbusiness deductions=20 percent of income]

AGI	Present law	Tax reduction under H.R. 13270	Percentage decrease under H.R. 13270 [1]	Tax reduction under tax funds proposal [1]	Percentage decrease under proposal
$3,000	0	0	0.0	0	0.0
$3,500	$56	$56	100.0	$56	100.0
$4,000	112	47	42.0	112	100.0
$5,000	230	30	13.0	230	100.0
$7,500	552	36	6.7	262	47.5
$10,000	924	56	6.6	304	32.9
$12,500	1,304	76	5.8	304	23.3
$15,000	1,732	96	5.5	352	20.3
$17,500	2,172	116	5.3	352	16.2
$20,000	2,660	152	5.7	400	15.0
$25,000	3,708	216	5.8	448	12.0
$50,000	11,060	608	5.5	720	6.5
$100,000	31,948	2,256	7.1	928	2.9
$500,000	249,300	22,656	9.1	1,120	.5

[1] Provisions as effective for taxable years beginning in 1973.

(At this point Mr. BYRD of Virginia assumed the chair.)

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I do not want to prolong the discussion, but I must tell my friend that perhaps in his thinking the word "regressive" means something different from the meaning in the mind of the Senator from Iowa. If we are going to come up with a change in the tax law under the name of tax reform, which is going to mean that a wealthy taxpayer is going to have a $1,000 personal exemption and a $700 tax break as a result of it, because he is in a 70-percent income tax bracket, and a low-income taxpayer with a $1,000 exemption is going to have only a $200 tax break, I think this is pretty regressive; and I think it falls in the same area of criticism as the tax rates to which the Senator from Tennessee is now referring.

If that is not regressive, I do not know what the word means. I repeat that while there may be a number of people who have not thought through the personal exemption and thought through what would happen to wealthy taxpayers and low-income taxpayers by increasing it from $600 to $1,000, that does not mean that the U.S. Senate should go ahead and compound inequity.

I do not know how the Senator's amendment is going to fare, but if it should not be adopted, I would suggest to him that there ought to be a little collaboration here, possibly to improve upon the tax rates and to tie in a tax credit, certainly so far as the children are concerned. If we did that, I think we would be applauded; and it would not take very long, through the mass media and the rapidity of communications, for the American people to know that finally, after many years, we did in fact achieve some tax reform in this very important area of tax law.

I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. GORE. I thank my able friend. He and I, I think, could entertain ourselves with a discussion of the number of spirits on the point of a needle. Particularly, I would enjoy hearing my able friend the senior Senator from Iowa. But I think the principles involved herein have been fairly stated.

My amendment would provide more relief for the people who need it most, the people with most dependents to support, in the lower middle income bracket.

As will be noted, the pending bill provides a tax reduction of $30 for a taxpayer with $5,000 taxable income and a wife and two children. Once again, I ask: What does a $30 tax reduction per year really mean to a man with a wife and two children? That is $7.50 each. The cost of living for four people has increased more than that in the last 30 days. My amendment does not do too well by him, perhaps. It would give him a tax reduction of $230. He cannot do too much with $230, but at least it is $200 more than $30. That is not regressive. That is trying to be fair.

Let us take another. Each of the taxpayers to whom I refer in this table and to whom I will refer in the comments on the table is one with a taxable income of a given amount and three dependents. Take the taxpayer with an income of $7,500. The committee bill, which is called a tax reform and tax relief bill, provides tax relief of $36. That is $3 a month for a family of four. My amendment would give this taxpayer a tax reduction of $262.

Let us go to another. With an income of $10,500, the bill would give him a tax relief of $56; my amendment, $304.

Let us go to $15,000. The committee bill reduces his taxes $96. This is beginning to be meaningful; $96 is $8 a month, $2 each. They can go to a couple of movies for that. My bill, instead, gives him a tax reduction of $352. The two begin to reach equality just above the $50,000 income level. Let us take a taxpayer with $50,000 income. The committee bill would give tax relief of $608.

My amendment would give him tax relief of $720. Beyond that, the committee bill begins to pile up the benefits. The taxpayer with an income of $100,000 receives a tax reduction of $2,256.

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

Mr. GORE. I shall yield in just a moment.

For a taxpayer with $500,000 income, the committee bill would give him a tax reduction of $22,656. My amendment would give him a tax reduction of $1,120. Mr. President, mind you, he has no more children under the committee bill than he has under my bill. He still has two children to support and a wife to support.

Now, it may be, as the Senator from Iowa states, that there is some element of unfairness in providing $1,120 tax relief for a man with $500,000 income because he has three dependents while providing only $304 in tax relief for a taxpayer with the same number of dependents and income of $10,000.

One can recognize that, but let us look at the differences in the committee bill and its treatment of those two men. The committee bill provides relief for a taxpayer with $10,000 of $56; and the taxpayer with $500,000 of income, of $22,656. So my amendment would substitute $1,120 tax relief for a provision that provides a tax reduction of $22,656. How anyone would construe that as regressive I am unable to say.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would like to underscore what the Senator is talking about. Statistically speaking, what the Senator has said is correct. The people having more than $50,000 in income a year, representing less than one-half of 1 percent of the people who file tax returns, receive an undue share of tax relief.

The bill before the Senate provides 13.4 of the tax relief to this group, which represents less than four-tenths of 1 percent of all taxpayers, which demonstrates conclusively that the benefit is going to those who need it least. It is unnecessarily beneficial to the rich; and it is unnecessarily inadequate for the poor.

The ratio of relief between the $20,000 and $50,000 category—the amount of tax relief provided under the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, of which I am a cosponsor—is not as great to those people with incomes of less than $20,000, and the bulk of the American people are in that category of incomes of less than $20,000.

We proceeded with the basic belief that a man in the poverty bracket would not have to pay a tax. I would like to call attention to the fact that the need to increase the personal exemption is not a new idea. The Treasury Department made a study of exemptions in 1947.

Mr. GORE. Before the Senator gets to that point, I would like to give another illustration which was brought up by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut.

The committee bill would provide, by tax rate changes, $641 million of tax reduction for 95,000 taxpayers with incomes of $100,000 and over. Let me repeat—$641 million for 95,000 taxpayers.

Mr. HARTKE. For how many?

Mr. GORE. 95,000. It provides approximately an equal amount of tax reduction

of $641 million for 30 million taxpayers with incomes under $7,000.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I think this statement is very important. I hope the Senate understands what is being said. It is a situation with so many facets, one which requires so much understanding, but one thing is clear and that is that some tax relief is needed for the low- and middle-income groups.

I agree with the Senator about what the Senator from Iowa said. There may be some fancy juggling with statistics in regard people with incomes of over $100,000, but that is not where the need is. Those people do not come home and meet the mother and the kids every Friday night with a paycheck and figure out how they are going to cut down on expenses. I might turn to those who are in the poverty group. Those figures are not very extravagant. They do not talk about buying a new car every year. They buy things that people with incomes over $100,000 would never worry about. They might buy a different used car every 4 years.

The point I am talking about is that people in the lower levels, and the poverty level, have a standard that is not very high.

To return to the circumstances we have today, if tax relief is to be given to people in the same proportions as when the $600 exemption was established after World War II, we would have to go not to $1,000, but to more nearly $2,500. We have not kept pace with the times. The needs of individuals have gone up and but the tax relief has gone down.

I hope that someday economists and sociologists apply themselves to what happens to people when the tax laws are changed. This is what the Senator is talking about, and I commend him for it. The Senator is talking about what happens to a man and a woman who have two children, ages 7 and 13. They are in the position where they have to worry about whether they are going to eat hamburger this week or soup. That is the difference.

Mr. GORE. I believe it is illustrated by a simple question: Who can live on $50 a month?

Mr. HARTKE. I think this is elementary. I commend the Senator.

I know that the Senator is quite aware of what I am about to say, but in 1947 the Treasury Department made a study of the entire question of exemptions and they came to certain basic conclusions. This was right after World War II. Before World War II there was a personal exemption of $1,000, then it went to $500 and finally back to $600. I wish to quote one paragraph from the study to which I have referred:

> According to a widely accepted view, the exemption should be at least adequate to cover some minimum essential living costs, such as the amount required for reasonable maintenance. It is conceded that the adjustment of exemptions to living costs may not be exact and that under emergency conditions it may be necessary to go below ordinary minima. For the long run, however, it is to be regarded as essential to exempt amounts required to maintain the individual and his family in health and efficiency.

That is exactly what the Senator from Tennessee is talking about, and what I am talking about, what the committees are talking about, and the great bulk of Americans. The average American has suffered long enough. It is time we recognize that the end of that suffering must come and that we must do something for these people.

I talked to a young man this week in Washington. He said to me, "You people on the Hill had better get busy." I said, "What's the problem?" He said, "I am working three jobs a day in order to keep my family going." I asked him, "How many children do you have?" He said. "Four."

I think that the attitude of people should be reflected in a government that is really concerned about human needs.

Mr. GORE. I want to thank the Senator from Indiana for joining me in sponsorship of the amendment. I have always found him to be a champion in the cause of justice and equity in tax policy and tax law.

With regard to the young gentleman the Senator just mentioned with four children and a wife, working at three jobs in order to maintain them, the Government estimate that I saw as of October last year stated that a family of four would need an income of $9,484 to maintain a moderate standard of living. I do not have the figure for December of 1969. I do not know what it will be in April of 1970. But, surely, it is in the order of $10,000. Yet, for this man, whom the Senator has cited, with a wife and four children, if he is able, by working at three jobs, to earn $10,000, the pending bill would provide him a tax relief of $56. I thought the Senator would be interested in that.

Mr. HARTKE. There is no question about the need for the bill. It is here. Now is the time. It is repetitious to keep talking about it. Frankly, even if we do not increase the personal exemption, there will be cost to the Government. People will be driven to welfare. They must pay their bill. Maybe not as well as they would like to. It sort of depreciates their appreciation of their Government because they feel that somehow or another they are not able to earn their way and therefore they are forced to go to some agency that they would prefer not to use.

I am not one who says that all people on welfare really apply themselves as well as they should, but most apply out of sheer need. It is time to eliminate many people from the taxrolls. The welfare load should be reduced. To a great extent while 50 percent is paid by the Federal Government and the States also, it is true that property taxes are soaring. Look at it on that basis. Probably it would provide not alone an equality or a utilization of the tax money collected but in addition probably would give some relief to people from the tensions they feel from the tremendous squeeze occasioned by the cost of living. The standard of living has increased in this country and, therefore, it is just, equitable, fair, good, and right, that my amendment to increase the personal exemption be adopted.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator. I wish Mr. President, to make particular reference to the letter of the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury published in the RECORD on yesterday. The first fallacy of the argument which the Treasury advances is that it assumes failure to produce in this particular bill a relative balance between revenues and tax relief is, ipso facto, a demonstration of fiscal irresponsibility. Nothing could be further from the truth. A judgment as to fiscal responsibility depends on the impact of my proposal on the total budget picture of the Government, upon the total economy of the country, and upon the social fabric and the consequences of the proposal, and not just the amounts in the particular bill.

No one in the Treasury or elsewhere, so far as I am aware, has asserted that an increase in the personal exemption will, in and of itself, produce a budget deficit either in the short run or in the long run. Indeed, quite the contrary is true.

Given reasonable estimates as to future needs of spending and increased tax revenues from growth in the economy, we can expect a unified budget surplus of from $3 billion to $6 billion in the coming fiscal years, even with an increase to a more realistic $1,000 personal exemption.

Mr. President, this estimate is not lightly arrived at. I ask that this subject be given careful consideration, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table which verifies this conclusion.

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

ESTIMATED BUDGET EFFECTS OF GORE PROPOSAL—FISCAL YEARS

[In billions]

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Revenue:					
1. Present law (including surcharge for 6 months of 1970 and assumed 6 percent annual increase in revenues)	$197.2	$209.0	$221.5	$234.8	$248.9
2. Tax reform	+1.6	+3.8	+4.7	+5.0	+5.3
Total revenue	198.6	212.8	226.2	239.8	254.2
Increase in personal exemption ($700 in calendar 1970; $800 in 1971; $900 in 1972; $1,000 in 1973)	−1.6	−5.5	−9.4	−13.0	−14.8
Net revenue after increase in personal exemption	197.0	207.3	216.8	226.8	239.4
Expenditures (assumes $10,000,000,000 per year increase)	−192.9	−203.0	−213.0	−223.0	−233.0
Unified budget surplus	+4.1	+4.3	+3.8	+3.8	+6.4

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Treasury Department has not even attempted to assert the contrary. This illustrates that the question of fiscal responsibility partakes of many parts, not merely a narrow measurement between tax reform and tax relief. Indeed, this question goes, as I have said, to our whole society. Further revenues from tax reform have nothing logically to do with a tax measure to increase or reduce the tax burden.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Fowler stated on numerous occasions before congressional committees that the issues of tax reform on the one hand and tax decreases or increases on the other are two quite separate and independent issues. He was correct.

Proper tax reforms should be enacted because they constitute wise, fair, equitable tax policy. Appropriate tax relief should be enacted because it is in the best interests of our people, because of economic justification, and because of revenue needs. But it does not mean at all, Mr. President, that in order to have tax reform, we engage in the sham of tax relief by rate changes of 1 percentage point for the low brackets on small amounts of income and up to 8 percentage points in the high brackets on large amounts.

One could almost reach the conclusion that the rate changes, meager as they are, in effect, on the lower brackets, are proposed only as an excuse to give big tax cuts to those in the high brackets. I do not really know how one can avoid that conclusion, because a reduction of 1 percentage point for a taxpayer with a tax liability of $50 is 50 cents.

But if that appears ridiculous, take 1 percentage point on a tax liability of $1,000. This gives a tax reduction, under the committee bill, of $10.

This is a costly excuse for giving a $22,000 tax reduction to a man with an income of $500,000.

Who can say that this is according to need or can be arrived at by the imposition of taxation according to ability to pay?

The issues of tax reform and tax reduction and of budgetary balance are separate issues, and there need not be a connection between the revenues to be derived and expended through each of these two or three separate actions. One may follow the other, of course, unless both receive simultaneous treatment, but each should and must stand upon its own justification.

The burden of proof of fiscal responsibility is on the administration in supporting this bill, which provides a new loophole for railroads; which continues unreasonable percentage depletion allowances for oil, gas, and the minerals; which continues a tax loophole for banks, for real estate; and which provides, as I have indicated, unjustifiable tax relief for individuals with high incomes.

Those who advocate these measures, it seems to the Senator from Tennessee, are hard put to justify them either from the standpoint of fiscal responsibility or of social justice. That burden has not been satisfied so far as I am concerned, nor will it be, in my opinion, for the American people so long as the Treasury insists on viewing my proposal, or the proposal of others of similar portent, with fiscal blindness that prevents their seeing beyond the four corners of the bill.

I wish to refer further, Mr. President, to the letter of Assistant Secretary Cohen. One of the most shocking statements to bear the official imprimatur of this administration is one contained in this letter of Assistant Secretary Cohen to Senator LONG relative to my amendment, which will be found in the RECORD of yesterday's debate, at page 36264.

In commenting on the burden of supporting and educating children—a burden which my amendment would do much to relieve—Secretary Cohen, speaking officially for the Nixon administration, stated:

> Through appropriations for education and other purposes, the cost of raising large families is already borne to a considerable extent by those who did not beget the children.

Mr. President, this illustrates the gross insensitivity, if not the social callousness, that this administration repeatedly displays toward the mass of our people. I thought we had long ago gotten beyond the point where we regarded public education as the responsibility of parents alone. I thought everyone had understood for at least the seven decades of this century, if not for the 3½ centuries of our colonial and national existence, the responsibility of government, whether it be local, State, or National, the responsibility of the whole society, in the field of education.

We do not have public education for the benefit, pecuniary or otherwise, of the parents of our children. We have public education for the benefit, betterment, and progress of the whole society. This point is cardinal to the whole question of public school development, including problems of desegregation, both North and South.

True, Mr. President, there are still some individuals who want to avoid and deny responsibility for children, for education of children. I recall, as a superintendent of education in a county in Tennessee, I sought to provide additional educational facilities; and I recall one gentleman, who had not been favored with offspring in his lifetime, but who had been so fortunate as to acquire a considerable amount of wordly goods in the form of rich farmland. He vigorously resisted increasing the county tax rate, and said to me and others that he did not want to bear any responsibility for educating the children that others beget. I find the Secretary of the Treasury following this same antediluvian principle.

I thought Thomas Jefferson successfully led the fight to settle that a long time ago. Here is what he said:

> By far the most important bill in our whole code, is that for the diffusion of knowledge among the people. No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness.

Then later he said:

> If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be.

Yet, Secretary Cohen seems to be arguing with Thomas Jefferson. If he is, I should like to quote Jefferson a little further:

> Enlighten the people generally, and tyranny and oppression of both mind and will vanish.

And he continued:

> The tax which will be paid for the purpose of education is not more than the thousandth part of what will be paid to kings, priests, and nobles who will rise up among us if we leave the people in ignorance.

Yet, Mr. President, on December 1, 1969, we have the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury in the Nixon administration writing to the U.S. Senate:

> Through appropriations for education and other purposes the costs of raising large families is already borne to a considerable extent by those who did not beget the children.

If Thomas Jefferson could hear that, to use a colloquialism, he would turn over in his grave. How many times have we condemned those who pled for segregated schools on the basis that the poor, those who do not live in the affluent suburbs, those who are black or of some Spanish-derived descent, or oriental, do not pay as much in taxes as do the richer elements of society, and therefore do not have and perhaps should not have equal school facilities, and therefore should not be entitled to invade the better public schools in the more affluent neighborhoods.

As early as 1647, with the so-called Old Deluder law, the responsibility of the community to establish schools was proclaimed. With the passage of time and further progress in education, we moved away from purely local control of education to State control, and all State systems have long since incorporated six very important principles: They are tax supported, they are under public control, they are free of charge at least through the secondary level, they are nonsectarian, they are compulsory to a certain age or grade level, they are universal in scope, and their cost is borne by general taxation.

This has been established by democratic development since the age of the Old Deluder law in 1647; and yet, we have Secretary Cohen complaining today that people of affluent income are already bearing—well, perhaps I had better read it:

> Through appropriations for education and other purposes the costs of raising large families is already borne to a considerable extent by those who did not beget the children.

Mr. President, I am thinking about the children. I do not wish to assess blame for those who brought them into the world. I wish, however, that our tax laws be fair and equitable, and whether we condemn a father and a mother for having children or whether we do not—and I do not—who can support a child on $50 a month? Is this a birth control measure? If we wish to deal in the future, with birth control, family planning, et cetera, that should be dealt with in another bill. Here we are dealing with

taxation, and I am talking about the father and the mother living out in the suburbs, with a big mortgage on a little house already filled with children.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I submit to the Senator that while he is making an eloquent argument, he is using what we in debate usually refer to as a strawman technique: He is making an eloquent argument in answer to an argument the other fellow did not make.

Mr. GORE. The Senator put it in the RECORD yesterday.

Mr. LONG. I have read what the Secretary said twice. The Senator is making an eloquent argument against an argument the Secretary did not make. It would seem to me to be logical for the Senator to make his argument against the argument which the Secretary did make. That way, it might appeal to the Secretary; but I do not see how the Senator can convince somebody by answering an argument he did not make. Why does the Senator not answer the argument he did make? I have read the words the Senator referred to; but it would seem to me that the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury made a logical argument, to which I would be interested in hearing a logical response, but I see no point in either knocking over a strawman or lighting a match to it. Why does the Senator not respond to the argument the Secretary made?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall be glad to. I thought I had.

Mr. LONG. I have read it twice now, while the able Senator was answering an argument the man did not make.

Mr. GORE. It might enlighten the Senator to hear it read. Let me read it aloud, if the Senator does not mind. I am almost constrained to put the whole letter in the RECORD, but since it appears on page 36264, perhaps I should not burden the taxpayers by reprinting all of the letter again. But I wish at least to read this entire paragraph:

Thus the burden of supporting children above the minimum HEW standards would be shifted from the large families which have the children—

Does the Senator understand that?

Mr. LONG. I think I understand the whole paragraph. What concerns me is that I think the Senator does not understand those words he is reading.

Mr. GORE. That is fine, if the Senator understands.

The Secretary of the Treasury said:

Thus the burden of supporting children above the minimum HEW standards would be shifted—

Now he is talking about my amendment. That is what he is talking about. Let us understand that. He is saying that my amendment would shift the burden of supporting children above the minimum HEW standards—

from the large families which have the children—

That is not hard to understand—

to the single persons and smaller families.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. GORE. Yes. That is what it says.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree that his amendment would do what the Secretary says in that respect?

Mr. GORE. I agree that my amendment would provide the most tax relief for the taxpayers who need it most, those with the most children to support.

Mr. LONG. That is not precisely what the Secretary said.

Mr. GORE. All right. Let me read it again.

Mr. LONG. That sentence speaks clearly for itself, it seems to me.

Mr. GORE. If that is clear to the able junior Senator from Louisiana, it is clear to me. We will then go to the next sentence.

Mr. LONG. It means just what is says, that is all.

Mr. GORE. The next sentence reads:

Through appropriations for education and other purposes the costs of raising large families is already borne to a considerable extent by those who did not beget the children.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree with that?

Mr. GORE. That is what the Secretary says.

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator agree that is correct, that the Senator's amendment would tend to do that?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I think to use that as an argument against a principle of equitable taxation is older than Thomas Jefferson. I thought that was settled in the fight in Virginia. I thought that was settled by the democratic process that began, as I said, with the "Old Deluder" law. Let me continue to read. This is the conclusion he reaches:

We believe the committee has acted wisely in lowering the burden on all taxpayers whose incomes are above the minimum HEW levels, particularly upon those whose incomes are modestly above such levels, rather than—

Does the Senator follow me?

I continue to read—

rather than distributing the tax relief by size of families.

There, Mr. President, we have it. He does not wish to distribute tax relief in accordance with the size of families. The affluent people who are either single or have but few children are already, as he says, bearing a heavy burden in educating the children that others beget.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, as I understand what the Assistant Secretary is saying here, it is that when we get just above the poverty level, he wants to distribute the tax reduction according to need rather than according to number.

Mr. GORE. He does not say that.

Mr. LONG. That is what I understand.

Mr. GORE. How does he arrive at the conclusion of giving a $22,000 reduction to a man with $500,000 in income? Is that need?

Mr. LONG. The pending bill——

Mr. GORE. Answer my question. Is that need? The Senator laid down the yardstick.

Mr. LONG. The tax reduction in the pending bill with respect to a man above an income of $25,000 is not based on need.

Mr. GORE. The Senator violates his own yardstick when he gets above $25,000.

Mr. LONG. No, I do not violate it.

Mr. GORE. On what basis?

Mr. LONG. It is an adjustment for people in the lower income brackets.

Mr. GORE. That is a mechanism for doing something. Why is it done? The Senator started by saying it is on a basis of need. Now he is running from it.

Mr. LONG. I have never for a moment contended that where we reduce rates it is justified for a person in the upper tax brackets on the basis that he needs the money. He does not have to have bread or other things.

The Senator would increase taxes on a lot of single people and married couples and couples with one dependent who need their money every bit as much as the people he would like to help. In fact, the Senator would increase the tax benefit more for the people for whom he would provide tax increases.

Unfortunately, a lot of people who are taxed under the pending bill would be taxed even if the Senator's amendment were to provide that they can be said to need the money and expenses.

I would like to have a tax system work on such a basis that we would not tax anyone who has any pressing need for the money.

The Government needs money, and it would be inflationary if we were not to try to maintain some balance in our budget.

May I state the argument that I understand the Secretary to be stating here?

Mr. GORE. Surely.

Mr. LONG. It seems to me that the Senator is answering an argument that the Secretary did not make.

It seems to me that the Secretary is saying—I think we will both agree—that we do not want to tax a person whom we define as being in the poverty bracket.

The Senator modified the amendments he offered in the committee to take that into account.

What the Secretary was advocating and what the committee seemed to agree on did more for the poor than did the Gore amendment.

So we agree, I would think, that where a person is regarded as being in the poverty bracket, he should not have to pay any income tax at all.

I submit that what the Secretary is saying is that when you tax these taxpayers who are in the lowest tax brackets—and I am talking about the people who are paying at the 13, 14, and 15 percent rate—we ought to tax those people who are paying at the lower rate according to need. And the Senator's approach based on the need to which the Secretary is referring would place a heavier tax on single people or married couples or couples with but one child that would be a heavier tax burden based on need than the administration seems to think we ought to impose on those people.

The Senator points out that those

people are already paying taxes for the support and assistance of families to educate children. And he contends that the big families, if there is no greater need for them, ought to pay something, little though it might be, for the education and support of their own children, the same way in which a single person who is equally in need ought to pay taxes. It is also fair that a married person equally in need ought to pay for the support of his own children.

If we were to raise the exemption to the point that the Senator would like to raise it, we would not be talking about a bill that would cost $9 billion in revenue, but we would be talking about a bill that would cost $50 billion in revenue.

Unfortunately, if we did that, we know that we would have a huge Government deficit and would be adding to the inflationary spiral and might well take away from those people, in terms of inflation, as much as we would hope to do for them in terms of tax reduction.

Mr. GORE. I am grateful to have the explanation of the Secretary's letter by the distinguished chairman of the committee. It is enlightening. But the letter stands as written. The Senator's explanation does not change it. The letter can be found in yesterday's RECORD.

The Senator from Louisiana made a statement, however, that I must challenge. He said that I propose—that is, that the senior Senator from Tennessee proposes—to increase the tax on single taxpayers and on taxpayers having small families, for the benefit, as I believe he said, of taxpayers having large families. That is not the case. My amendment would not increase the tax on any taxpayer above the tax levied by present law.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will yield, so that we might just get together on this point, I am talking about what would be done relative to the committee bill.

Mr. GORE. All right. I appreciate the amendment of the Senator's statement compared with the committee bill.

My amendment would provide a heavier tax liability for some taxpayers. I want to come to that. But before doing so, I wish to make it perfectly plain that my amendment does not increase the tax liability of any taxpayer over the present law.

Let us begin with single persons. A single taxpayer having an income of $1,700 would have a tax reduction of $109 under the committee bill. It would be $100 under my amendment. So that is evening up.

Now I should like to discuss the status of a single taxpayer having an income of $3,000. The committee bill would provide him a tax reduction of $96. My amendment would provide a tax reduction of $131. So my amendment would not discriminate against him.

Take a single tax payer with $5,000 taxable income. The committee bill would give him a tax reduction of $52. My amendment would give him a tax reduction of $76.

A single taxpayer with $10,000 taxable income: The committee bill would give him a tax reduction of $122. My amendment would give him a tax reduction of $130.

Now let us come to a single taxpayer with an income of $15,000, and at that point the committee bill would give him a tax reduction of $304; my amendment, $278.

Let us now come to the point at which the committee bill would give him more tax reduction. A single taxpayer with an income of $20,000 would receive from the committee bill a tax reduction of $626; my amendment, $576.

At the $50,000 income level, the committee bill would provide a tax reduction of $3,104; my amendment, $2,482.

At the $100,000 level, the committee bill would give him a tax reduction of $5,104; my amendment would provide a tax reduction of $2,664. The further up the scale one goes from there, the greater the disparity.

I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that single taxpayers with hundreds of thousands of dollars of income derived from this economy, which belongs to all Americans, derived from the processes of government and society of which he is such a wonderful beneficiary, does in fact owe a social responsibility to contribute to the government that provides the education and the well-being, in large measure, for the mass of our people.

I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON OF TAX REDUCTION UNDER PERSONAL EXEMPTION PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270

TAX REDUCTION FOR SINGLE PERSONS [1]

[Assumes nonbusiness deductions=20 percent of income]

AGI	Present law	Tax reduction under H.R. 13270 [1]	Decrease under H.R. 13270 (percent)	Tax reduction under proposal [1]	Decrease under proposal (percent)
$900	0	0	0	0	0
1,700	$109	$109	100.0	$109	100.0
3,000	276	96	34.8	131	47.4
4,000	424	80	18.9	114	26.9
5,000	576	52	9.0	76	13.2
7,500	998	68	6.9	98	9.8
10,000	1,480	122	8.2	130	8.8
12,500	2,022	196	9.7	182	9.0
15,000	2,638	304	11.5	278	10.5
17,500	3,334	452	13.6	414	12.4
20,000	4,096	626	15.3	576	14.1
25,000	5,800	1,034	17.8	930	16.0
50,000	16,322	3,104	19.0	2,482	15.2
100,000	41,394	5,104	12.3	2,664	6.4

[1] Provisions as effective for taxable years beginning in 1973.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking to an amendment which would cost the Government several billion dollars a year—roughly, $5.8 billion a year—more in revenue loss than would the committee bill.

If the Senator would direct himself to an increase in the exemption to about $800 per person rather than $1,000, he would be speaking in terms of about the same revenue loss as entailed in the bill reported by the committee. If the Senator is directing himself to a revenue loss of approximately the same amount, his amendment, tailored to an $800 figure, which would be about the same revenue loss as the committee bill, would involve the shift of approximately $1 billion of tax reduction from those with either no family or with families of a wife and no children in favor and to the benefit of those with families of four or more.

At the point where one has a wife and two children, there would appear to be a slight balance in favor of the Senator's argument in terms of revenue impact, but not much. In order to achieve that, the Senator's amendment would sacrifice the advantages of simplicity that are gained by increasing the standard deduction, which benefits middle-income families, from 10 percent up to 15 percent, and with the top limit from $1,000 up to $2,000. There is something in it that does not meet the eye, and that is the great amount of inconvenience to people to have to keep the records to prepare the tax returns in order to itemize a claim for deductions, the expense that occurs to a great number of people because of having to pay someone to advise and consult, and the time involved in going to those people for help in preparing one's income tax return. So there are advantages in the committee bill in addition to the rate reduction that the committee voted.

While, of course, the Senator's amendment would do much good for many people, if it is reduced to the same revenue loss, it would also impose additional taxes on a great number of people, the majority of whom are in the same earning brackets that the Senator would seek to benefit.

Mr. GORE. I thank the able Senator. I suggest that he be careful lest he set up a strawman for himself?

The Treasury letter concludes by comparing an increase in the personal exemption to $800 with the tax reduction provisions in the Finance Committee bill.

It is asserted that my proposal is not as effective as the pending bill for single persons, married couples with no dependents, and married couples with one dependent. I am offering an amendment to increase the personal exemption to $1,000. But even taking the administration figure of an $800 exemption, to which the able Senator has just referred, it is worthwhile noting that with respect to taxpayers, about whom the administration is so concerned—I call it to the Sen-

ator's attention in response to his statement—the administration asserts that at an $800 personal exemption, single persons would receive $392 million less relief than under the committee bill. But almost one-half of this excess relief goes to high-bracket taxpayers.

If the Senator wishes to beat his breast for the benefit of the single taxpayers in the income brackets of hundreds of thousands of dollars and aline himself with the philosophy expressed in the Assistant Secretary's letter, he has every right to do so. But it is certainly contrary to all the "grandma" amendments I have heard him offer on the floor as amendments to the social security bill.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator offering me assurance that if his amendment for a $1,000 exemption is rejected, he will not offer one for an exemption of a lesser figure, perhaps $900, $800, $950—some figure less than $1,000?

Mr. GORE. The assurance I am pleased to give the Senator is that should the Senate err in not adopting the amendment to raise the personal exemption to $1,000, I shall then offer it at $900 or $800, or, indeed, I might even split the hundreds. I am very strongly opposed to the rate changes recommended in the committee bill. As I have said, and I repeat, the meager tax reduction given in the lower brackets by rate changes can be viewed, in my opinion, as but excuses to provide big tax cuts for the high brackets. I am opposed to it and I offer as a substitute for that proposal tax relief for those who need it most, the people at the low-income level with families to support.

Yes, I will give assurance, not ad infinitum, but until I win.

Mr. LONG. I had assumed the Senator would do so. If we were debating the Senator's amendment just as he offered it, I would be willing to debate it on the ground that the Government cannot stand the revenue loss, but I anticipated, and I am not constrained to say that I am happy about the proposition, the Senator would offer it at a lesser figure if it failed at $1,000.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. The Senator had better stay around because support has been rising for the $1,000 exemption in the last few days, and, particularly, if those on the other side of the aisle who have introduced amendments vote as they have introduced amendments. I think they will, I anticipate that they will, and I shall shout with glee when they do.

Mr. LONG. I am equally impressed by the fact that during the course of this debate we have had some difficulty in prevailing upon Senators to be present to hear the arguments. At the moment, the Senator is addressing himself ably to this proposition, as he has on previous occasions. It seems to me that we could get on more expeditiously with the bill if Senators would plan to be in the Chamber and hear the presentations both for and against proposals. It is somewhat frustrating to find that many people vote when they have not heard the presentations. I think the Senator has made a good presentation for his amendment and in due course I shall make a presentation for the committee position.

I regret that the Senator has been compelled to make his presentation to a large number of empty chairs and I expect the same thing will be true with respect to those who think they will do a better job than the Senator—not in debating the proposition but in presenting the best thing that could be worked out.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President (Mr. BELLMON in the chair), the observations of the Senator from Louisiana are pertinent. Of course, it is a matter of regret and disappointment that I do not have the entire membership of the Senate present for a debate on a principle of taxation for which I have labored and fought for several years. I guess I am a bit vain in assuming that if more Senators had heard my arguments the easier the victory would be. But be that as it may, I am doing the best I can, talking to as many Senators as I can, and perhaps the people will have an opportunity to read the RECORD. At least, it is the only way I have of undertaking today to persuade the Senate. I must add that frequently Senators have aides either in the Chamber or in the gallery who take notes on points made during the course of debate, so one's efforts here are not entirely without effect. Nevertheless, I do thank the able Senator.

Mr. President, if democracy is to survive we must provide for the children of today in order that the citizens of tomorrow be healthy of mind, body, and spirit. In order to do so we must tax the wealth and income, where it is, to educate and nurture the children, where they are.

I am so surprised that a very enlightened, delightful, and personable man such as Secretary Cohen would write a letter based on the assumptions to which I have already referred. I find him most agreeable and erudite. It is beyond me to explain why he would write such a letter but the letter is here and it is advanced as an argument against the adoption of the amendment which I propose.

I wish now to return to the adequacy of the personal exemption which is also referred to in the letter of Secretary Cohen. His letter goes on to set forth the most shocking proposition imaginable. The Treasury asserts that my proposal to increase the personal exemption will produce a level of taxfree income for the necessities of life that "substantially exceeds the minimum amount needed to sustain each individual." Marvelous.

Now, one would read this astounding statement to mean that the Treasury believes a child can be housed, clothed, fed, and educated for a cost of $50 a month, but even the Treasury does not believe that, because the Treasury itself urges a low income allowance of $1,100 for a family. Thus, for a family of four, the Treasury offers the comforting proposition that this family can provide the necessities of life on $3,500 a year, or $72.91 per person per month.

Now, the Treasury says this is a reasonable minimum amount to sustain each individual member of the family. Is there a Senator who will accept that as factual? The Department of Labor does not accept it as factual. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare does not accept it as factual. Why should the Senate? Compare my proposal to increase the personal exemption. In 1970 my proposal would give the same family of four the sum of $3,800 of tax free income for the necessities of life or $79.17 per person per month.

Is that enough? I do not think so.

The interesting point is, how can anyone explain on what basis the Treasury concludes that $72.91 per month is a reasonable amount to feed and clothe a dependent, but that $79.17 per month provided by my proposal "substantially exceeds" the minimum required amount?

Ah, that is cutting the hair very fine.

What is involved here is a principle, the practicality of millions of American citizens trying to make ends meet. They are having to pinch their pennies and count their nickels and dimes.

Even when fully effective, my proposal would allow only $104.17 per month as an exemption from Federal income tax to feed, clothe, house, and educate each child in a family of four. It does not approach the level which the Department of Labor says is necessary—let me use the right term—to enjoy a moderate standard of living.

You know, Mr. President, one way a Senator, by speaking longer than perhaps he should, can reach his fellow Senators is that now and then a colleague will enter the Chamber who has not been benefited, regaled, or elevated by the previous remarks of the Senator. I see in the Chair the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) who presides over this body with such grace. I see to my left the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) who has been in the Chamber during part of the remarks I have made. So, to their attention and to others who have come into the Chamber—I see a conference of four Senators underway on my right—I will try to speak loud enough for them to hear—the Department of Labor conducted a study over a period of years and arrived at the conclusion that the amount necessary to maintain a moderate standard of living, defined as that amount which provides for the maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities, would be for a family of four, as of October last year, $9,484.

Now, Mr. President, the amendment I have offered does not provide an exemption for citizens and taxpayers in the State of Oklahoma anything approaching that level which your own administration says is necessary to provide a moderate standard of living.

All my amendment would provide as exempt income, exempt from Federal

taxation, is an average of $104.17 per month, even when it is fully effective in 1973. For next year, it would provide exempt from Federal taxation $79.17 per month each for a man, woman, and child.

Yet, the Secretary of the Treasury says that this "substantially exceeds" what he says is necessary, the $72.19 per month.

Ah, Mr. President, we have involved here a principle of taxation which must be preserved, the exemption from Federal income tax for each taxpayer, rich or poor, enough for a minimum existence, before the Federal Government levies a tax on his income.

I am sure that most mothers in this country would feel that an extra $30 a month to feed and clothe a child was very little. But little as it is, it is needed. Senators have but to inquire of their constituents to find that out.

But the Treasury of the United States is telling them that this pittance would be a luxury for which they should pay in higher taxes.

Further, I must note that the allowance at present in the bill is already obsolete. The Labor Department has just announced a new poverty level of $3,600 for an urban family of four.

That, Mr. President, is $100 above the low-income allowance provided in the pending bill.

So, the bill which the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury proposes and defends is already out of date by other departments of the same administration of the Government of the same country.

Continued inflation will continue to erode the effectiveness of the low-income allowance in the bill. Since it is tied to a $600 personal exemption, it has already been out-distanced by inflation. My proposal would bring the personal exemption in line with the cost of living. Thus, under my proposal, all—including those in poverty—will get a start toward catching up with the cost-of-living increase that has taken place since 1948 when the $600 level was set. Those in poverty will soon have some buffer against future erosion of the low-income allowance due to inflation.

Mr. President, I have spoken now for more than 3 hours. I feel that I must close. I appreciate the attention of a number of Senators who have remained in the Chamber throughout the debate and those who have been present at one time or another.

I should like to conclude by saying that the Tax Reform Act of 1969, as reported by the Finance Committee, is a signficant step in achieving greater equity in our tax system. It embodies two principles; tax reform and tax relief.

As I see it, tax reform should ensure that those who are paying too little of the total tax burden relative to their income, because of special tax preferences, will bear a fairer share of the total tax burden.

Tax reduction should provide tax relief for those who are paying too much in taxes relative to their income and need.

In evaluating the provisions of the bill, both those that provide for tax reform and those that provide for tax relief, an overriding yardstick must be applied.

This standard is embodied in the Cordell Hull principle of progressivity—taxation based on ability to pay. This was at the heart of the successful move to adopt a Federal income tax as a national policy.

To achieve these ends of social justice, the personal exemption of income from Federal income tax must be raised from the present, unrealistic, unfair $600 to a minimum, I believe, of $1,000. I think the most out-of-date provision in the tax law, the most socially unjustified provision in our Federal income tax law, is the low $600 exemption.

Fairness and equity require tax reductions for those who are now paying too much in taxes, primarily the low- and middle-income taxpayers. This tax relief, in my opinion, should be granted in a simple, easily understood fashion, and pursuant to the fundamental basis of a fair tax system, a progressive tax structure.

This general statement raises questions about the specific proposals in the bill, to which I have already referred. I refer to the rate changes in the bill. Those changes were approved by an 8-to-8 vote in the Senate Finance Committee and, of course, were endorsed by the administration. These rates, as I have illustrated, are actually regressive. They would undo much of the reforms so laboriously achieved in the remainder of the bill.

These rate changes providing for a 1-percentage point reduction in the bottom income brackets, and up to an 8-percentage point reduction in the high brackets, should not be adopted in any event. And I wish to emphasize that I would not support—I would resist—as an individual item rate changes proposed in the bill irrespective of what is done about raising the personal exemption.

In my opinion, there is no social, political, or economic justification for reducing the maximum rates in one 5-year period from 91 to 65 percent.

What is the justification for that? Is it because others are not sacrificing equally? What of the men who are dying in Vietnam? Is it because we do not have budgetary needs? What of the community facilities projects in our respective States for which we are unable to secure either loans or grants? What of the educational needs, the health needs? Is it because our debt is not large enough?

Oh, Mr. President, there is no justification for a big tax cut in the high brackets.

The distinguished chairman of the committee said, in one instance, that the reductions in the bill were based on need, but then from that he quickly retreated and acknowledged that the rate changes were not based on need.

On what basis do we proceed, then, to give tax reduction if we eliminate need, if we eliminate social justification, if we eliminate budgetary requirements? What, Mr. President, is the basis for it?

Describe it as you will, it is an unneeded, unjustified, undeserved tax cut in the high brackets, based not on need, not on budgetary requirements—I do not know how it can be adequately based.

How should we provide tax relief? I think the fairest and simplest means of providing tax relief is to increase the personal exemption. To what level? Frankly, I would like to go to $1,000 immediately, but I do not believe that would be possible to achieve just now. Therefore, I have proposed this be approached at the rate of an increase of $100 per year until, in 1973 and thereafter, the personal exemption would be $1,000 for each taxpayer and each dependent.

Why is this necessary? I have already stated.

I close by suggesting that the amendment is offered as a substitute for the unjustified tax reduction provided by unfair changes in tax rates; and therefore, I plead, as earnestly as I can, for the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. 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. GORE. 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. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I have offered, which applies to various sections in the bill, be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the study to which I referred earlier in the colloquy be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

It is imperative that we provide some measure of tax relief for the average American. Unfortunately, the tax relief in the Senate Finance Committee bill gives too much to taxpayers who do not need it, and not enough to those who should have more relief. Using figures provided by Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers and not considering the reform provisions, whose future remains uncertain, taxpayers with income of $50,000 and over, representing only 0.4 of the total tax returns, would receive 13.4 percent of the tax cuts. Considering a percentage increase in after-tax income, there is the same picture of unnecessary tax relief for the wealthy and inadequate tax relief for the lower income tax payer. In the $5,000 to $10,000 bracket, taxpayers receive about the same dollar relief as those in the $20,000 to $30,000 bracket, but much less favorable tax relief than those in the $20,000 to $50,000 group. Using this standard of comparisons the tax relief provision extends immensely more favorable treatment for taxpayers above $50,000 income. I do not think that aid to the wealthy is what is meant by tax relief. These provisions only add to the presently grossly inequitable tax code.

We must concentrate tax relief on the lower and middle income-tax payer. To accomplish this purpose, Senator Gore and I offered an amendment raising the personal exemption to $1,000. This amendment received only three votes in executive session of the Senate Finance Committee. Various

other amendments for raising personal exemptions were offered in executive session but all failed to pass; the last by a tie vote.

I will continue this battle to raise the personal exemption on the Senate floor. Increasing the personal exemption to $1,000 is the quickest and easiest way of providing tax relief to most Americans. The level and pattern of family exemptions in the United States has undergone many changes since 1913 (see table 1). The present equal per capita arrangement was started in 1914. The $600 per capita exemptions were started in 1958.

TABLE 1.—MAJOR CHANGES IN FEDERAL PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS SINCE 1913

Year	Single persons	Married persons		Children	
		Amount	As percent of single persons' exemption	Amount	As percent of single persons' exemption
1913	$3,000	$4,000	133	----------	0
1917	1,000	2,200	200	$200	20
1921	1,000	2,500	250	400	40
1925	1,500	3,500	233	400	27
1932	1,000	2,500	250	400	40
1940	800	2,000	250	400	50
1941	750	1,500	200	400	53
1942	500	1,200	240	350	70
1944	500	1,100	200	500	100
1948	600	1,200	200	600	100

Source: Table contained in Federal tax treatment of the family by Harold M. Groves.

Today, the $600 exemption is ludicrously inadequate and is more of an insult than a benefit to the American taxpayer. Since that figure was first adopted the cost of living has increased by 40 percent. To expect the American taxpayer to provide the basic minimum necessities of life for himself, his wife, and his children on $50 per month each is as unrealistic and antiquated as crossing the Atlantic in a sailing vessel.

What is the basic purpose of these exemptions?

There have been differing views, but probably the most common view, and the one to which most of us hold, is that taxes should not be applied to the income of persons until their minimum basic needs have been allowed for. It was in 1948 that the last change in the amount of the exemption was made. At that time it was increased from $500 to $600, the $500 rate having been adopted in 1942 under wartime need for increased tax income, a reduction from $750. Thus we have never returned even to the prewar situation, let alone modernize the tax exemption in accord with more recent cost of living changes.

In 1947, the Treasury Department produced a study of individual income tax exemptions, which included as an appendix a consideration of "Function and Purpose of Individual Income Tax Exemptions." Under a section discussing minimum living standard there appears this paragraph:

"According to a widely accepted view, the exemption should be at least adequate to cover some minimum essential living costs, such as the amount required for reasonable maintenance. It is conceded that the adjustment of exemptions to living costs may not be exact and that under emergency conditions it may be necessary to go below ordinary minima. For the long run, however, it is to be regarded as essential to exempt amounts required to maintain the individual and his family in health and efficiency."

You will note that the Treasury, in this wartime era, spoke of going "below ordinary minimums" as only a temporary procedure, that it might be necessary "under emergency conditions." Certainly those emergency conditions have long since passed, the economy has prospered, the cost of living has risen drastically—but the $600 remains where it was 20 years ago.

Under the concept of the income tax, with the exemption's purpose being that of allowing an untaxed minimum for health and efficiency, says the Treasury study:

"Ability to pay does not commence until a point is reached in the income scale where the minimum means of life have been obtained."

What is that minimum means of life today? How does it compare with the minimums left untaxed for the average American family?

In 1948, when the $500 was lifted to $600, a family of four had an exemption of $2,400. But these were 1948 dollars. To be equivalent, because of dollar inflation alone, moderate as it has been year by year, the sum would now need to be $3,288, or $822 per person.

But what were average incomes like in those days? Fortunately, wages are not only much greater today, but living standards—acceptable minimums for family life—are also much greater. This is reflected in a study released in March of this year by the Department of Labor, measuring the income needed for a family of four. This is a revision of the work produced in the fall of 1959 dealing with city worker's family budget estimates. That budget measured the needs of a family of four—an employed husband aged 38, a wife not employed outside the home, and two school-age children, a boy of 13 and a girl of 8. It was not a luxury or ideal budget, but was described as one presenting a "level of adequate living according to standards prevailing in large cities of the United States in recent years."

As an example of the kinds of items calculated, the budget assumes for the husband the purchase of five shirts a year and not quite two pairs of shoes annually. The wife's dress allowance is about 2 and a half new dresses a year. The budget allows not for new cars but for the purchase of a used car every 4 years—and for only 80 percent of most city families; calculations for New York, Philadelphia, and Boston.

U.S. average annual cost in spring of 1967 was $9,076 for total budget and $7,221 for cost of goods and services in the budget. Because of increases in prices it has been estimated that the cost of the same costs and services in autumn of 1968 would have been about $7,630. Of the total, food accounts for $2,235; housing was $2,311, transportation, $912; clothing and personal care, $1,069; and medical care, $520.

Other economic studies have placed the needs on families in the same general range within the last 2 or 3 years. For a two-person family, the same calculations give a minimum of $4,690, and for a family of five, with the oldest child not over 16, the total budget comes to $8,020.

This, of course, is considerably more than the amount that many thousands and even millions of families have as income; $3,000 is often cited as the poverty line. Yet our present $600 exemption provides only $2,400 deductible for a family of four. A $1,000 exemption for four persons would still be more than 50 percent below the family budget I have been noting.

We in the Congress must be the initiators and the guardians of the welfare of the unorganized common man.

The times have changed. This is no longer 1948, and a lot has happened to the economy in the last 20 years to make features of that era outmoded. Outmoded certainly is the $600 exemption, unrealistic, inequitable, and undeserved penalty for the taxpayer who is in the lower brackets. To refer once more to the Treasury paper I have cited:

Perhaps the major function of the exemptions is to determine minimum levels of income subject to tax.

We are in all too many instances today taxing the poor, those whose incomes are below the income level needed for adequate living standards of decency, perhaps even for some who are below the income level which we designate as that of poverty. It is time we stopped taxing the poor and gave them an equitable share in the prosperity of the Nation. An exemption of $600 per person—I might remind you also that until 1939 it was $1,000 for a single person and $2,500 for a married couple without children—an exemption of $600 per person is unrealistic and unfair. It should be changed to $1,000.

While increasing the personal exemption to $1,000 is both desirable and necessary it may prove impossible to achieve on the Senate floor. President Nixon has already suggested that he will veto a greatly unbalanced bill—i.e., a bill that loses more tax revenue than it generates. A $1,000 exemption, even spread over a series of years, will result in an unbalanced bill.

In the event that the amendments to increase the personal exemption to $1,000 fails, I will offer an amendment which will provide much more equitable tax relief but will not result in any more tax revenue loss than the bill approved by the Senate Finance Committee. This amendment would establish a minimum standard deduction phased in on the same basis as the Senate proposal for low-income allowance, coupled with an increase in the personal exemption to $650 in 1970, $700 in 1971, and $800 in 1972. The following tables indicate some of the consequences of this amendment:

TABLE 2.—ANNUAL REVENUE LOSS FROM RELIEF MEASURES

[In billions of dollars]

	1970	1971	1972
Senate[1]	1.7	5.1	9.0
Hartke[2]	2.3	5.0	9.0

[1] Includes when applicable: Rate reductions, low-income allowance (minimum standard deduction) singles and standard deduction
[2] Includes: $800 personal exemption ($650 in 1970. $700 in 1971. and $800 in 1972) and minimum standard deduction phased same as Senate proposal.

TABLE 3.—DISTRIBUTION OF TAX RELIEF BY INCOME GROUPS

[In percent]

Adjusted gross income	House	Senate	Hartke proposal	Percent of taxpayers in income bracket
0 to $3,000	8.5	8.6	10.1	16.0
$3,000 to $5,000	11.3	11.4	14.6	15.1
$5,000 to $7,000	10.8	10.9	15.4	15.5
$7,000 to $10,000	14.6	14.8	21.9	21.9
$10,000 to $15,000	21.1	21.3	21.8	20.7
$15,000 to $20,000	8.6	8.7	7.3	6.1
$20,000 and over	25.0	24.3	8.8	4.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Revenue loss (millions)	$9,273	$8,968	$8,991	

Note: Foregoing proposals make following allowances:
House: Low-income allowance, elimination of phaseout, standard deduction, general rate reduction, maximum tax, and intermediate relief.
Senate: Low-income allowance, elimination of phaseout, standard deduction, general rate reduction singles.
Hartke: $800 personal exemption plus $1,100 minimum standard deduction.

TABLE 4.—FEDERAL INCOME TAX BURDEN—PRESENT LAW COMPARED WITH THE HOUSE AND SENATE REFORM BILL, AND HARTKE PROPOSAL [1] (MARRIED COUPLE, 2 DEPENDENTS ASSUMES DEDUCTIBLE EXPENSES OF 15 PERCENT OF INCOME)

Wage or salary income	Total tax			Amount of tax reduction			
	Present	House and Senate	Hartke proposal	House and Senate	Hartke proposal	House and Senate (percent)	Hartke proposal (percent)
$3,000	0	0	0				
$4,000	$140	$65	0	$75	$140	53.6	100.0
$5,000	290	200	$98	90	192	31.0	66.2
$7,500	691	576	480	115	211	16.6	30.5
$10,000	1,019	958	867	61	152	6.0	14.9
$12,500	1,430	1,347	1,271	83	159	5.8	11.1
$15,000	1,897	1,794	1,721	103	176	5.4	9.2
$20,000	2,910	2,738	2,710	172	200	5.9	6.9
$25,000	4,058	3,829	3,834	229	224	5.6	5.5
$50,000	12,188	11,504	11,825	684	363	5.6	3.0
$100,000	34,858	32,292	34,384	2,566	474	7.4	1.4

[1] $800 personal exemption and $1,100 minimum standard deduction.

Note: Assumes deductions equal to 15 percent of income, or minimum standard deduction (low-income allowance)—whichever is greater. Surtax excluded.

This amendment clearly concentrates tax relief among the lower and middle income taxpayers. For the taxpayer in the $7,000 to $10,000 income bracket my proposal will provide 21.9 percent in tax relief compared with only 14.8 percent relief in the Senate Finance bill. For taxpayers in the $10,000 to $15,000 bracket my proposal provides for 21.8 percent tax relief compared to 21.3 percent provided by the Senate Finance bill. Taxpayers in these and lower tax brackets desperately need this tax relief because they bear a disproportionate share of the existing tax burden, and endure the full brunt of the present high tax and high interest rate policies and pay more than their share of the highly regressive State, local, and property taxes.

If the attempt to increase the personal exemption fails on the Senate floor, and I do not believe it will, I will offer an amendment that I also offered in executive session, but which failed to pass 10 to 7. This amendment does not affect the low-income allowance provisions or the provisions increasing the standard deduction. It does, however, redistribute the relief provided by rate reductions and concentrates such relief among the lower income and middle income Americans. I will offer the proposed change in the rate as follows: the 14 percent rate cut to 9 percent; the 15 percent rate cut to 13 percent; the 16 percent rate cut to 15 percent; the 17 percent rate cut to 16 percent; the 19 percent rate cut to 17 percent. Every taxpayer would receive a tax reduction but the bulk of the tax relief would be concentrated on lower and middle class taxpayers. Assuming the proposed rate changes as indicated above, my proposal contrasted with the committee bill, would affect certain income levels as follows:

For a couple with two dependents, $7,500 in income, the Senate Finance bill provides $111 in tax reduction, my proposal would provide $161. For a couple with two dependents, $10,000 income, the committee bill provides $156, my proposal provides $206. With an income of $12,500 the committee bill provides for $220, my proposal would provide for $267. With an income of $15,000, the committee bill provides for $216, my proposal provides for $240. While I hope for a great deal more, this is the very least that should be done.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, if we are to bring about true tax reform, it is required that we give some true tax relief to the people who bear such a great portion of this Nation's total tax burden—the average taxpaying citizens. To my mind, the simplest, easiest, and most sensible means of achieving this goal is to accept the proposal put before us by the Senator from Tennessee. I might add that I have believed this approach deserves merit for quite some time and have previously cosponsored legislation aimed at the same purpose.

The present $600 exemption was established in 1948, when economic conditions were quite different from those we experience today. The basic cost of living has gone up by about 50 percent in that period of two decades, yet we have left the exemption at $600. The amendment before us would not only recognize the rising cost of living and erosion of the dollar over the past 20 years, but would serve to direct the tax relief granted toward the middle- and lower-income groups, giving greater relief to all taxpayers with up to $15,000 in adjusted gross income, and the most relief to those with the lowest incomes.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we face a fundamental choice in voting on this amendment. In contrast to the bill presented us, it treats the average American taxpayer more liberally. I am fully aware that we will face other choices if we go this route, but I am sure the citizens of this country would applaud not only a law that recognized their need for more equitable taxation, but a Congress willing to make the necessary choices in the areas of taxation and spending. I think the taxpayers deserve this.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I support in principal the proposal to increase the existing $600 personal income tax exemption. Somewhere along the line we seem to have lost sight of the fact that the personal exemption is designed to allow the taxpayer to retain a sufficient amount of money—tax-free—to enable him to maintain a minimum standard of living; to provide food, clothing, shelter, and medical services that are the indispensable necessities of life.

Certainly it would be the height of fantasy to contend that the present $600 allowance would sustain even the barest needs of today's taxpayers.

I have urged the adoption of a more realistic rate of exemption since 1947, the year before the allowance was raised from $500 to the present $600. At that time I sought an increase from $500 to $750 and, in offering the amendment, made the following statement which is as apt today as then:

> I have said over and over again that I think that is the point where tax relief ought to begin, namely, with people in the low-income brackets, the low-wage earners, the people who are having a struggle to provide the actual necessities of life. I believe this is the way to do it. A reduction of taxes at the bottom level by an increase in personal exemption affects everyone all the way across the board. The man making $100,000 a year receives some relief and some benefit, and the man in between gets his proportionate relief according to his earnings and ability to pay. Many a man is struggling today to live on a comparatively decent standard. * * * It is obvious that we should start reducing taxes by helping those at the bottom of the ladder who have the hardest struggle. (Congressional Record, p. 5924, 5/28/47.)

Recent statistics reveal that, for a family of four, the present $600 exemption provides a lower amount of tax-free income for the necessities of life than was available for a family of four in 1940. Yet, since that date, the cost of living has risen more than 2½ times, as reflected in the Consumer Price Index, from 48.8 in 1940 to 128 at the present time. And still the taxpayer is allowed no more than a meager $600 exemption.

Let me repeat, Mr. President, the reason for the personal income tax exemption. It is, according to a study prepared by the Treasury Department during the period when we last increased the allowance—1947—to allow enough money "to cover some minimum essential living costs, such as the amount required for reasonable maintenance. It is conceded that the adjustment of exemptions to living costs may not be exact and that under emergency conditions it may be necessary to go below ordinary minima. For the long run, however, it is regarded as essential to exempt amounts required to maintain the individual and his family

in health and efficiency. Ability to pay does not commence until a point is reached in the income scale where the minimum means of life have been obtained."

This Nation has always been sympathetic with the problem of the poor and the disadvantaged, and that concern certainly has been intensified since President Johnson announced his war on poverty. Many studies, analyses, and recommendations relating to the problems of poverty have come forth since that time.

The most recent report which comes to my attention is the report of the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs issued November 12, 1969.

The Commission explained:

> The poverty living standard which the Commission used is the widely used poverty index, developed by the Social Security Administration. This index is based on the Department of Agriculture's measure of the cost of a temporary low-budget, nutritious diet for households of various sizes. The poverty index is simply this food budget multiplied by three to reflect the fact that food typically represents one-third of the expenses of a low-income family. The resulting figure is the minimum income needed to buy a subsistence level of goods and services; the 25 million people whose incomes fall below the index are poor, while those above it are, officially at least, nonpoor. According to this poverty index, in 1968 a nonfarm family of four required a minimum income of $3,553 per year . . . to meet its basic expenses.

Thus, Mr. President, the Government has established the line of poverty at $3,553 for a family of four and yet the pending bill, with its present $600 personal exemption and standard deduction of $1,100, would in the case of a family of four, begin taxing anything above $3,500. Such a situation seems hard to square with a bill described as one to provide for tax reform and relief. Where is the equity—the justice—the humaneness in this situation?

As I said in 1947:

> If our Government can stand any loss of revenue—if now is the time to make a reduction in income taxes—let us start by including in any tax reduction bill that we enact relief for those people who need it most by raising personal exemptions sufficiently to take them off the tax rolls. (Congressional Record, p. 11337, 12/12/47.)

It is estimated that over 80 percent of the tax relief provided by increasing the personal exemption would go to wage earners with incomes under $15,000 and 20 percent to those earning more than $15,000. Surely the vast number of taxpayers fall into the under $15,000 category and that is where we should concentrate efforts to provide tax relief. That is where relief is needed.

These are the people who form the backbone of this Nation—these are the people feeling the pinch of inflation—these are the people who are carrying the burden—and these are the people who need help.

Mr. President, that help—that relief—can best be provided in the simple and direct fashion of increasing the personal income tax exemption.

Our primary concern in enacting tax reform and tax reduction legislation should be with those taxpayers in the lower- and middle-income brackets who are trying desperately to maintain their standards of living in the face of ever-rising costs. These are the people who frequently must borrow money from banks and other sources in a continuing struggle to keep pace, to educate their children and, hopefully, to enjoy some of the fruits of America's present high standard of living.

Mr. President, however much we would like to provide these exemptions and this relief to the low-income groups we must consider the cost. I am advised that the Treasury Department estimates that if we should adopt the Gore amendment, the pending amendment, to increase the personal exemption to a thousand dollars, we would incur a loss in revenue of some $12.7 billion annually. The loss may be even more than that. I am not sure. But, according to my information, these figures were issued by the Treasury Department on November 29, 1969.

If we should increase the personal exemption to $900, that would incur a loss of revenue of $9.7 billion annually. An increase in the personal exemption to $800 would incur a loss of revenue of $6.6 billion annually. An increase to $700 in the personal exemption would incur a loss of revenue of $3.4 billion annually.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The figures that the Senator just quoted are correct, as I understand them, as to the cost of raising the exemptions. However, they do not take into consideration the other features of the Gore amendment which raise the low-income allowances, and so forth. For example, on the pending amendment, it would bring it up from a $12.7 billion loss to $14.8 billion.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I understand that. The figures related to the increase in exemptions are correct. They are the latest, so far as I know.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There are some other features in the Gore amendment that would entail further loss of revenue.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the Senator.

One must always wonder, under these circumstances, if such projections of revenue losses took into account the fact that an increase in the personal income tax exemption would permit taxpayers to retain more of their wages to meet personal expenses and the cost of living. Instead of using this money to pay more taxes, it could be used to provide for the essentials of life. Money spent in the normal course of trade by our small-income earners goes for food, clothing, shelter, and the other necessities. Such expenditures ultimately go back into the marketplace, into industry, thereby enabling it to expand, to create more jobs, and more profit opportunities—all of which are sources for additional tax levies.

Let me assure my colleagues that during the more than 22 years that I have sought a more realistic personal income tax exemption, I have never lost sight of the equally important need to maintain our fiscal integrity to the fullest possible extent.

Fiscal prudence demands, of course, that we seek to balance the budget, and I am willing to work with Members in seeking that objective.

I am for a sound economy; but an economy that must survive on a disproportionate tax upon the earnings of the low- and middle-income taxpayer—a tax that deprives him of those essentials that are needed and necessary to provide for him and his family a minimum standard of living—can hardly be said to be sound. Certainly it is of no concern to that taxpayer that he has a so-called sound economy if he is still deprived of the fruits of such an economy.

Mr. President, I believe that the time has come to be honest with ourselves and with the American people. If we are going to afford tax relief to the heavily burdened taxpayers of this Nation, let us give it where it is needed most. Let us give it to the multitude of families of four, five, or more persons, who are trying desperately to raise and to educate their children in the face of ever-increasing costs—let us give it to them, America's long-suffering low-income, low-wage taxpayer.

Mr. President, I would not want to conclude my remarks without paying tribute to the chairman and members of the Committee on Finance, who labored long and hard to bring this measure to the Senate floor. I support some of their recommendations and, of course, take exception to some, but I commend them for their diligence and thoroughness in bringing this far-reaching and complicated measure to the floor. They made every effort to keep all Members of the Senate informed of their decisions in a continuing and most effective manner, and I, for one, am most appreciative of their courtesy.

Since I have mentioned one exception that I take to the committee's recommendation, Mr. President, I want to mention one that I am in full accord with, and that relates to the treatment of interest on State and local obligations. On September 26, I introduced an amendment to the tax bill on this matter and stated at that time that I was "unalterably opposed to any attempt by the Federal Government to tax, directly or indirectly, interest on State and local obligations."

I am highly pleased to see that the committee agreed with this position and adopted the objectives of my amendment. I sincerely hope that the Senate conferees will stand firm in conference and that this provision of the Senate bill will be retained.

With respect to the pending amendment, no one in this body would be more happy than I to support it and to raise the personal exemption to $1,000, if we could do that without doing injury to our fiscal responsibility and to our general Government responsibilities, I would gladly vote for this amendment. But I do not believe that, under present conditions, in view of the already heavy burden of expenditures that our Government is carrying, we can with

prudence sustain an additional $12 billion loss in revenue at this time.

So I think it would be unwise to vote for a $1,000 personal exemption at this time. I think it would be unwise to do that because I think such a loss in revenue would place an undue strain on our fiscal position, one that might well cause heavy deficits that would feed the flames of inflation. Thus, the ultimate result of such action, the benefit we would undertake to bestow, would be consumed in those flames of increased inflation.

However, I do feel some relief in this area is imperative at this time and I think that we should seek a middle ground. While I have said I would like to support a personal exemption of up to the amount of $1,000, I feel, as I have just stated, in good conscience I cannot go that high.

My own judgment is that if I were to write the ticket at this moment, I would write it for $750. That would give a family of four a $3,000 exemption, not that we should not keep trying to do more because we should, but I do not believe we can go much higher than that until we can do one of two things or both: Either reduce governmental expenditures or increase revenues, or do enough of both to get our fiscal situation in a more comfortable balance. I think this should be done at the earliest possible time that circumstances permit, but until we can do that, I do not feel we can do as much in this area as I would like to do.

I would say increase the present $600 personal exemption to $750; in fact, I would be willing to vote today for an increase of up to $800. That is as high as I feel I could go. I would like to see it more, but if we can increase it to $750 or $800, we will have taken a pretty long step in the right direction, and I wish that step could be longer. I wish we could raise it more, but I do not feel we can do so at this time.

Mr. President, I see the author of the pending amendment in the Chamber. He was not here when I began my remarks. I wish to take this opportunity to compliment the Senator for bringing this issue before the Senate. He presented it to the committee and he was not successful there. He has now brought it to the floor of the Senate for the Senate to discuss and pass judgment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall yield but first I would like to conclude my thought.

I say this because back in 1947 when we had the exemption down to $500, we had a tax bill before us and I undertook at that time by amendment to raise the exemption to $750. The next year, 1948, the exemption was raised up to $600, later in 1954, when an effort was made to increase the exemption to $800 I made brief remarks in the Senate in which I referred to my efforts in 1947 to get the exemption increased.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the comments I made in the Senate on March 4, 1954, which appear in the RECORD at pages 2632 and 2633 of that date.

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

INCREASE PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS AND EXEMPTION FOR DEPENDENTS UNDER INCOME-TAX LAW

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on February 19, last, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], for himself, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], introduced Senate bill 2983, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code so as to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to $800 for the 1954 taxable year and to $1,000 for succeeding taxable years; to the Committee on Finance.

This bill would increase the personal exemptions and the exemptions for dependents from $600, the present amount of allowable deductions, to $800 for the taxable year 1954. Beginning next year those deductions would be increased to $1,000. Mr. President, I wish to announce my support of that measure.

At the time of introducing that bill, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia said, among other things:

"Whatever we do for corporations and whatever we do for the big business organizations may have an indirect effect on our economy, but what we do in this field, by leaving more take-home pay in the pockets of the workers, will increase the purchasing power, and will stimulate productivity in the United States. If we are courageous enough to take this forward-looking step, before our economy falls on its face, we can be of great service to the American people."

Mr. President, I am sure my announced support of this measure is no surprise to my colleagues in the Senate. Nor will it come as a surprise to the people of my State of Arkansas, whom I have the honor to represent in this distinguished body. I have long advocated this method as the proper way to begin reducing taxes. As early as May 28, 1947, when a tax bill was before the Senate, and at which time these exemptions were only $500, I offered an amendment to increase personal exemptions to $750.

In urging the adoption of that amendment, Mr. President, I said on the floor of the Senate:

"I have said over and over again that I think that is the point where tax relief ought to begin, namely, with people in the low-income brackets, the low-wage earners, the people who are having a struggle to provide the actual necessities of life. * * * Many a man is struggling today to live on a comparatively decent standard. * * * It is obvious that we should start reducing taxes by helping those at the bottom of the ladder who have the hardest struggle."

Notwithstanding my efforts, on a rollcall the amendment was rejected by a vote of 44 to 27.

Again, on July 14 of the same year, feeling so strongly the propriety and necessity for increasing income tax exemptions, but realizing I could not get them increased to $750 as I had originally proposed, I offered an amendment to raise exemptions to $600, the amount they are at present. In addressing the Senate at that time, I said:

"There is no use arguing the amendment. Senators know they are either for it or do not favor it. I know it will be said it would increase the loss of revenue to result from enactment of the bill. Certainly it would. That is what we are doing, proposing to lose revenues, and if we are to lose revenues, and keep on losing them, I want to lose some to the advantage and for relief to wage earners and small-salaried folks who are trying to make a living, who are having a hard struggle to meet the high cost of living. I should like to remove some of them from the Federal tax rolls. They are the ones who need tax relief most. Their tax burden is much greater than any whom this bill is designed to benefit."

The Senate turned down that proposal, but by a vote of only 47 to 43.

Later, on December 12, 1947, I again took the floor in a special session of the Senate to urge the Republican majority of the 80th Congress to acknowledge their responsibility for the enactment of proper tax legislation by providing relief to low-income groups. In that address I said:

"Those are the people, Mr. President, who are really suffering from high taxes. If our Government can stand any loss of revenue—if now is the time to make reduction in income taxes—let us start by including in any tax-reduction bill that we enact, relief for those people who need it most, by raising personal exemptions sufficiently to take them off the tax rolls."

Continuing, I said:

"I hope, Mr. President, that in the next session of the Congress we will enact legislation to raise personal exemptions in order to remove many citizens from the tax rolls and help others in the low-income brackets who greatly need tax relief."

The issue raised by my amendments in 1947, although they were not adopted, helped to pave the way for the raising of personal exemptions to $600 in the bill that was enacted the following year.

While trying to get personal exemptions increased in 1947, I also sponsored an amendment to remove the flagrant Federal income-tax discrimination that then existed against husbands and wives in Arkansas. Husbands and wives in 12 community-property States paid much less Federal income tax on the same amount of income than husbands and wives of Arkansas were required to pay. Three of those States—Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana—border on Arkansas. Thus, citizens of Arkansas were being unjustly penalized and discriminated against.

The first amendment I offered to remove that discrimination was defeated by a vote of 51 to 29. Later in the same session I offered the amendment again, and it was defeated by a vote of 52 to 40; but, it was not defeated until promises were given by the leadership of both the majority and the minority that the amendment I was sponsoring would be incorporated in the next tax bill, which came up the following year. That promise was kept, and in 1948 the principle of putting husbands and wives of all States of the Union on the same basis with respect to Federal income taxes was passed.

I may say that up to now it has resulted in the elimination of a discrimination which has amounted to approximately $40 million to the husbands and wives of Arkansas, as compared with the 3 States on its borders.

Mr. President, a general tax-revision bill is presently being developed and processed in the House of Representatives. It has not yet been reported by the Ways and Means Committee, but I think we can anticipate that a tax-revision bill will be passed by the House and sent to the Senate at this session of Congress. If that prospect materializes, then the distinguished Senator from Georgia will have the opportunity to present his bill as an amendment to the tax bill that comes over from the House.

I understand that the Secretary of the Treasury, and the administration opposes raising personal exemptions. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has already rejected the proposal. If the House does not incorporate this provision in the bill it passes and sends to us, then we must make the

fight in the Senate and adopt the George amendment.

I say this, Mr. President, because the reductions now indicated by the House Ways and Means Committee are wholly inadequate to give proper tax relief under present economic conditions. They ignore and disregard giving relief where the need is the greatest. That relief can be provided only by the increasing of personal exemptons.

It appears that the revisions now proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee and by this administration would benefit big business and individual taxpayers in the upper-income brackets.

Apparently the philosophy behind this administration's tax-revision program is based upon the so-called "trickle-down" theory—the argument being that tax cuts for big business would stimulate investments and production, resulting in more jobs and more payrolls. This "trickle-down" theory, Mr. President, is not the proper approach for relieving the tax burden where the present greatest distress exists.

The cost of living is today at the highest level in the history of our country. It has risen approximately 12 percent since 1947. If I was right in the position I took then—and I was—in urging that personal exemptions be raised to $750, we are more than justified in insisting now that they be raised to $800.

Instead of providing tax relief, Mr. President, that will "trickle down" to the small-income groups, I want to give them some direct relief by raising their personal exemptions and thus permit them to return more of their wages to meet their own personal expenses and the cost of living. In other words, Mr. President, by raising personal-income exemptions we can create tax relief and benefits that will "trickle up" and bolster our economy by placing more purchasing power in the hands of the consumer. That is to say, if those in lower-income groups are given an increase in personal exemptions they will be able to spend those additional funds, taxes they are now required to pay, for those essentials and necessities of life of which they and their families are now being deprived.

That money spent by them would, of course, find its way into the possession of those in the higher income categories. It always does. Money spent in the normal course of trade by our small-income earners goes for food, clothing, and those basic essentials that make for a higher standard of living. Such expenditures ultimately go back into industry, thereby enabling it to expand, to create more jobs, and to increase production and payrolls.

It is said that the increasing of personal exemptions to $800 as proposed by the Senator from Georgia will cause a loss of revenues of approximately $4 billion. While I doubt that the net loss would be that much, nevertheless, such a program is necessary in the threatening situation if we are to use tax relief for the bolstering of our economy. I am for a sound economy, but I submit that no economy is sound when, by the imposition of a Federal income tax on his meager earnings, the low wage earner is deprived of those essentials that are needed and necessary to provide for him and his family a minimum standard of living.

Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support, as I have in the past, the proposal to raise personal exemptions as a means of providing tax relief to those in the greatest distress, and who are suffering most under the present income tax burden.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at one time we came very near increasing the exemption. I see the vote was 44 to 27 on the first effort I made to raise the amount to $750 per person; and then, on the second effort I believe the Senate turned me down by a vote of 47 to 43. We got close and thereafter the exemption was finally increased to $600, the present exemption.

At the same time I was fighting for the increase in personal exemptions I initiated the effort that finally culminated in the removal of the discrimination that then existed with respect to married couples in different States of the Union. As a result of my efforts in 1947 on that issue we were promised, in order to defeat the proposal, that it would be incorporated in the next tax bill. That amendment was then defeated by a vote of 52 to 40 but it was not defeated until promises were given by the leadership of both the majority and the minority that the amendment I was sponsoring would be incorporated in the next tax bill. Therefore, it can be seen that I started my efforts in this direction quite a long time ago.

Mr. President, I will yield now to the Senator from Tennessee. I wish to congratulate him for bringing this issue to the floor of the Senate. I cannot go all the way with his proposal. I think there would have to be some restraint due to conditions today. We cannot afford to throw the budget too far out of balance, and I do not see much prospect of raising any additional revenues of any great consequence by this bill. So I think we have to be restrained in this matter.

If the pending amendment does not prevail, I hope the Senator will offer another amendment to bring the amount down. I would like to see it at $750. I think that would be the happy balance or the best balance under all the circumstances. But I will vote to raise the personal exemption as high as $800.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I find great comfort in the position and the eloquent statement of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas.

In reviewing this issue, I had occasion to read remarks the Senator made in the 1940's. In 1954, as a new Member of the Senate, I was a supporter of his amendment to raise the exemption.

Mr. McCLELLAN. That was an amendment offered by Senator George. I was speaking on the amendment, but it was a followup of the effort I had made earlier, as I remember.

Mr. GORE. As I recall, Senator George actually offered the amendment, but it was the Senator from Arkansas who had been in the forefront in urging that the exemption be raised.

I share the Senator's concern about the budget; but once again, I call attention to the fact that the amendment to raise the personal exemption is offered as a substitute for other tax relief items in the bill which would be revenue losers.

I hope that the amendment to raise the exemption to $1,000 will be adopted; but if it is not, I would surely welcome the support of the Senator from Arkansas if and when a test comes on an exemption of $800.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will give the Senator from Tennessee my support on that, although I think the amendment would have a better chance, and that we could sustain it in conference and come nearer to getting the proposal accepted and enacted, if the amount were $750.

I think $1,000 would not be too much; do not misunderstand me—not at all. But I am dealing with the realities of the situation. I am constrained by conditions that prevail by fact, not by fancy. Surely, we would like to have a higher exemption; but I do not feel it would be wise to try to obtain it at this time for the reasons I have stated. I do believe we can go to $750 or possibly to $800 and not do great damage or injury to the soundness of our fiscal policy.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, all of us would like to vote for some form of tax reduction. The more we could reduce taxes the better we would like it. However, there is one thing we must keep in mind, and that is, the fact that to the extent we reduce taxes at this time we will have to borrow the money to finance it. That is true to the extent of the reductions in the committee bill as well as in the pending amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The Gore amendment would increase the deficit substantially greater than would the committee bill, and we can not afford this added loss in revenue.

Senators should be reminded of tne fact that as of June 30, 1968, about 17 months ago, the national debt stood at $350.7 billion.

One year later, June 30, 1969, it stood at $356.9 billion, or an increase of $6.2 billion in the national debt.

Mr. President, I know that under this phony bookkeeping system the administrations have resorted to in the past 2 years, where we include the accumulation in the trust funds in order to confuse the American people, we are trying to tell them that we have a surplus while we are actually operating with a deficit. The facts are that in the past fiscal year we borrowed $6.2 billion in additional money to finance this imaginary surplus that we are leaving to the American people.

From June 30, 1969, to November 1 of this year, a period of 4 months, the national debt jumped $11 billion.

Between November 1, 1969, and November 20—the most recent date we have—the national debt rose to $369.5 billion, or a jump of about $1.9 billion during the month of November.

I point that out to show that we are running far behind the expenditure level for the first 5 months of this year as compared to the first 5 months of last year. It should be taken into consideration that we always get some increase in the national debt beyond the normal during the first 5 months due to revenue collections falling off in the last half of the year.

Nevertheless, we cannot get away from the fact that our expenditures and our deficits are rising today at a much faster rate than they were in the corresponding period last year.

For example, in the first 4½ months of the last fiscal year our income—that is the deposits—was $69.5 billion.

This year in the same comparable period our deposits were $75.6 billion, or

an increase of around $6 billion in income.

On the other hand, our withdrawals or expenditures between July 1, 1969, and November 20, 1969, have jumped from $80 billion in last year's corresponding months to $90 billion this year, which means that the deficit has jumped in the first four and a half months of this fiscal year to $15 billion, or $5 billion more than the rate at which the deficit was rising 1 year ago.

Mr. President, all of us should be aware of the fact that we cannot afford to keep cutting taxes and piling up this deficit without further fanning the fires of inflation.

I also point out that the interest on the national debt today is costing a little over $200 million a month more than it cost in the same month a year ago. That is equivalent to an increase of around $2 billion a year that we will have to pay just on the interest on the national debt. We are borrowing in order to pass on some of the so-called tax reductions.

Mr. President, there are a number of other reasons why the Senate in my opinion should reject the Gore $1,000 personal exemption and standard deduction.

First of all, and by far the most important, it would result in a long-term annual revenue loss of $14.8 billion as compared to the $9 billion of tax relief under the committee's bill. There is no way to justify the additional $5.8 billion of tax relief if we are to be at all concerned with fiscal responsibility. The existing bill already is out of balance over the long run by $2.3 billion, and this $5.8 billion would increase the shortfall of the bill to $8.1 billion.

In recent months we seem to have made a start toward getting inflation under control. We are not quite sure yet but certainly there are a number of economic indicators where the growth pattern has slowed down, which suggests that we are about to get our inflation problem under control. To adopt the Gore plan, however, is to throw this long and difficult effort right out the window. In the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 the Gore plan would result in an additional loss of revenue of $3.4 billion. This involves more revenue loss in this period of time than the amendment which the Senate rejected the other day by a vote of 49 to 28 which would have made the 5-percent surcharge inoperative in the first part of 1970. It seems to me that there can be no question that fiscal responsibility demands that we reject the Gore $1,000 plan.

But even if the Gore plan were to provide for an $800 exemption rather than a $1,000 exemption it still would be nowhere near as desirable as the committee action. The committee met the specific problems of the poor by increasing the minimum standard deduction to $1,100. It met the problems of the middle income group by increasing the ceiling on the standard deduction to $2,000 and the percentage standard deduction to 15 percent. The rest of the relief under the committee action is provided in rate reductions for all taxpayers. The Gore amendment concentrates the tax relief among those taxpayers with very large families. While we certainly must treat the folks with large families fairly, we should not treat other taxpayers unfairly just to give this group an extra large share of the tax reduction.

Concentrating the tax reduction, as he does, Senator GORE's proposal with the $800 exemption gives taxpayers with incomes over $20,000 practically no relief at all. The only exception to this are those with very large families.

The Gore amendment also treats unfairly single persons and childless couples or those with only one child. The Gore amendment, in these categories, would increase tax burdens over the House bill by more than a billion dollars. This is done primarily to give more than a billion dollars of tax relief to married couples with three or more children.

HEW minimum standard of living studies show that the biggest living cost is for the first person. Their studies show that $1,700 at a minimum is required for a single person to maintain a minimum standard of living. A minimum standard of living, however, may be maintained by a married couple with an income level of about $2,300. The study shows that the cost of providing the minimum standard of living of necessities for a dependent tends to rise at the rate of approximately $600 per dependent. Therefore, the fairest thing to do is to provide a tax exempt amount of $1,700 for the taxpayer and a $600 additional exemption for each dependent. That is precisely what the committee bill does.

Mr. President, I might add that if and when we get the budget under control we can then raise the exemptions, and that would be a worthy project. Certainly we would all like to do that, but we cannot do it until we get the budget under control.

The Gore amendment, on the other hand, by providing an $800 exemption plus a $1,000 minimum standard deduction provides more relief than is justified for large-sized families.

It is, of course, true that the cost of living per child differs for every family depending upon the family income. This does not mean, however, that whatever someone spends on children should be the amount exempt from tax. An equitable division of total cost of Government requires that these differences be ignored except insofar as exemptions are needed to provide the minimum standard for necessities. This the committee bill does with great precision.

The Gore plan is also unfortunate because it removes the benefit of the major simplification effort made in the committee bill.

The committee bill not only provides a minimum standard deduction of $1,100; it also raises the standard deduction from a maximum of $1,000 to $2,000 and from 10 to 15 percent of adjusted gross income. These are very significant changes and are very important means of simplfying our tax structure for millions of Americans. The committee bill, in fact, should switch 11.6 million people from itemized deductions to the standard deduction and increase the percentage of taxpayers using the standard deduction from 58 percent to 74 percent. This change alone will do more than anything else to simplify the income tax structure for the great bulk of our citizens.

On the other hand, the Gore amendment would only cause some 4.4 million persons to shift over from itemized deductions to the standard deduction. Even this is not caused by the proposed exemption increase but only by the fact that the amendment borrows from the committee plan most, although not quite all, of its minimum standard deduction.

I urge the Senate to reject the Gore amendment, first because it gives away far more in tax relief than our fiscal situation permits. We cannot afford the $5.8 billion of extra tax reduction provided by his amendment. I believe that this alone would cause a veto of the bill and make us lose all of our efforts toward achieving tax reform.

Second, the Gore amendment is unfair because in order to provide greater tax relief for those with large families it robs the single people and married couples with only one or no children of their fair share of the tax relief.

Third, the Gore amendment is unfair because it takes away virtually all of what little tax reduction is provided for those above $20,000 and piles it on top of already large tax reductions for those at lower income levels. The committee's bill provides a 66-percent tax reduction for those in the zero to $3,000 class and a 30-percent reduction for those in the $3,000 to $5,000 class. I should think that this would generally be considered adequate. I cannot see why or how one justifies increasing this still further.

Fourth, in order to find the money for this exemption increase Senator GORE has to scrap one of the most essential characteristics of this bill; namely, the shift for some 11.6 million taxpayers from having to itemize their deductions to taking the simple standard deduction each year.

I urge Senators to reject the Gore amendment at either the $1,000 level or the $800 level.

Mr. President, at this point I wish to read into the RECORD the letter, dated December 1, 1969, signed by the President, as addressed to the minority leader, the Honorable HUGH SCOTT, wherein he strongly recommends that the Senate stand by the committee bill and reject the Gore amendment.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 1, 1969.

DEAR HUGH: The Senate is to be commended for the deliberate speed with which it is considering H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969. I hope that meaningful and acceptable legislation can be passed by Congress before the end of this year. But to be acceptable, such legislation must be equitable and it must meet the test of fiscal responsibility.

Certain amendments scheduled to be considered by the Senate this week fail these tests. I refer to the proposals to raise the personal exemption from $600 to either $800 or $1,000, and to establish a $1,000 uniform standard deduction. Those proposals would be substituted for the major tax-relief provisions of H.R. 13270 as voted by the Senate Finance Committee.

The Finance Committee bill would result in a net revenue gain for fiscal years 1970 and 1971, and a minor loss in 1972. It is consistent with our determined efforts to control inflation.

This bill fights inflation by extending the income tax surcharge at 5 percent until mid-1970; postponing scheduled reductions in certain excises; and repealing the 7-percent investment credit. It is simply not in the national interest then to add new inflationary pressures through reduction in personal income taxes which are too early and too generous.

The proposed amendments would substitute imbalanced, inequitable relief for the Committee's evenhanded tax rate reductions in all income brackets.

The proposal to raise the personal exemption to $1,000 would fall some $6 billion short of the Committee bill during the next 2½ years. The $800 exemption would result in a $4.8 billion short-fall. The Administration's economical Low Income Allowance, which would take some 5 million citizens off the tax rolls and lower taxes on 7 million others, goes far enough this time.

The spirit of this legislation is tax reform which attempts to make taxation fairer to all Americans not tax reduction. It would be unfortunate indeed if Congress violated this spirit of reform and thereby jeopardized both the source of revenue for vital national goals and the fight against inflation.

This Administration is strongly committed to tax reform. I have stated that I will sign a good tax reform bill. I still intend to do so, but it must be equitably constructed and it must be fiscally responsible.

I urge the Senate to accept the tax relief provisions so carefully constructed by the Senate Finance Committee.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD statistics compiled by the Joint Committee on Taxation which show that if a 100-percent tax were imposed on all incomes in America in excess of $50,000 the additional revenue would amount to only $1.1 billion.

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

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1969.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: This is in reference to your request for an estimate of the revenue gain which would result from applying a tax rate of 100 percent to that portion of each tax return's taxable income which is in excess of $50,000 ($100,000 for joint returns).

We estimate that under present law (without tax surcharge) at 1969 income levels, if a tax bracket rate of 100 percent were applicable to that portion of each tax return's taxable income which is in excess of $50,000 ($100,000 for joint returns), the resulting revenue gain would amount to $1.1 billion, as follows:

[In billions]

Portion of every return's taxable income which is over $50,000	$3.3
Tax at present law rates (without surcharge)	2.2
Additional tax	1.1

If net long-term capital gains subject to the alternative 50 percent rate falling in the bracket level in excess of $50,000 ($100,000 for joint returns) were also subjected to a 100 percent rate an additional revenue gain of $1.75 billion would result, as follows:

[In billions]

Portion of every return's net long-term capital gain (subject to alternative tax) which falls in the bracket level over $50,000	$3.50
Tax at present law rate (without surcharge)	1.75
Additional tax	1.75

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I put those figures in the RECORD in order to do away with the argument that the way to reduce taxes is just to put more taxes on the so-called rich and thereby pass a tax relief on to those in the lower brackets. This table emphasizes the fact that we have already gone far down the road to confiscating the wealth of the so-called rich. I think the table should be included in the RECORD, and I hope Senators will read it carefully.

It should be pointed out that even if Congress should impose this 100 percent tax on incomes in excess of $50,000 the revenue of $1.1 billion is only possible on the unrealistic assumption that all those earning this amount would work just as hard for the honor of turning all their income over to the Government.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the amendment introduced by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, of which I am a cosponsor, to increase the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 is, in my opinion, the most needed tax relief in America. This is not the first time that I have supported a measure to increase the personal exemption. For over 12 years I have worked for such an increase. Three times I have been elected to the U.S. Senate. Each time that was a prime matter in my platform. No other matter has moved the American people, in my opinion, more than this desire for tax relief.

At the beginning of this Congress, I introduced a bill, S. 1717, which would have increased the personal exemption from $600 to $1,200. When the House passed its tax bill, I reintroduced my bill as an amendment to that bill. Throughout my fight for this increase, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee was an invaluable ally. When I testified for this tax relief before the Finance Committee a few weeks ago, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee said that he would offer such an amendment on the floor of the Senate. I have the privilege of being a cosponsor. He has done so with his usual fine ability, comprehension of the needs of the people, and understanding of legislation. I commend him for his efforts to increase the personal exemption in the Finance Committee. I applaud him for his leadership in bringing this amendment to the floor of the Senate for action.

The tax bill now before the Senate had its genesis with the discontent of the people with the unjust and inequitable system of taxation which forces the major portion of the Nation's tax burden on the lower- and middle-income groups, and lets the richest off with the lightest burdens. These people have demanded that their elected representatives in Congress reform our tax laws and provide relief to the overtaxed segment of our society. Unfortunately, neither the House nor the Senate Committee on Finance included in their tax proposals the one measure that means the most to the average taxpayer: an increase in the personal exemption.

Let me repeat, Mr. President: That means most of the average taxpayers in America; and that means about 90 to 95 percent of the people—the people in the middle-income tax brackets, upper middle-income, lower middle-income, and the workers in the lower income brackets also. Without an increase in the personal exemption, no tax reform will be complete.

The personal exemption of $600 per person was established by the Revenue Act of 1948. During its 21-year history, the personal exemption has not been increased despite the fact that the cost of living, according to the consumer price indexes, has risen by 52.3 percent since 1948. Under present economic conditions, the $600 amount would have to be increased to $914 merely to equal the purchasing power of the personal exemption in 1948. That would be at the level of the standard of living of 1948, but if we increase the amount of the personal exemption to equal the higher standard of living people have now over 1948, it would require an increase in the personal exemption to $1,200 per person per year. But if we were to increase it to only match the increased cost of the same objects that were bought in 1948, without allowing for the higher standard of living, we would have to increase it to $914.

The personal exemption is intended to accomplish three basic purposes: First, to exclude from taxation those individuals and families with the lowest income; second, to provide all taxpayers with a deduction from otherwise taxable income for essential living expenses; and third, to provide an additional allowance to those taxpayers with dependents and for those who are aged and blind. I submit that at the present unrealistic amount of $600, the personal exemption is not fulfilling any of these purposes.

The amendment that has been offered by the Senator from Tennessee and the other cosponsors is a well reasoned and progressive approach to remedying many of the inequities in the present tax laws and bringing tangible tax relief to a majority of our citizens. This amendment not only increases the personal exemption; it also provides a $1,000 low-income allowance. The combined effect of the increase in the personal exemption and the low-income allowance will be to provide more direct tax relief to the lower and middle-income taxpayer than does the Finance Committee's version of H.R. 13270.

The Gore amendment, which I am cosponsoring, would raise the personal exemption to $700 in 1970, $800 in 1971, $900 in 1972, and to $1,000 in 1973 and subsequent years. This stair-step increase completely answers the argument that a personal exemption increase would disrupt the tax structure. The 4-year spread-out would help taxpayers to some extent each year, but would do it in such a span of time as to allow increased employment, income, and production to put other taxes in the Treasury. This amend-

ment gives needed tax relief to the most needy, and is fiscally and governmentally sound at the same time, by spreading that increase over a 4-year period.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important amendment. It is a measure which is based on strong economic and moral considerations. I have long advocated it. I am devoted to its objectives. I am committed to seeing it adopted. I plead with Senators to give it their most careful consideration and full support.

AMENDMENT NO. 332 TO PERMIT TAX EXEMPT FOUNDATION FUNDS TO BE USED FOR NONPARTISAN VOTER EDUCATION AND REGISTRATION

Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) and myself, and approximately 30 other Senators whose names I shall read, I send to the desk an amendment to the tax bill, H.R. 13270, and ask that the amendment be printed. The amendment would permit tax exempt foundation funds to be used for nonpartisan voter registration and education programs within certain limitations.

In 1965, Congress took a major step toward fulfilling the American dream of having a society in which all our citizens can participate fully by enacting the Voting Rights Act. This act embodies the belief of Congress and of the majority of our people that the right to vote is fundamental to our democracy and should be extended to all our people. Important as the Voting Rights Act is, it standing alone will not assure full participation in our Government, because it is an axiom of political science, Mr. President, that people who have been disfranchised for many years will not, of their own volition, begin to participate in their government unless they are encouraged to do so.

For the Voting Rights Act to be more than a scrap of paper, it is imperative that those members and groups that have been denied the right to vote for so long be educated as to their rights and encouraged to exercise them. The task of voter education and registration has been left largely to private organizations.

Private organizations have responded to the challenge and their hard work is reflected in the increased voter registration throughout the country.

Two organizations which have been particularly effective in increasing interest in voting have been the League of Women Voters and the Southern Regional Council. These two well-respected organizations have conducted nonpartisan voter education projects throughout the country which have been designed to encourage people to take part in their government by voting their convictions. Neither of these organizations have attempted to stimulate interest in a particular party, nor have they tried to elect a particular candidate or champion a particular cause or political party. On the contrary, what they have tried to do is persuade people of all political philosophies and beliefs that our democracy will respond to the desires and wishes of our people if only they will take the time to vote. Their efforts have met with success. For example, between 1966 and 1968, the voter education project of the Southern Regional Council has added 700,000 people to the registration rolls. Many of these people are members of minority groups which have for years been systematically denied the right to vote despite clear language of the Constitution.

Unfortunately, in some isolated instances, private foundations have abused the privilege granted them under our present tax laws and have engaged in partisan political activities. Such activities must be stopped. The House of Representatives attempted to deal with this problem by including provisions in its version of the tax bill that would permit private foundations to engage in voter registration and education projects provided that these projects are nonpartisan in nature, operate in five or more States, supported by five or more private foundations, and the contributions to the organization conducting such projects are not geographically limited as to use. Although the House provision would eliminate the abuses that have occurred under the present law, these provisions are too restrictive and would eliminate too many voter programs of many of the smaller nonpartisan private foundations.

Instead of trying to improve the provisions of the House bill, the Committee on Finance took what I believe to be an ill-advised and unnecessary step of banning all foundation grants to voter registration and education projects. If this decision is not reversed, much of the good work accomplished by the League of Women Voters and the Southern Regional Council as well as many of the smaller organizations will be destroyed. Furthermore, to eliminate the means of educating and registering of voters without proposing a workable substitute will seriously undermine the 1965 Voting Rights Act.

The amendment which the distinguished minority leader of the Senate, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), and I are submitting today is designed to accomplish two specific purposes: First, to curb the abuses that exist under present law, and second, to restore the opportunity to private foundations to support nonpartisan voter registration and education projects. More specifically the amendment would allow foundation participation in such programs provided: First, these activities are truly nonpartisan; second, they are conducted in more than one State; third, they are supported by contributions from the general public or from three or more tax exempt organizations; fourth, no one tax exempt organization contributes more than 40 percent to these activities; and fifth, contributions to such activities are not specifically designated for use in a particular geographical area or specific election.

In short, the amendment will encourage legitimate voter activities while stopping abuses.

It is sad that in the United States, the greatest democracy in history, voter participation is so low. In this country only 70 percent of the eligible voters participate in our Government by voting, whereas in Great Britain 77 percent participate, and 80 percent participate in West Germany. It is the duty of Congress to encourage, not discourage, full participation in our democratic processes. Toward that goal, Congress has made significant progress since 1965. If, however, the tax bill is passed in its present form, this progressive trend will be reversed.

During my years in both public and private life, I have seen the effects of the poll tax and literacy tests on the democratic process. I have seen how for years large portions of our society have been taxed and drafted into military service, but denied the basic right to vote.

Mr. President, on Monday of last week, 8 days ago, for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare I was conducting a hearing on the health problems of Mexican Americans in my State. Some of the Mexican American leaders stated that their people were unable to obtain medicare, they were unable to get welfare, and they were unable to get social security; that they did not understand the language and therefore had great difficulty obtaining these benefits. These leaders, however, did say:

> The government can always find us when they need us for the military draft or for the labor force, but they can't find us for our social security or welfare or medicare payments when we need the government.

When it needs men for the draft, the Government never has any trouble in finding the minority groups of our Nation; however, if these same people want any Government services, or need help in the form of welfare, social security, or medicare payments, the Government cannot seem to find them.

So vast numbers are not on the voter rolls and are not receiving social security or medicare. These people need to vote. They need to be assured the right to vote.

I have seen the good work of private foundations in voter registration and the positive impact of the 1965 Voting Rights Act. Therefore, I urge all Senators to give the amendment careful consideration and respectfully request that they vote for it.

Mr. President, I read for the RECORD the names of Senators who are cosponsoring the amendment. They are: Senators HARRIS, HARTKE, MONDALE, JACKSON, HUGHES, CHURCH, METCALF, INOUYE, HART, YOUNG of Ohio, CRANSTON, MCGOVERN, TYDINGS, BAYH, PROXMIRE, RIBICOFF, MUSKIE, MCINTYRE, EAGLETON, MCCARTHY, NELSON, PELL, GRAVEL, FULBRIGHT, and MCGEE. We have as cosponsors of the amendment on the other side of the aisle Senators SCOTT, CASE, BROOKE, GOODELL, JAVITS, PERCY, COOK, and SCHWEIKER.

I have been away from my office at a conference between the House and Senate on the legislative appropriations bill since well before 3 o'clock. There may be the names of other cosponsors to add to the list before the day is over.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Finance, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the amendment together with the distinguished mi-

nority leader and the distinguished Senator from Texas.

I took the same position in committee. I was sorry that we were not able to prevail at that time.

I am very much impressed by the number of cosponsors of the amendment. I think it heralds well for its chances of adoption in the Senate.

It is rather strange to me that whereas in most Latin American countries if a person is able to read and write, he is required to vote; in our country, where we pay tribute rightly to the democratic ideals, we place all sorts of barriers in the way of people who want to vote.

I think that adoption of the amendment will allow us to continue to lower some of the unreasonable barriers. I hope that the amendment will be agreed to.

Again, I point out that I am pleased to laud the two principal sponsors of the amendment. I think their stature and support of the amendment will also be very helpful as it is considered by the Senate.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Texas for his clear exposition of an amendment which has such wide sponsorship and is clearly designed to make possible the important efforts of some well recognized civic organizations in encouraging the registration of more people to vote, the exercise of the franchise obviously being one of the most precious essentials of our rights in our society. There is a desire on the part of most Americans at this time to vote.

Mr. President, I welcome this opportunity to join as the primary cosponsor of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) to reinstate in the Senate version of H.R. 13270, the tax reform bill now before us, provisions which would permit tax-exempt foundation funds to be used for voter registration and education programs. I am pleased to note that this effort has a broad base of support in the cosponsorship of Senators from both sides of the aisle.

Mr. President, our amendment is addressed to the action taken by the Committee on Finance in totally deleting from the tax reform bill provisions which would permit private foundation funds to be used for voter registration activities. This action, in my opinion, was far more severe than justified or necessary. It complicated further the action taken earlier by the House of Representatives in approving restrictions which, in attempting to correct a few abuses, would have the practical effect of terminating the participation of many well recognized nonpartisan foundations in programs of this kind.

Our amendment, Mr. President, is not without its safeguards; its conditions for eligibility are explicit. It requires that voter registration activities be of a truly nonpartisan nature; that they be conducted in more than one State; that they be supported by contributions from the general public or from three or more tax-exempt organizations, and that no one tax-exempt organization contribute more than 40 percent to any given voter registration effort. Further, our amendment requires continuity by prohibiting the specific designation of tax-exempt funds for use in a particular geographical area or specific election. In short, our amendment, while broad enough to encourage legitimate voter registration and education, is drawn tightly enough to discourage a repetition of those few isolated instances in which foundations have misused the exemption granted them under our present tax laws by engaging in partisan political activities.

The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights is deeply concerned by the potential impact which the Senate version of the tax reform bill would have in this area, if enacted without amendment. The Commission, while urging a more active Federal role, has officially recognized also that the right to vote will not be realized fully unless the burden of taking affirmative action to encourage voter registration is shared with the Federal Government by others. Two private organizations which come readily to mind for their success in nonpartisan efforts in voter registration and education are the League of Women Voters and the Southern Regional Conference. There are others, perhaps less well known, but equally deserving of public recognition and confidence. Unfortunately, the Senate bill not only fails to recognize the need for voter education programs of this kind, but it undermines totally private foundation efforts directed at stimulating voter participation. Our amendment is designed to continue, with adequate safeguards, the tax stimulus needed to encourage and make possible this support.

As one of its strong proponents, I am encouraged by the progress which has been realized to date under the Voting Rights Act of 1965. This act embodies the belief of Congress, a belief shared by a clear majority of Americans, that the right to vote is fundamental to our democracy and should be extended to all of our people. I hope to see the Voting Rights Act further strengthened by extension in this Congress, and I intend to lend fully my support.

But as important as this act is, it cannot, by itself, assure full participation for all Americans in the governmental process. For this goal finally to be achieved, those citizens, who have been denied the voting right that the rest of us take for granted, must be educated about this right and encouraged to exercise it.

Private organizations have responded well to this challenge, and their hard work is reflected in increased voter registration throughout the country. Only today, for example, the Bureau of the Census has reported that the number of Negroes in Southern States who voted in the presidential election last year increased to 51 percent, compared with 44 percent for the presidential election of 1964. The Bureau's report adds that 61 percent of the South's Negro population was actually registered to vote in 1968. The positive impact of this effort must not be abated, especially when so much remains still to be done, not only in the South, but also in the urban areas of the North and in the rural Southwest.

Therefore, I urge all Members of the Senate to give our amendment their serious consideration and support.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I recognize the attractiveness of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee to increase the personal exemption to $1,000. It sounds so easy, so simple, and so understandable to the voters back home just to provide the tax reduction in the form of an exemption increase which none of them can fail to understand. Despite this, there are some things about this exemption proposal that I think one should hear and think about before he casts any vote in favor of an exemption increase.

I want to talk about this plan at two different levels. First, I want to talk about the fiscal aspects. The Senator has offered, so far, the $1,000 personal exemption proposal and the increase in the minimum standard deduction to $1,000. However, we all know that if he is defeated on the $1,000 exemption proposal, if we vote down this proposal, as I certainly think we should, then we can expect further suggestions along the same line. We can expect either the Senator from Tennessee or other Senators to seek to scale down the increased exemption level, perhaps first to $900 and then perhaps to the $800 level.

At the $800 level, the revenue impact would be about the same as it would be in the measure provided by the committee.

The Senator from Tennessee used that approach in the committee, and he has assured us that he will do it again in the event the $1,000 exemption is not agreed to.

Because of the double or triple approach that the Senator is almost sure to use on his proposal, I want to talk first on the basis of the revenue loss which is involved in the proposal before us at this moment. In commenting on this proposal, I will hold my comments largely to the fiscal policy implications.

While I think that by far the most dangerous thing we could do would be to adopt the $1,000 exemption proposal with the tremendous revenue loss involved, yet even the $800 exemption proposal contains some very serious flaws. In fact, if the Senate fully understands how serious these flaws are, I doubt whether it would approve even the $800 exemption.

Let me turn first to the $1,000 exemption. There really is no way to describe this, except as fiscal irresponsibility.

If we have any doubts of its fiscal irresponsibility, let me give you just a few of the numbers. Any exemption increase is expensive. Even a $100 increase in the per capita exemption costs over $3.3 billion annually. Each additional $100 exemption increase costs slightly less since the tax base as the exemptions are raised keeps getting a little smaller. Nonetheless, a $400 increase in exemptions on an annual basis still results in a revenue loss of $12.7 billion.

When this is taken together with the minimum standard deduction increase and the rate adjustment which the Senator's proposal provides for single people,

the long-run revenue cost of the tax relief which the Senator would provide is $14.8 billion.

This is $5.8 billion more than the $9 billion of relief provided in the bill as reported by the Finance Committee.

The $9 billion of relief provided by the House bill, as reported by the Finance Committee, results in a $2.3 billion long-run deficit. I have some doubt as to whether that deficit should exist, but the Gore amendment increases this deficit for the bill by more than three and one-half times, to a level of $8.1 billion.

Frankly, I do not see how we can justify so large a deficit in this bill. I know that the Senator from Tennessee says that he can find plenty of places to increase revenue by adding this reform and that reform to the bill. But these additional measures are hard to enact. I, too, can find ways by which to increase revenues. In committee, I offered proposals to raise more revenue in various and sundry ways. Those proposals would have raised between $2 billion and $3 billion in the pending bill. However, the amendments were not agreed to.

It seems to me to be totally irresponsible to vote for a tax reduction based upon revenue raising measures which neither the House nor the Senate committee has seen fit to agree to. We cannot justify a tax reduction because we think someone ought to pay more taxes. We can justify a tax reduction because we are successful, as the committee was successful, in providing additional revenue. Only in that way can we justify further tax reductions in the pending bill.

Therefore, I do not see how we can justify the revenue loss in this case by problematical revenues which might be obtained from sundry provisions if the Senate were willingly to vote for these tax increases, but I confidently predict that the Senate will not so vote.

If anyone thought seriously that additional reforms could be added to the bill, it would seem to me that the responsible way to go about it would be first to offer amendments to obtain the additional revenue, and then to undertake to dispense the additional revenue in terms of tax savings to those whom one wanted to benefit. That is how we approached it in the Committee on Finance. We voted to raise as much additional revenue as the majority on the committee was willing to vote to raise. Each Senator voted for tax increases in terms of tightening up loopholes or making various groups pay more taxes, as his conscience dictated. Then we proceeded to dispense tax reduction to the extent that we thought we could do so and be fiscally responsible.

If one wanted to vote for a major tax reduction—that is, beyond what the committee did, beyond the $9 billion tax reduction the committee voted—he ought first to submit a revenue raising proposal in the form of an amendment—and see if he can have it agreed to. He should submit a proposal to raise more taxes by imposing them on somebody, no matter who it may be—the bankers, the lawyers, the doctors, the oil people, the real estate people. If he could raise more money, then he could suggest that we provide further tax reductions.

Senators will recall that when we were discussing the surcharge last week, it was pointed out how an effort had been made, for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 particularly, to build up a surplus insofar as this bill was concerned to help contain inflationary pressure. This amendment, however, has worse implications for fiscal years 1970 and 1971 than a failure to extend the surcharge—an action which this body has already rejected by a vote of 49 to 28, presumably upon the basis that the Government simply cannot afford the revenue loss involved in terminating the surcharge as of January of next year. This amendment would cost us in these 2 years an additional $3.4 billion, as contrasted with the $3.1 billion of revenue that would be lost had Senators not agreed to an extension of the surcharge. The Gore amendment would reduce the surplus provided by this bill by $900 million in fiscal year 1970, from $3.4 billion to $2.5 billion. In fiscal year 1971, however, its impact would be much worse. In that year it could be expected to reduce the $3 billion surplus in this bill to $500 million.

Mr. President, when I talk about a $3 billion surplus in this bill, I am not saying that the Government is going to have any surplus in the budget. All I am saying is that this bill would raise $3 billion more than we would have if we permitted the surtax to expire and the excise taxes to expire and if we failed to repeal the investment tax credit. In other words, on balance the bill will produce $3 billion of taxes that otherwise would not exist; and by levying those taxes, we say that we have a surplus over what we would have if we passed no bill at all. But this does not alter the fact that the Government still projects a deficit, next year, of several billion dollars in its administrative budget, and a further deficit in years to come.

The Committee on Finance, in its consideration of the bill, very carefully rearranged the tax reduction features to improve the fiscal situation in fiscal year 1971. The Gore amendment undoes all of this good work plus a great deal more.

We have been told that the surplus on the unified or consolidated budget basis is $5.9 billion for the fiscal year 1970. The Budget Bureau people tell us that even this surplus is in real jeopardy because increases in mandatory payments under existing law for such things as interest on the public debt, veterans' benefits, and social insurance trust fund payments could well exceed the budgeted amounts by $2 billion. These are automatic increases. Moreover, Congress is seriously considering proposed legislation which would add $5 billion in expenditures to the request already reflected in the budget. When we take into account these difficulties in holding down expenditure levels for fiscal year 1970, it seems to me that it is impossible to justify a further increase in the deficit on the revenue side by $900 million.

The problems in fiscal 1971 are likely to be much worse. The administration has already indicated that expenditures in fiscal 1972 can be expected to go over the $200 billion mark, and the struggle in that year will be to try to come up with a balanced budget. We certainly do not help matters along toward achieving this result if we add a $2.5 billion revenue loss to that picture by this amendment.

We seem to be beginning to win the battle to get inflation under control. Retail or consumer prices are still rising too rapidly, but the rate of increase as shown by other indicators, such as wholesale prices, suggests some slowdown. Just as we are beginning to win our battle with inflation, it seems to me that it would be especially inappropriate for us to refuel the fires of inflation all over again by turning this tax reform bill into a measure for deficit financing.

Let me say just one more word about the $1,000 exemption as such. I think it is clear that the administration is not going to put up with the type of revenue loss represented by this $5.8 billion increase in revenue reductions. To me, this suggests only one thing—a veto of the tax reform bill. This would be a terrible waste of effort and hard work for both the House and the Senate and for a good many people who have worked with us diligently in trying to improve our tax laws. So I urge Senators to vote against the $1,000 exemption if they are at all interested in tax reform.

Let me turn now to what is wrong with the exemption proposal, as I see it, even if the amount proposed were reduced so that it would not cause a loss of any more revenue than the Finance Committee's bill. In other words, what would still be wrong with the exemption proposal if it provided for an increase in exemptions to $800 rather than to $1,000? On this basis, the revenue loss from the proposal, given the $1,000 minimum standard deduction and the rate adjustment for single people, would be about the same as the revenue loss provided in the Finance Committee bill and in the House-passed bill.

But before I deal with the problems under the Gore proposal with exemptions set at $800, let me say just a few words about the Finance Committee proposal.

The committee bill is in no sense a jerry-built plan. The House of Representatives Committee on Ways and Means had more time to work on this matter than did the Senate committee, and after our analyses of the matter we agreed that the approach they took was appropriate. There was a specific decision to take care of a number of problems in the existing tax structure. The objectives of the bill were aimed specifically at these problem areas.

The first objective was to take off the tax rolls all persons at or below poverty levels and to provide some special relief for people whose incomes, though above the poverty levels, were still too close for comfort to the edge of poverty. The committee concluded that it just makes no sense to tax people who do not receive enough to maintain themselves at even a minimum standard of living.

For this reason, the committee bill provides a minimum standard deduction of

$1,100. This is available to every married couple that files a joint return and also to every single person who files a separate return. This replaces the minimum standard deduction under present law, which provides an allowance of $300 for the first exemption and $100 for each additional exemption claimed on the tax return.

The purpose of this provision is to be sure that those at or below the poverty level pay no income tax and those immediately above this level receive some special tax relief. The committee provision achieves this objective with real precision, as Senators will see when I show them a chart on this matter. The Senator from Tennessee apparently finds little fault in this provision, since he has adopted it as his own, except that he has set the minimum standard deduction level at $1,000 instead of the $1,100 provided by the committee action, or at a level $100 below that which the committee saw fit to provide for those in poverty.

The second concern of the committee was the increasing complexity of the tax laws for the average taxpayer. I am not referring to the taxpayer who is involved in complex business operations or who has an accountant to keep track of his activities for him; rather I am referring to the average taxpayer who at one time took the standard deduction but who now must itemize his deductions because, given the present levels of interest, taxes, medical costs, and prices, the standard deduction has become inadequate for him. At one time in 1944, 92 percent of our taxpayers used the standard deduction. But year by year, this number has shrunk as prices have risen, until today only 58 percent of all taxpayers use the standard deduction.

Mr. President, imagine how much more the reduction in the use of the standard deduction has caused taxpayers to resent the complexity of their tax system. In 1944 82 percent of our taxpayers used the standard deduction. But year by year that number has dropped until today only 58 percent of all taxpayers use the standard deduction.

The bill proposed by the committee would cause a much greater percentage of all taxpayers—approximately 74 percent—to use the standard deduction, and they will feel much better satisfied with our tax system when they are able to do so.

If there is to be a revolt on the part of taxpayers because of complexity, I do not believe it will be because of those who have accountants and lawyers to help them prepare their returns, but rather because the average taxpayer finds that his tax return is too complicated for him to prepare by himself.

The person who has to hire accountants and who has to seek advice and keep records and itemizations just so he can fill out his tax return is the person who is more likely to revolt than the person who already has his accountants, lawyers, and records but who must pay $10, $15, or even $50 more in taxes because of the bill. It is the thought of having to keep records and make itemizations or having the Treasury people call him in that is more likely to cause a person to resent our tax system than anything else.

The bill as reported by the Finance Committee takes dead aim at this problem in two different ways. First, it raises the percentage of the standard deduction from 10 to 15 percent of income; and second, it raises the maximum from $1,000 to $2,000. The effect, in conjunction with the increase in the minimum standard deduction, is to switch 11.6 million taxpayers over from itemized deductions to the standard deduction. This will increase from 58 to 74 percent the percentage of all of our taxpayers using the standard deduction.

The Gore amendment, on the other hand, has relatively little impact in shifting people over from the itemized deductions to the standard deduction as the exemption increase itself has virtually no effect in this direction. The only reason there is any shift at all over to the standard deduction under his proposal is because he accepts the minimum standard deduction from the committee bill, although reducing it to $1,000. This will cause 4.4 million to shift over to the standard deduction as contrasted to the 11.6 million under the committee action. As a result, the exemption increase part of the Gore proposal does nothing to help simplify the tax return for those who continue to pay taxes. To me, this is a major failing of the Gore amendment. It is in marked contrast with the considerable achievements of the Finance Committee bill in this area.

It is true that the Gore amendment takes more people off the tax rolls, as such, than does the committee action, but I will show Senators in just a moment that it is not good to take people off the tax rolls when they really still have a taxpaying capacity.

The third objective of the Finance Committee action, after meeting the special problems of the poor and the need for tax simplification, was to make the remaining relief available to everyone on an across-the-board basis. It is for this reason that the committee provided an across-the-board rate cut for everyone of approximately 5 percent. It is important to realize that this across-the-board cut is available for everyone and is in addition to the reductions resulting from the minimum standard deduction and the increase in the ceiling and rate of the regular standard deduction. This means that those in the lowest and middle-income brackets who are the chief beneficiaries from the minimum standard deduction and the increase in the regular standard deduction get relief in two ways. They get relief not only from the changes in the standard deduction but also in the rate reductions as well. That is why, as I will show you in just a minute, the tax relief provided by the committee action is heavily weighted in favor of the middle- and lower-income brackets.

Let me turn now to a comparison of the reductions provided by the committee action and by the Gore amendment. I have already pointed out the failure of the Gore amendment to achieve the simplification provided by the committee bill. But let us now compare the actual distribution of the tax reductions provided by the two approaches.

At this point I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the percentage tax reduction by adjusted gross income classes provided by the committee bill and by the Gore plan providing an $800 exemption.

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

PERCENTAGE TAX REDUCTION UNDER H.R. 13270 WHEN FULLY EFFECTIVE AND UNDER $800 PERSONAL EXEMPTION AND $1,000 LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE IN PLACE OF H.R. 13270 RELIEF PROVISIONS

Adjusted gross income (thousands)	H.R. 13270	$800 personal exemption and $1,000 low-income allowance
0 to $3,000	−66.1	−72.5
$3,000 to $5,000	−30.3	−36.2
$5,000 to $7,000	−17.0	−22.8
$7,000 to $10,000	−10.9	−16.1
$10,000 to $15,000	−10.3	−10.4
$15,000 to $20,000	−8.6	−7.4
$20,000 to $50,000	−7.2	−5.0
$50,000 to $100,000	−4.8	−0.5
$100,000 and over	+2.6	+10.4
Total	−10.1	−10.0

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the tax reductions provided by the committee bill start at 66 percent in the zero to $3,000 category. They provide for a reduction of 30.3 percent in the $3,000 to $5,000 category and a reduction of 17 percent in the $5,000 to $7,000 category. From $7,000 to $10,000, the reduction is approximately 11 percent, and from $10,000 to $15,000 it is 10 percent. Above that level, the reduction gradually falls off, until in the category from $50,000 to $100,000 the reduction is only 4.8 percent. Above $100,000, because of the major impact of the tax reform measures in the bill, instead of a reduction there is an increase of 2.6 percent.

Mr. President, that would work in this way. While some people who are paying taxes on all they earn would receive some reduction in the rates and thereby be benefited, those who have enjoyed tax-sheltered income would be paying much more in taxes. Therefore, when one averages the two, he will find there is a tax increase for persons who make more than $100,000. Although some persons in that group receive tax reductions because they receive reductions in the rates, many of those same people will be paying more taxes because of the increase in the capital gains taxes, the decrease in the depletion allowance, the real estate adjustments, and various and sundry other matters.

Let us now compare these tax reductions with those provided by the Gore amendment. First of all, the average reduction provided by the two plans, since they both lose approximately the same amount of money, is the same: both provide for an overall reduction of approximately 10 percent. Also an examination of the percentages will disclose that in the $10,000 to $15,000 income group, the percentage reduction in the two plans is almost exactly the same—10 and a fraction of a percent. I think this is especially worth noting because of the many statements as to how much more the Gore plan will help the middle-income groups than will the committee action. The statistics just do not show that this is true; the reduction is almost identical to the great middle-income category of $10,000 to $15,000. In

the area from $15,000 to $50,000 the Gore amendment provides approximately one-third less relief than the committee bill. Above $50,000, the Gore amendment provides virtually no relief at all and above $100,000, instead of resulting in a 2.6-percent tax increase as under the committee bill, the Gore proposal results in a tax increase of over 10 percent. The relief that the committee bill provides in these areas the Gore amendment adds on in the areas below $10,000. Not satisfied with a 66-percent tax reduction in the zero to $3,000 category, the Gore amendment increases it to 72 percent; it also increases the $3,000 to $5,000 cut from 30 to 36 percent and the $5,000 to $7,000 cut from 17 to 23 percent. Frankly, I do not think that the Senator from Tennessee can establish that these additional cuts over and above those provided by the committee bill are needed in these brackets.

Mr. President, I have been talking to you up to this point only from the standpoint of the distribution of the changes we made in the individual income tax. One must realize that we also provided some tax increases—and no reductions—in the corporate area as well. An important part of this, although by no means all, was the repeal of the investment credit. We also did a number of other things such as getting rid of multiple surtax exemptions and revising the tax treatment of banks and companies engaged in natural resources.

I discussed this matter with the Senator from Tennessee a little bit the other day. As I pointed out then, somebody must bear this additional tax burden represented by these corporate income tax changes. This gets us into the question of the incidence of the corporate income tax—or who bears the burden of this tax. Economists are not in agreement as to the extent to which this tax is borne by the shareholders or shifted forward to consumers. Generally, however, I heard it said that somewhere from one-half to three-fourths of the burden was borne by the shareholders. Obviously, I do not know any precise percentage in this case nor does anybody else.

I have assumed, for purposes of illustration, that a portion of the increased taxes on corporations would be borne by the shareholders, which is half way between 50 and 75 percent that the economists tend to gravitate toward. If we average that out, one could expect about 62.5 percent of the corporate tax changes to be borne by the shareholders. The other 37.5 percent would be about what we would expect the corporation to be able to pass forward to those who ultimately consume its products.

On this basis, I have examined the tax burden of individuals by income levels, taking into account both the corporate and the individual income tax changes made by this bill.

On this basis, the percentage reduction is much less since this takes into account $4.9 billion of corporate income tax increases. The overall tax reduction under the committee bill on this basis is only 2.1 percent. The important thing, however, is the distribution of the tax burden, taking into account the reduction on this basis. I have such a distribution based upon the House-passed bill which is quite close to the Finance Committee action. This indicates a tax reduction of 16.5 percent for those in the zero to $3,000 bracket, a decrease of 14.4 percent for those in the $3,000 to $5,000 bracket, and a decrease of 8.1 percent for those in the $5,000 to $7,000 bracket. For those in the $7,000 to $15,000 bracket, the rate reduction on this basis is 4.5 percent. In the $15,000 to $20,000 bracket, the reduction on this basis is only 2.7 percent, and above that level we are faced with only tax increases—tax increases which amount to 9.1 percent for income levels of $100,000 and over and even in the $50,000 to $100,000 category an increase of 1.5 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the distribution of tax reductions, taking into account the tax increase imposed with respect to corporations based upon the assumption that 62.5 percent of the increase is borne by the shareholders.

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

Distribution of tax reductions under House-passed tax reform bill (Assuming 62.5 percent of the burden of increases in corporate taxes under reform provisions is borne by shareholders)

[In thousands of dollars]

Adjusted gross income:	
0 to 3	−16.5
3 to 5	−14.4
5 to 7	− 8.1
7 to 10	− 4.5
10 to 15	− 4.5
15 to 20	− 2.7
20 to 50	+ .1
50 to 100	+ 1.5
100 and over	+ 9.1
Total	− 2.1

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, these data, mind you, are based upon the House distribution of the burden which also approximates the Finance Committee distribution.

Mr. President, if the bill is to be amended as suggested by the Gore amendment, I have another table I should like to offer for the RECORD, to show how the tax reduction falls when one looks at who is actually bearing the incidence of the increase in corporation taxes. I ask unanimous consent to have this table printed in the RECORD.

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

Distribution of tax changes from House-passed reform measures and Gore $800 exemption proposal (Assuming 62.5 percent of the burden of increases in the corporate tax is borne by shareholders)

Adjusted gross income class:	Percentage tax change [1]
0–3,000	−19.0
3–5,000	−18.1
5–7,000	−12.3
7–10,000	−8.3
10–15,000	−4.5
15–20,000	−1.8
20–50,000	+1.7
50–100,000	+4.4
100,000 and over	+13.4
Total	−2.1

[1] Percentage of present law individual and corporate tax liability.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what this points out is that the zero to $3,000 income bracket would receive a 19-percent tax cut and the cut would gradually be reduced until those in the $100,000 or over bracket would have a tax increase of 13.4 percent. So that the tax increase is very substantial in the Gore amendment on those with incomes of $100,000 or more. Not a tax cut, but a tax increase. It is a much bigger tax increase in reality than it looks like when we fail to take into account the increase in taxes on corporations.

In other words, rather than being about a 2.4-percent increase in taxes on people with incomes over $100,000, the pending bill, taking into account the corporate increases, provides a 9-percent increase in taxes for people with incomes over $100,000. It would be a 13.4-percent increase on those people with incomes over $100,000 under the Gore amendment, again taking into account the corporate increases. Furthermore, the Gore amendment would impose a tax increase of 1.7 percent on people with incomes between $20,000 and $50,000, and an increase of 4.4 percent on taxpayers with incomes between $50,000 and $100,000.

My main concern with the taxpayers in the higher brackets is what we are doing with their incentive to work, to produce and to create. I think it is important that we should seek to provide justice among all taxpayers at all income levels and that we provide the most incentive to our economy so that we can do the maximum good for all. We need to think in terms of employment and in terms of overall earnings of people, including their standard of living. I think it is important that the tax system provide enough encouragement to someone starting out a new endeavor so that he will really be interested in doing this. It is this which enables a low-income man to move up the income scale, to move up from a job paying, perhaps $2.50 an hour, to $5 an hour. This may not be a direct tax reduction for the man at the lower income level, but I can assure you that it is far more important for his own well-being. He is better off if a little bit of this reduction at least goes to the man further up the income scale so he will help try to provide better opportunities for employment for the man at the lower income level. I do not mean to imply by this that most, or even an important part, of the reduction should be provided in this manner. But I do think it is desirable that at least some of the reduction go to those in higher income brackets, particularly in view of the fact that we are reducing the incentives they previously had through the closing of loopholes.

Let me turn now to the distribution of the tax reduction of the Gore amendment and the committee action by family size. I am well aware of the appeal of the Senator's amendment in this area. But I think we tend to forget, when we are talking in terms of an even amount of revenue loss involved between the committee action and the Gore amendment, as is true with his $800 exemption, that for everyone who gains under the Gore amendment in terms of revenue reduction, someone else must lose. Who are

these people that lose under the Gore amendment? I think we should take a close look at this group.

Actually, the Gore amendment, in broad general terms, takes more than a billion dollars of tax relief away from single persons, married couples with no children, and married couples with one child; it then gives this amount to married couples with two children—although the amount involved in this case is quite small—but more particularly to married couples with three or more children.

Mr. President, I ask that a table showing this be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

Effect of Gore $800 exemption relative to committee amendments

[In millions of dollars]

Increases (+) under Gore amendment:	
Single persons	+346
Married—no children, Married—1 child	+713
Total	+1,059
Decreases (−) under Gore amendment:	
Married—2 children	−232
Married 3 or more children	−1,154
Total	−1,386

(Totals are not equal because heads of household category not shown, etc.)

Mr. LONG. Basically, the Gore amendment takes away some $346 million from single persons and some $715 million from married couples with either no children or one child and gives an amount equal to this to married couples with three or more children.

I have on the easel at the back of the Chamber a chart showing the percentage tax increases that the Gore amendment would impose relative to the Finance Committee action for single persons at various income levels. You will note that the highest increases under the Gore proposal are in the $10,000 to $12,500 range, although they are still very high at the $15,000 level as well.

In other words, Senators will see that taxpayers—and this chart refers to single persons—would pay 2.7 percent more in taxes if they are in the $5,000 category; 4.1 percent more if they are in the $7,500 category; 11.7 percent more if they are in the $10,000 bracket; 11.9 percent more if they are in the $12,500 category. They would pay 8.9 percent more if they are in the $15,000 category. They would pay 5.6 percent more if they are in the $17,500 category. They would pay 3.4 percent more if they are in the $20,000 category. They would pay 4.3 percent more if they are in the $25,000 category.

It can well be seen that a single person in the middle-income tax bracket would be discriminated against badly and would be taxed much more under the Gore proposal than he would be under the bill as reported by the committee. That is assuming one is looking at two bills, each involving the same revenue loss, one of which proposes a $800 personal exemption and the other of which proposes the tax relief proposed by the committee, assuming that deductions are 10 percent of income.

The second table on the easel at the back of the Chamber shows the percentage tax increase, relative to the Finance Committee bill, of the Gore amendment in the case of married couples with no children. You will see that the Gore amendment again has a 9-percent tax increase for those with a $12,500 income and a 7.8-percent increase for those at the $10,000 level.

It should be kept in mind that all students of our tax system agree that those who are discriminated against most in this country by our tax laws are single persons, who enjoy few benefits from the income tax laws. But it is those very taxpayers who would lose most heavily under the Gore approach. The second group which would lose most heavily are those taxpayers who are married and have no children.

Again, when we look at the $10,000-to-$15,000 income levels—it is those taxpayers who would fare worst. They would pay 7.8 percent more at the $10,000 level; 9 percent more at the $12,500 level; 6.7 percent more at the $15,000 level; 4.8 percent more at the $17,500 level; 2.9 percent more at the $20,000 level; and 3 percent at the $25,000 level.

So, generally speaking, if we are talking about the kind of people we see every day, if we are talking about the kind of people we see in the Capitol Building, if we are talking about the kind of people we see in our offices every day, the ones who are regarded as being discriminated against most in the whole tax system, they are the ones who suffer most under the Gore approach.

The question naturally arises then what standards should be used in deciding whether it is the single people or the married couples with no children or one child who need tax reductions, or whether most of the tax reduction should be given only to those with three or more children. Let me tell you how the committee made this decision in what I believe is a rational manner.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, for several years now, been conducting studies to determine minimum subsistence levels. Their study has shown after adjusting their figures to bring them up to current income levels, that it requires $1,735 as a minimum subsistence level for a single person. For a married couple with no children, this figure is set at $2,230. For a married couple with one child, this figure is set at $2,755, and so on. In fact, if Senators will turn to page 258 of the committee report, they will see table 19, which shows the poverty income levels adjusted to current income levels for families of different sizes. The interesting thing that Senators will note from this table is that it costs approximately $600 per family member, after the first member, to provide a minimum standard of living as the number of persons in the family unit increases.

In other words, if we want to be sure to cover the minimum cost-of-living increase, there should be an additional exemption from tax, after the first exemption, of about $600 for each additional exemption claimed on a return. This is not to say that the actual cost of living does not go up by more than $600 per additional family member because, of course, few of us maintain our families, or ourselves for that matter, at the subsistence level.

If you will now look at the third chart at the back of the Chamber, you will see how the committee action matches actual needs as shown by the HEW study of subsistence levels. The lower solid line of stairsteps is the exemption level provided under present law as the number in the family increases. You will see that it varies from one to eight across the bottom of the chart.

The second stairstep line on the chart, the green line indicates the increase in the nontaxable level which occurs under the committee action. Senators will also see a large dot which is close, although not exactly at the same level, in the case of each variation in family size. This large dot represents the subsistence level as determined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In other words, the committee action in this regard provides almost an exact correlation with these levels, and is the best and only way I know of measuring the relative needs according to the differences in family size. The dotted stairstep line above the two that I have referred to—the red line in dots—is the level provided by the Gore amendment.

Senators will see that as the number in the family increases, the Gore proposal departs farther and farther from the needs of the family unit. In other words, the Gore amendment removes from the taxrolls many individuals who still have taxpaying capacity. His amendment does that by what I would consider to be a greater and heavier emphasis on exemptions for large family units—a heavier emphasis than subsistence levels would indicate, and certainly more than the studies of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would indicate to be justified.

I certainly do not want to see anyone left on the taxrolls who does not have a minimal standard of living. But inherent in the thinking of the Senator from Tennessee is one consistent fallacy, and that is the assumption that it costs twice as much for two to live together, three times as much for three to live together, four times as much for four to live together, and eight times as much for eight to live together—as it does for one person living singly.

When the Senator from Tennessee first started offering his amendments in the committee, he was offering amendments to increase the personal exemption for all persons. He was not providing—as provided by the House bill and as voted by the Senate committee—an increase in the minimum standard deduction, which is the most efficient use of money that man has yet contrived to provide tax relief in ways that would give the maximum number of dollars of benefit to those in the low-income bracket. An increase in the minimum standard deduction provides a far more efficient way to help the poor with a given amount of money than would an increase in the personal exemption. So the first several times the Senator offered his amendment

in the committee, he kept being confronted with the fact that invariably GORE would tax the poor more.

After he had been voted down several times, the Senator came to us with a modification of his amendment as seen here, where he did start out by retaining those things in the House bill and those things in the committee bill which help the poor the most; so that the Senator from Tennessee proceeded on the basis that the minimum standard deduction, as suggested by the committee, would be about the same.

But he still retains the fallacy I mentioned. He still thinks in terms of the same exemption for one person as for each member of a family of two, or a family of three, or four, or five.

The fact is that $1,000 is not enough for one person living alone to subsist on. He needs more than $1,000. He needs $1,735, according to the study that was the basis of this bill. But when he takes a wife, he does not have to have $1,735 multiplied by 2. At that point, he needs only $600 more for the two of them living under the same roof, sharing the same bed, using the same cooking facilities, so that those two people can live as well as that one person could live with $1,735. And when the two have a child, it is estimated they would need about $600 more for the child, so that the three could live on the same standard of living as one person would live if he had only a $1,735 income to support himself.

So, while it is nice to think in terms of providing the same amount of personal exemption for all taxpayers based on need, the fact of the matter is that you need a greater figure than that if it is just one person you are looking at, but you do not need to multiply the same figure to maintain the subsistence level beyond that.

If we proceed on the basis of the fallacy that has been consistent throughout the presentation of the Senator from Tennessee, Senators will see that a large amount of income is removed from the tax base in ways that minimum subsistence levels just do not require. Under the bill that the committee has brought forth, we increase the tax base by making a lot more income subject to taxes. That is what we call the reform part of our bill, and that is the part that takes most of the pages—about 90 percent of them.

Under the committee bill as reported, 5.6 million people would be removed from the tax rolls. But we started with the subsistence levels as determined by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and therefore the committee bill did not provide the much greater reduction in the tax base which would otherwise have occurred.

When you take the tax increases and the increase in the tax base provided by those increases, and then subtract from it the low income allowance and other tax relief measures provided by the committee, the bill before us reduces the tax base on which Americans pay taxes from $370 billion to $350 billion. So the tax base in this bill, as reported by the committee, is narrowed by $20 billion. And, Mr. President, insofar as we tax a $350 billion tax base, instead of a $370 billion tax base, and insofar as we have removed people from the tax rolls, we must put more taxes on those who remain on the rolls.

Let us see what the Gore amendment does. It would further reduce this tax base to $327 billion. That is $23 billion more than the reduction in the committee bill. This additional $23 billion reduction is reflected on that chart by the difference between the higher stairstep line of red dots and that solid green line with a dot in the middle of each stairstep.

Going up to the green stairstep level, we are relying on the studies made in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regarding the subsistence level that a person requires. By this standard, the Gore amendment would increase exemptions more than that information would otherwise justify.

Insofar as the committee has raised the low-income allowance and taken people off the tax rolls, it has done so by a study of subsistence levels. The Gore amendment proceeds by arbitrarily raising the per capita exemptions to the level that the Senator from Tennessee would prefer: $1,000. And if he cannot get the $1,000, if he follows the same procedure as he did in the committee, he will offer $900, and he said here on the floor he would offer various steps on down if he cannot get that agreed to.

The figure taken by the Senator from Tennessee is a figure calculated to be popular, but it is not a figure based on a study of what people's needs are; it is a figure taken by the Senator as one that would be politically appealing. And well it would be. The difficulty is that the Government cannot afford that loss of revenue. And a further difficulty is that it is a vain thing, in my judgment, to talk about it, because I have no doubt that if this bill, amended in that fashion, reaches the President's desk, the President is going to veto it.

I do not know precisely at what point the President would feel that the Congress has been so irresponsible that he should veto the bill. The President once said that he had in mind some point at which he felt he would be compelled to veto the bill, and for good reasons.

I assume that he is not going to disclose what that point is, because he does not want to dictate what we should do or should not do with respect to a particular amendment. Other Presidents have not done so, and I assume that our President would not say, "If you cause us to lose more than $3 billion in revenue, I will veto the bill."

I do think, however, that every President has some idea at what point he will veto a bill.

I have no doubt that the big revenue loss which would result from the Senator's amendment, even though the amendment may be popular to those who will be removed from the tax rolls, would cause the President to veto the bill. It might be fine for one to say to a constituent, "I have voted to give you a $1,000 tax deduction." However, as a practical matter, there is no doubt in my mind that the President would then veto the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree completely with the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana. I do not think that the President would have any choice but to veto the bill in view of the financial situation currently confronting our country.

Mr. LONG. That is how it would seem to me. It involves an enormous revenue loss. It involves a revenue loss of $5.8 billion more than the amount which the committee thought was responsible. It involves a loss of $5.8 billion more than the amount the House thought would be responsible. Frankly, the committee hoped to bring about a bill with more balance than that of the House. Although we did not come quite up to the House balance, we came very close.

We cannot say much for the shape that the bill would be in, however, if we were to agree to the $1,000 amendment or even the $800 proposal. If the amendment retains some of the good features the committee voted for—and the Senator's amendment does contain some of those good features—there would be a very large revenue loss to the Government—a loss so large that we would be irresponsible in adopting it. The only way we could make the bill work out on balance would be to strike out some of the desirable things provided in the bill by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in addition, if we agree to the Gore amendment and there is the additional revenue loss of almost $6 billion, there is no question that the Government in the present situation would have to borrow the money with which to finance the tax reduction. And the interest on the money the Government would have to borrow would itself cost the taxpayers over $1 million a day in order to give these taxpayers the added tax reductions. It would also add further to the inflation we presently have.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. It would be highly inflationary.

If our Government is going to proceed to enact tax reductions that it cannot afford to enact—it already has a projected deficit of $4.7 billion in the administrative budget next year—and if we are going to decline to do anything to help the Government put its house in order, how can the Government or anyone else call upon the bankers to hold down the interest rates or call upon the businessmen not to increase their prices? That would be a case of every man for himself.

The Government would not have done anything to fulfill its responsibility. And it is hard to see how the Federal Reserve Board could try to restrain the inflationary pressure if we on the Hill, who have the responsibliity for supervising the Board and enacting the laws under which it acts, are not responsible enough to provide the Government with the amount of money it needs to operate and hopefully to achieve a balanced budget.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, if the Senator is disturbed about the matter, I

have a copy of the letter received from the Secretary of the Treasury commenting on the $800 proposal of the Senator from Tennessee.

It is indicated here that this would shift the burden from the present law or the committee's suggestion so that single persons, married couples with no children, or married couples with one dependent would pay an additional $1.2 billion. Persons with four exemptions would pay an additional $0.2 billion. Persons with five or more exemptions would continue with the tax exemption and would benefit from the amendment.

Perhaps I have a conflicting interest there, having five children. However, does the Senator have the information as to the impact the $1,000 proposal of the Senator from Tennessee would have?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the long-term effect of it would be to unbalance the bill by about $5.8 billion, as compared with the committee's bill. That is what the effect of the pending amendment would be.

The amendment is phased in. The Senator's proposed increase in the personal exemption would not go into effect all at one time.

As I understand it, the amendment the Senator offered would cause the personal exemption to be increased next year from from $600 to $700. Then, in the following year it would go from $700 to $800. In the next year the personal exemption would go from $800 to $900, and in the following year it would go from $900 to $1,000.

While the bill itself entails a long-term revenue loss when in full operation—as I recall, it is about $2.3 billion—this would increase that net revenue loss by $5.8 billion. So we would have more than an $8 billion long-term revenue loss in the bill. The pending bill provides that taxes are to go down in January of 1970, in July of 1970, and then after that by such amounts as we think are responsible.

The Gore proposal puts us away above that in respect to revenue loss each year. Even though it is phased in, it would start out with an increase in the deficit of $900 million next year, and $2.5 billion in the deficit the next year, and so on.

It would continue until it built up, when in full effect, to a revenue loss of $5.8 billion more than the committee's bill.

I would think that one could see how any President looking at that thing in terms of his fiscal problems would have to say, "We cannot afford that much revenue loss now."

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, with all due respect for the argument of the Senator about the future, if I were sure that it might be vetoed, it might correct some of the mistakes we made yesterday, as far as I am concerned. That might encourage more of this body to vote for the amendment.

Can the Senator explain it to me in terms of the committee bill? The Assistant Secretary of the Treasury's analysis shows that the proposal of the Senator from Tennessee shifts the burden to the smaller families and single people. Is it true that the committee bill goes the other way and shifts some of the burdens to the larger families?

I seem to think that the Senator has, by the committee proposal, increased the standard deduction, but not given the person who has had a little piece of the action before, the man with more than three children, the same benefits as the others get under the committee bill.

Mr. LONG. No, that is not the case. The man with three children gets the same rate reduction and low-income allowance as everyone else. If he is in the middle-income bracket, where the standard deduction is available to him, he gets the tax reduction resulting from the increase in that, too. In other words, the committee's bill does not shift a portion of the tax burden from smaller families to larger families. It does not vary the amount of tax relief by the size of the family—as the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee would do. The committee's bill provides the additional tax relief equally to taxpayers, whether they have small or large families.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, why did the committee not touch the $600 proposal? It has been in effect since 1948. The standard exemption has not been altered.

If we are for tax reform, why did the committee not suggest some change in this exemption so that the total concept of tax reform could pass on to everyone?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the committee concluded that the minimum standard deduction, which has been developed, is a better device. Given any figure of revenue loss that the Government can stand, it would distribute that revenue loss in ways that are most advantageous to those at the bottom of the taxpaying ladder and would have the least impact on those who are better off up at the top. The minimum standard deduction is a device which makes it possible to reduce the tax of the poor and reduce the tax of the people who are just above the poverty level, without providing any tax relief to the upper income tax brackets where it is less needed. By using that device, one can most efficiently take $1 or $2 billion and give more relief to those at the bottom than he can with the same number of dollars in any other way.

When we were confronted with the possibility of using a minimum standard deduction to help the poor and the near-poor, as an alternative to increasing the personal exemption by $100, it was pointed out that if you increase the personal exemption by $100, the man who is in the 70-percent bracket will get a $70-tax benefit from it, even though he does not need it for living purposes. The fellow in the lowest bracket, the 14-percent tax rate, however, would get only a $14 benefit, and yet this is the fellow who most needs the relief.

It was argued that there was no need at all, if you had only that much tax reduction to grant, to give the tax cut to someone in the upper bracket; that you ought to concentrate in the lower brackets and give it all, not just the $14, but the whole thing, to the fellow at the bottom.

So the minimum standard deduction was worked out to give the advantage to the little fellow at the bottom, without bringing that tax reduction on up the ladder to those people able to pay.

In past years, no one ever discussed that. When I first came to the Senate, no one ever heard of any minimum standard deduction. At that time, it was thought that the most effective way you could help the little fellow at the bottom, if you had $1 billion of revenue to work with, would be to increase the personal exemption. Organized labor came up with the idea of a minimum standard deduction as the most efficient way to take $1 billion, let us say, or any other given figure in terms of dollars, and give the most possible advantage to the poor and the near poor.

It was on that basis that we utilized that device in the 1964 act. This is the tool that President Nixon picked first, saying that if you had only a small amount of revenue loss that could be afforded by the Government—let us say $3 billion—you ought to use the minimum standard deduction approach, or virtually the same thing, which is called the low-income allowance, which would concentrate the tax benefits on the low-income taxpayer, who needed it most.

So, it is true that there was a time when it was thought that the most effective device, in terms of tax reduction, that one could propose to help the poor would be to raise the personal exemption—that was before 1964. But we discovered a device which from 1964 forward has been more effective in taking any given number of dollars and concentrating it for the benefit of the little fellow at the bottom, and that is the minimum standard deduction. Most people do not know about this. They just look at a tax chart and run down a column in one direction to see what their income level is, and in another direction to see what the number of exemptions is; and where the two lines cross on the chart, that is the figure they owe.

The reason why we have been able to distribute tax reductions in ways that most efficiently help the poor is that someone came up with the device of a minimum standard deduction. That is in this bill. The Senator from Tennessee, even though he started out without it, has incorporated that in his proposal, because up until that point he was offering these increases in the personal exemption as an answer to, and a better proposal than, the committee bill; and, without exception, he was running into the fact that GORE would tax the poor more. So eventually he accepted the device recommended by President Nixon, and also by President Johnson, that as a starting point you ought to take a certain number of poor people off the rolls, and the most effective way to do it was the minimum standard deduction. That is what this bill does. We take the most efficient tool that can be used to help the poor and take as many as we can off the tax rolls.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

I still feel that what is missing from the committee proposal is the equity that is involved by giving the larger families additional exemptions under existing law. I cannot quite see, even assuming

this minimum standard deduction, why the exemption itself should not be carried forward as it is today.

Mr. LONG. The level of exempt income for single people is advanced to the extent that their subsistence level has advanced, and they then receive the benefit of the rate reductions beyond the subsistence level. The larger families also receive major tax reductions under this bill. The large families in the category of zero to $3,000 of taxable income share—and they share proportionately—in a 66-percent reduction in their tax liability—a 66-percent tax cut, and that is a big cut, a cut of approximately two-thirds. Many of them come off the tax rolls completely. So they enjoy a great deal of tax reduction. Many of them will come off the tax rolls, along with many single people and married couples.

But the Gore proposal would then proceed, as between these categories, to shift more tax reduction to the larger families at the expense of the smaller families or the single persons. One cannot justify that if it is done on the basis of the amount of money that someone needs to subsist.

Mr. President, this cutting away at our tax base can have serious repercussions for the future. It means that people who do have taxpaying capacity will not be concerned with the amount or purposes of Federal Government expenditures. It means that tax burdens borne by those in the future will be borne by a narrower group of taxpayers, which means higher taxes for those who remain subject to tax.

I realize that we are concerned with the mother pushing the market basket through the grocery store, and I am just as much concerned as anyone else to be sure that we do not overburden her and her family with too much taxes. I am also concerned, however, that we are fair in the tax burden imposed on single people and the married couples either with no children or with one child. They, too, must meet the cost of living and push the market basket through the grocery store. There are about 13.5 million of these single people over 21 in our country, in addition to the 22 million married couples—that means 44 million people—with either no children or one child who also must meet the cost of living.

All I am asking is that we be fair in the distribution of the tax burden as between those with different family sizes. I think we have a responsibility in this regard for all the people in the country and not just limited groups. I believe that the committee action in this regard is the fairer of these proposals, and I urge Senators to vote to retain the committee proposal and to vote to reject the Gore amendment.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I speak today in support of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, which I have joined in sponsoring. This is a matter of the utmost importance to all Americans, but especially to the millions of low- and middle-income taxpayers. Much has been said in this deliberative body about the poor and what should be done to help the poor. In this connection, the debate and our actions are not yet completed; in fact, they will not be until poverty is eliminated in America.

On the other hand, what has been said about the middle-income taxpayer and the tremendous burden placed on his shoulders by an unfair and antiquated tax system? Precious little, I am sorry to say, until very recently and especially in this congressional session. The middle-income taxpayer is by all accounts the forgotten American. He is not making so little income that he is eligible for special compensation benefits, nor is he making so much that he is carefully scrutinized by the Internal Revenue Service or is so rich that he is in the public eye. He pays more than half our individual income taxes, works steadily, goes on a modest vacation annually, if at all, and generally speaking, is the backbone of our American society. Unfortunately, instead of rewarding the many average Americans, we have punished them by not seeking to fairly distribute the income tax burden evenly and according to one's ability to pay.

The now well-known testimony of former Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr before the Joint Economic Committee early this year brought into clear focus the urgent task of Congress—to reform our tax system and make it more fair, simple, and neutral, and to restore and strengthen public confidence in our tax system. I quote a portion of Mr. Barr's testimony which underscores the need for this Congress to pass far-reaching tax reform legislation this year:

> Our income tax system needs major reforms now, as a matter of importance and urgency. That system essentially depends on an accurate self-assessment by taxpayers. This, in turn, depends on widespread confidence that the tax laws and the tax administration are equitable, and that everyone is paying according to his ability to pay.
>
> We face now the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes. The revolt will come not from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes of $7,000 to $20,000, whose tax payments now generally are based on the full ordinary rates and who pay over half of our individual income taxes.
>
> The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay. People are concerned and indeed angered about the high-income recipients who pay little or no Federal income taxes. For example, the extreme cases are 155 tax returns in 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above $200,000 on which no Federal income taxes were paid, including 21 with incomes above $1,000,000.

But merely recognizing the need for reform is one thing. Proposing and passing legislation to eliminate inequities is another matter. So far the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Finance have responded well. It is now encumbent upon the members of the Senate to carry forward the work accomplished thus far. I submit to all assembled here today that we cannot allow the rich to pay little or no taxes while those least able must bear the burden. All Americans must pay their fair share. The 16th amendment to the U.S. Constitution gave Congress "power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever sources derived."

However, the Congress must exercise its responsibilities by making certain that the tax system does not lag behind the times, keeping in mind that although the 16th amendment to the Constitution provided the Congress with the power to lay and collect taxes" it is for Congress continually to review the tax system and insure that a just and fair tax structure prevails. Some may find comfort in rebutting my comments with the allegation that no tax system, after all, is perfect. I take no comfort in that statement. As now constituted, the flaws in our system are so severe, so widespread, that it is a wonder we have not already had an outright tax revolt in America.

Tax reform legislation this year has been legislation that would cut taxes for some and legislation designed to close tax loopholes, enabling tax cuts to become feasible in some areas while at the same time raising revenue to make tax cuts possible in other areas.

The tax reform bill now before the Senate still does not embody what many of us must carefully address ourselves to—a more just and equitable personal exemption on each individual's personal income.

In the past and now on two occasions in this Congress I have introduced bills to increase the personal exemption. S. 1054 and S. 2095, introduced by me this year, include a provision to increase the amount of personal exemption from $600 to $1,000. Today, Senator GORE's amendment, which I have joined in sponsoring, includes portions of the same provisions in my bills. I believe, as Senator GORE and many others do, that the $600 personal exemption, established in 1948, has long ceased to be a fair exemption for millions of middle-income Americans.

Since 1948, the personal exemption has not been increased, while during the same time the cost of living has shot sky high. In fact, since 1948 the Consumer Price Index has risen by about 45 percent—based on average levels of the index in 1948 and 1968—so the $600 figure would have to be raised to, at the very least, $868, merely to equal the purchasing power of the $600 personal exemption adopted more than 20 years ago. Also, what was considered a reasonable standard of living 20 years ago is not so today. Thus, the great majority of taxpayers are taxed at a standard-of-living and cost-of-living index that has become outdated.

Many have said they are opposed to increasing the personal exemption because of loss of revenue to the Federal Government. We can replace any loss of revenue by closing tax loopholes which favor the wealthy people in our country, and by eliminating wasteful Federal expenditures.

The burden placed for years on the millions of average Americans must end this year. The House Ways and Means Committee, under the able chairmanship of Representative WILBUR MILLS, and the Senate Committee on Finance, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), are to be com-

mended for their tireless and dedicated efforts in the name of tax reform. The provisions are complex, and in some cases the impact of some changes on our society are as yet undetermined.

In the next session and in succeeding sessions of Congress it will be necessary to continue our scrutiny of the tax system, revising and improving upon the work done in this Congress. It is our constitutional and moral responsibility. Today, however, we need to enact tax reform legislation that will improve the system now. Therefore, today I support my colleague, Senator GORE in the amendment to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 to increase the personal exemption to increase the personal exemption to $700 in 1970, $800 in 1971, $900 in 1972, and $1,000 in 1973 and thereafter.

This means there will be sufficient time for the Federal Government to get its treasury in order. The delayed increments will also allow the Federal Government time to obtain additional revenue not before obtained as a result of the passage of the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The $1,000 personal exemption we propose by 1973 will mean a loss of revenue, true. But this loss can be made up by the tax reform measures we are now considering. Also, the additional money available to the taxpayer will result in money being spent by purchasing additional goods and services, or additional investments. This would have the effect of increasing the Government's tax base, and when the war in Vietnam comes to a close may give the economy a much needed shot in the arm.

This amendment should be the very least we can do to demonstrate our awareness and willingness to bring about a truly equitable tax system. Citizens everywhere are enraged by the many inequities that have continued to plague the "little man" while favoring the affluent minority. In my own State I have witnessed the formation of two organizations for tax reform—the New Mexico Taxpayers for Tax Reform and the Taxpayers Association of New Mexico. These and many other similar groups have been formed throughout the country by concerned citizens who do have legitimate complaints. We must respond to them, and one way is by the adoption of this amendment to raise the personal exemption to $1,000.

I remind Senators that at present 2.2 million poverty-level families pay taxes, and countless millions more are taxed heavily, while having to settle for a mere $600 personal exemption, and while billions go untaxed in many other areas. The reform legislation embodied in the bill we are considering today is the most far reaching ever proposed in Congress. It is the year for tax reform, so let us consider that raising the personal exemption will even further strengthen the people's confidence in the tax reform legislation. The tax surcharge, which is now to be extended into 1970, and which some may say should be extended even beyond that, the inflationary trend which plagues the millions of middle- and low-income families, must be met by fiscal and monetary responsibility to be sure. Also, however, it must be met by compassion and sensitivity to the pressing needs of millions of law-abiding American citizens who pay the bulk of our Federal expenditures.

Mr. President, I ask for the support of Senators for this amendment to raise the personal exemption to $1,000. It would go far toward bringing necessary tax relief to those hundreds of thousands in this country who work hard every day of their lives to provide for their families welfare, for their children's education, and who have for far too long shouldered an inequitable share of the tax burden.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, as a candidate for the office of U.S. Senator from Oklahoma, I was frequently approached by citizens of my State who were distressed by the erosion in the purchasing power of the $600 personal income tax exemption. These individuals pointed out the impossibility of meeting even the barest minimum cost-of-living needs with this nominal sum.

Since the establishment of the $600 personal exemption shortly after World War II, the value of our currency has consistently deteriorated. The effect, then, is that the taxpayer has been taxed at a continually rising level, even without a change in the rate of taxation.

Mr. President, statements that an increase in the value of personal exemption to near the 1968 level of purchasing power would cost the Treasury billions of dollars only emphasizes the inequity under which American taxpayers are presently suffering. American taxpayers have already suffered this loss. Taxpayers are being defrauded by the loss of purchasing power of their personal exemptions and it is past time for equity to be restored.

Mr. President, no Member of the Senate is more dedicated to Federal fiscal responsibility than the junior Senator from Oklahoma. This amendment proposes an orderly, step-by-step, $100 per year increase in the exemption through 1973. This adjustment can readily be absorbed without damaging the fiscal integrity of our country.

The complex and confusing changes in the schedule of income taxes in the committee bill does not provide tax relief where it is most needed. Namely, for families with young children to care for and educate. An increase in personal exemptions will provide relief where it is needed. It will easily be understood by the taxpayers and will help to convince them that Congress is alert to their needs."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of amendment No. 304, I wish to associate myself with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee in support of his substitute amendment.

His arguments favoring increases in personal exemptions and low-income allowances in lieu of lowered tax rates indicate his understanding of the basic motivation of this tax bill. The so-called tax revolt reflects, more than anything else, a public outcry from low- and middle-income Americans for tax relief.

Notwithstanding the equities of other provisions of the pending bill, our primary efforts should be directed toward relieving economic pressures on the people—not things or legal entities—but people. Single persons, husbands and wives, and families desperately need more tax-exempt income in order to survive.

The cost of living has risen more than two and a half times over what it was in 1940. Yet the law provides a personal exemption of only $600 per taxable year—exactly the same exemption as was allowed 21 years ago.

Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee has provided the Senate with a meaningful amendment. He is aware of the cost to the Government in the loss of tax revenues and has suggested many reforms which, if adopted, would recoup the losses and maintain a fiscal balance.

The amendment calls for the addition of $800 to the low income allowance plus a 2-year rise in personal exemptions from the present $600 per person to a total exemption of $800 per person in 1971. That is, $700 in 1970, and $800 in 1971.

Low- and middle-income wage earners would gain the greatest benefit from this amendment. In fact, over 80 percent of the tax benefit would be realized by individuals earning less than $15,000 per year. About 30 percent of the tax relief would be credited to those earning less than $7,000 per year, and to those whose income is between $7,000 and $15,000 annually would go about 50 percent of the tax relief. Thus, the overwhelming majority of American citizens, the backbone of the Nation, would be given by this amendment an immediate relief from the crunch of today's economic pressures.

At the same time, Mr. President, several areas have been enumerated by the author of this amendment where recovery of the tax losses may be realized.

The individual views of the able senior Senator from Tennessee are set forth in the report on the tax bill beginning at page 311. More up-to-date information was given to the Senate by the distinguished Senator on Wednesday, November 26, 1969, and is available to all Members in the RECORD for that date, and again in his opening statement, which appears in yesterday's RECORD.

Mr. President, I commend the Senator for his logical approach to a difficult problem, and for a constructive remedy for a vitally needed tax relief, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 564. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene G. Queja; and

S. 2019. An act for the relief of Dug Foo Wong.

TAX REFORM OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13270), the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I send to the desk a substitute for the pending amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) for himself and others proposes an amendment in the nature of a substitute for his amendment No. 304.

(The proposed substitute amendment is as follows:)

Page 454, beginning with line 5, strike out all through page 497, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 801. PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.

"(a) INCREASE TO $700 FOR 1970.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1971—

"(1) section 151 (relating to allowance of personal exemptions) is amended by striking out '$600' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$700'; and

"(2) section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in case of certain returns of husband and wife) is amended by striking out '$600' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$700', and by striking out '$1,200' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,400'.

(b) INCREASE TO $800 FOR 1971 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970—

"(1) section 151 (relating to allowance of personal exemptions) is amended by striking out '$700' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$800'; and

"(2) section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in case of certain returns of husband and wife) is amended by striking out '$700' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$800', and by striking out '$1,400' wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,600'.

"SEC. 802. STANDARD DEDUCTION.

"(a) MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION FOR TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1970.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1971, section 141(c) (relating to the minimum standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) MINIMUM STANDARD DEDUCTION.—The minimum standard deduction is an amount equal to $1,000 ($500, in the case of a separate return by a married individual), reduced, in the case of a taxable year beginning in 1970, by an amount equal to one-fourth of the amount by which—

"'(1) the adjusted gross income for the taxable year, exceeds

"'(2) the sum of—

"'(A) $1,000 ($500, in the case of a separate return by a married individual), plus

"'(B) the amount of each personal exemption provided by section 151 for the taxable year, multiplied by the number of such exemptions for the taxable year'.

"(b) STANDARD DEDUCTION FOR TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1970.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970, section 141 (relating to the standard deduction) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 141. STANDARD DEDUCTION.

"'The standard deduction referred to in this title is $1,000 ($500, in the case of a separate return by a married individual)'.

"(c) DETERMINATION OF MARITAL STATUS.—Section 143 (relating to determination of marital status) is amended—

"(1) by striking out 'For purpose of this part—' and inserting in lieu thereof '(a) GENERAL RULE.—For purposes of this part—'; and

"(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"'(b) CERTAIN MARRIED INDIVIDUALS LIVING APART.—For purposes of this part, if—

"'(1) an individual who is married (within the meaning of subsection (a)) and who files a separate return maintains as his home a household which constitutes for more than one-half of the taxable year the principal place of abode of a dependent (A) who (within the meaning of section 152) is a son, stepson, daughter, or stepdaughter of the individual, and (B) with respect to whom such individual is entitled to a deduction for the taxable year under section 151,

"'(2) such individual furnishes over half of the cost of maintaining such household during the taxable year, and

"'(3) during the entire taxable year such individual's spouse is not a member of such household,

such individual shall not be considered as married'.

"(d) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Section 4(a) (relating to number of exemptions) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) NUMBER OF EXEMPTIONS.—For purposes of the tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate pursuant to section 3, the term "number of exemptions" means the number of exemptions allowed under section 151 as deductions in computing taxable income'.

"(2) Section 4(c) (relating to married individuals filing separate returns) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) HUSBAND AND WIFE FILING SEPARATE RETURN.—

"'(1) A husband or wife may not elect to pay the optional tax imposed by section 3 if the tax of the other spouse is determined under section 1 on the basis of taxable income computed without regard to the standard deduction.

"'(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return for a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1971, the tax imposed by section 3 shall be the lesser of the tax shown in—

"'(A) the table prescribed under section 3 applicable in the case of married persons filing separate returns which applies the 10-percent standard deduction, or

"'(B) the table prescribed under section 3 applicable in the case of married persons filing separate returns which applies the minimum standard deduction.

"'(3) The table referred to in paragraph (2)(B) shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in the table referred to in paragraph (2)(B) in lieu of the tax shown in the table referred to in paragraph (2)(A). For purposes of this title, an election under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2).

"'(4) For purposes of this subsection, determination of marital status shall be made under section 143'."

"(3) Paragraph (4) of section 4(f) is amended to read as follows:

"'(4) For computation of tax by Secretary or his delegate, see section 6014'.

"(4) Section 1304(c)(5) (relating to special rules for income averaging) is amended by striking out 'section 143' and inserting in lieu thereof 'section 143(a)'."

"(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

"SEC. 803. TAX RATES FOR SINGLE INDIVIDUALS AND HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD; OPTIONAL TAX.

"(a) HEADS OF HOUSEHOLD.—Section 1(b)(1) (relating to rates of tax on heads of household) is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) RATES OF TAX.—There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual who is a head of a household a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000.	14% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000.	$140, plus 16% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$300, plus 18% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$660, plus 19% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,040, plus 22% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,480, plus 23% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$1,940, plus 25% of excess over $10,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,440, plus 27% of excess over $12,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$2,980, plus 28% of excess over $14,000
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$3,540, plus 31% of excess over $16,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$4,160, plus 32% of excess over $18,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$4,800, plus 35% of excess over $20,000
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000.	$5,500, plus 36% of excess over $22,000
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000.	$6,220, plus 38% of excess over $24,000
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000.	$6,980, plus 41% of excess over $26,000
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$7,800, plus 42% of excess over $28,000
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$9,480, plus 45% of excess over $32,000
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000.	$11,800, plus 48% of excess over $36,000
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000.	$12,240, plus 51% of excess over $38,000
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000.	$13,260, plus 52% of excess over $40,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$15,350, plus 55% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000.	$18,640, plus 56% of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000.	$19,760, plus 58% of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000.	$26,720, plus 59% of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000.	$30,260, plus 61% of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000.	$33,920, plus 62% of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000.	$36,400, plus 63% of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000.	$41,440, plus 64% of excess over $88,000.

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000.	$49,120, plus 66% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000.	$62,320, plus 67% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000.	$75,720, plus 68% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000.	$89,320, plus 69% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 ----	$103,120, plus 70% of excess over $180,000.'

"(b) SINGLE INDIVIDUALS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1 (relating to tax on individuals) is amended by redesignating subsection (c) and (d) as (d) and (e), respectively, and by inserting after subsection (b) the following new subsection:

"'(c) UNMARRIED INDIVIDUALS.—There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a surviving spouse or a head of a household) who is not a married individual (as defined in section 143) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500----	14% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000.	$70, plus 15% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500.	$145, plus 16% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000.	$225, plus 17% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000.	$310, plus 19% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000.	$690, plus 21% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000.	$1,110, plus 24% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000.	$1,590, plus 25% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000.	$2,090, plus 27% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000.	$2,630, plus 29% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000.	$3,210, plus 31% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000.	$3,830, plus 34% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000.	$4,510, plus 36% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000.	$5,230, plus 38% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000.	$5,990, plus 40% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000.	$7,590, plus 45% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000.	$10,290, plus 50% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000.	$13,290, plus 55% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000.	$16,590, plus 60% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000.	$20,190, plus 62% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000.	$26,390, plus 64% of excess over $60,000.
"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000.	$32,790, plus 66% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000.	$39,390, plus 68% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000.	$46,190, plus 69% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000----	$53,090, plus 70% of excess over $100,000'.

"(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1(a) (relating to rates of tax on individuals) is amended by striking out so much of such section as precedes the table in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) GENERAL RULES.—There is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a head of a household to whom subsection (b) applies and an unmarried individual to whom subsection (c) applies) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:'.

"(c) OPTIONAL TAX TABLES FOR INDIVIDUALS.—Section 3 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000) is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 3. OPTIONAL TAX TABLES FOR INDIVIDUALS.

"'In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $7,500 (or such higher amount, less than $10,000, as may be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate by regulations) and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables, applicable to such taxable year, which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. In the tables so prescribed, the amounts of tax shall be computed on the basis of the taxable income computed by taking the standard deduction and on the basis of the rates prescribed by section 1'.

"(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

"(1) Section 6014(a) (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended—

"(A) by striking out '$5,000' in the first sentence, and inserting in lieu thereof '$7,500', and

"(B) by striking out the last two sentences.

"(2) Section 1304(b)(1) (relating to special rules) is amended by striking out 'if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000'.

"(e) Section 21(d) (relating to changes in rates during a taxable year) is amended to read as follows:

"'(d) CHANGES MADE BY TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969 IN CASE OF INDIVIDUALS.—In applying subsection (a) to a taxable year of an individual which is not a calendar year, each change made by the Tax Reform Act of 1969 in part I or in the application of part IV of subchapter B for purposes of the determination of taxable income shall be treated as a change in the rate of tax.'

"(f) EFFECTIVE DATES.—The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) of this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970. The amendments made by subsections (c) and (d) of this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

"SEC. 804. COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES.

"(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—Section 3402(a) (relating to requirement of withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"'(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—In the case of wages paid after December 31, 1969, or the 15th day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (whichever is later), every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages (except as otherwise provided in this section) a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such tables shall correspond in form to the tables in effect under this subsection on December 31, 1969. For purposes of applying such tables, the term "amount of wages" means the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in subsection (b)(1)'.

"(b) PERCENTAGE METHOD OF WITHHOLDING.—

"(1) WAGES PAID IN 1970.—Effective with respect to wages paid during 1970, the table contained in section 3402(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"'Percentage Method Withholding Table

"'Payroll period

	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$13.50
Biweekly	27.00
Semimonthly	29.00
Monthly	58.00
Quarterly	175.00
Semiannual	350.00
Annual	700.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.80.'

"(2) WAGES PAID AFTER 1970.—Effective with respect to wages paid after December 31, 1970, the table contained in section 3402(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

"'Percentage Method Withholding Table

"'Payroll period

	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$15.00
Biweekly	30.00
Semimonthly	33.50
Monthly	67.00
Quarterly	200.00
Semiannual	400.00
Annual	800.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	2.10.'"

Page 549, line 17, strike out "$600" and insert "$700".

Page 550, lines 1, 9, and 11, strike out "$2,300" and insert "$2,400".

Page 550, line 12, strike out "$600" and insert "$700".

Page 550, lines 21 and 22, strike out "this section" and insert "subsections (a) and (b)".

Page 550, after line 23, insert the following:

"(d) TAXABLE YEARS AFTER 1970.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970, section 6012(a)(1) is amended—

"(1.) by striking out '$700' each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$800';

"(2.) by striking out '$1,700' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,800'; and

"(3.) by striking out '$2,400' each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '$2,600'.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered on the pending Gore amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, is it my understanding that under the rules an amendment or a substitute may not be offered by the sponsor without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the yeas and nays have been ordered the Senator loses his right to modify his amendment but he can still offer an amendment to his amendment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. To his own amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To his own amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the substitute which I have offered has been offered after a thorough canvass.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the Senator is entitled to quiet.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment I have offered as a substitute for my own amendment, No. 304, has been offered after a thorough canvass which demonstrates that there is an overwhelming majority in this body, in my opinion, and in the opinion of those who have canvassed the situation, that we have tax relief by way of raising the personal exemption in preference to a change in the rates.

The disagreement, with the exception of an unusually small number of Senators, particularly on this side of the aisle, is on the amount by which the personal exemption should be increased.

The amendment which I originally offered provided for an increase of $100 per year until in the year 1973 the total exemption would be $1,000. One Senator who has been the champion of this cause longer than I, has just entered the Chamber, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN). Both on the floor of the Senate in an eloquent speech and in the cloakroom with the senior Senator from Tennessee, and the leadership of the Democratic Party, he has pleaded that the amendment be limited to 2 years; that is, that the personal exemption be increased next year to $700, and in 1971 and thereafter to $800, leaving the other provisions in the amendment as they are—the low-income allowance and tax treatment of single taxpayers similar to that provided in the committee bill.

So, Mr. President, the amendment which I now offer to my own amendment would increase the personal exemption in two steps to $800, and provide a low-income allowance of $1,000, and the treatment of unmarried taxpayers similar to the committee bill, as a substitute for the rate changes in the committee bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it would seem to me that if the Senator wants to modify his amendment, he should have the right to do so. If he is not going to do so, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator be permitted to modify his amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire how the Senator wishes to modify the amendment.

Mr. GORE. The modification would——

Mr. SCOTT. How does the Senator propose it?

Mr. GORE. The modification of the amendment would strike from the amendment the third and fourth phased steps. My original amendment would increase personal exemption from $600 to $700; then to $800; then to $900; then to $1,000, in four annual steps.

As I have introduced it now, this amendment would increase the personal exemption only to $800 in two steps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Louisiana asking unanimous consent to modify the original Gore amendment to include the second Gore amendment?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I object. I wish to have a rollcall vote on the substitute.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what is wrong about the parliamentary situation that exists at this point is that if the Senator wanted to offer an amendment to provide for $800 he should have offered an amendment to provide for $800, or he should have withdrawn his first amendment and offered the one he wanted to offer. He could not do that because from a parliamentary point of view he asked for the yeas and nays, or another Senator had asked for the yeas and nays, and he was foreclosed.

In that respect, the usual courtesy in this body is to accord a Senator the courtesy of modifying his amendment in any fashion he wants.

I requested that, feeling the Senator was entitled to it if he wanted to modify his amendment.

Also, I am aware of the fact that when a Senator offers an amendment and then offers an amendment to his own amendment, he forecloses 99 other Senators from modifying the amendment, which they would have a right to do.

I do not think the Senator from Tennessee, when he started his effort to have his amendment agreed to, had any intention of offering a substitute for his amendment, certainly not so as to foreclose 99 other Senators. I do not think that he had that in mind. But, it would have that effect.

I do not care to modify his amendment. I know how I am going to vote. It occurs that someone else might want to offer an amendment to his amendment and the Senator, by moving in the fashion he has, has foreclosed the rights of other Senators. I know there are other ways that it can be done but I think in the ordinary parliamentary situation one offers what he believes in, whether it be in the first degree or the second degree, and reserves to other Senators the right to offer their amendments. In this procedure the committee offers the bill and any Senator can amend it with a substitute or an amendment, if he feels he has a better idea.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I had the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thought I had the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I had reserved the right to object.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offered the substitute and then I obtained recognition.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I do not understand how the Senator would get the floor when I objected. Will the Parliamentarian explain how I came to have the floor and when I gave it up?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not yield further for the moment.

This is not the first time that I have been involved in parliamentary procedure. I understand his rights and the rights of every other Senator. The facts are just to the contrary of those stated by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG).

The offering of a substitute in no way precludes any other Senator from offering a perfecting amendment. As a matter of fact, all perfecting amendments to the original amendment take precedence over the substitute. Thus, there is no question about that. The Presiding Officer is perfectly aware of that. What this does do is to give me an opportunity to present to the Senate the amendment we now have, which I am advised and determined is supported by a clear majority, for an $800 exemption. I would prefer a $1,000 exemption, but the important thing is to substitute tax relief by way of increasing the personal exemption for tax reduction by way of rate changes. Therefore, this assures a vote for the $800 exemption level which the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN) has been urging, and other Senators have said they would support.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nebraska for a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, would the distinguished Senator from Tennessee consent to an arrangement whereby his new amendment could be reduced to writing? After all, we are involved here with some $5 billion.

Mr. GORE. It already is.

Mr. CURTIS. Our staff people might want to take a look at it.

Mr. GORE. It is reduced to writing. It is now at the desk, in writing. I was prepared for that.

Mr. CURTIS. Has the Senator offered it by number?

Mr. GORE. I have sent it to the desk. It is in writing and is now at the desk.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. May I inquire of the Senator if he knew that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was seeking recognition for the purpose of offering a substitute at the time he was recognized?

Mr. GORE. I was aware that both the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Illinois were addressing the Chair. The Chair recognized the Senator from Tennessee. Let me say that it is perfectly proper, since the Senator from Tennessee has an amendment pending and is a member of the Finance Committee.

Mr. SCOTT. And has offered a substitute to his own amendment. That is where we are now?

Mr. GORE. Correct.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the Senator from Tennessee prepared to permit any other Senator to offer an amendment to his substitute?

Mr. GORE. I think that is in the third degree. Amendments are in order. That is not a question that should be addressed to me. It should be addressed to the Presiding Officer and the Parliamentarian. As I understand it, an amendment to a substitute would be an amendment in the third degree and not in order. A thousand amendments are in order to the original amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I hope that the Senate would permit the Senator from Tennessee to modify his amendment. I know that the yeas and nays were ordered on it last evening. I know that a Senator can modify his own amendment only by unanimous consent, but, as has been pointed out, there is an easy way around that. Of course, it would delay consideration of the bill a few more hours, but I am hopeful that the Senate would permit the Senator to modify his amendment. I wanted to ask for the yeas and nays last evening and supported it in principle. We will have a record vote on it. We will also have a record vote on final passage of the bill, but I hope that the Senate will allow the Senator from Tennessee to modify his amendment. It will save a lot of time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the sponsors of the original amendment be listed as sponsors of the substitute amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, am I recognized? I want to get that clear first. May I ask the Parliamentarian——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania may reserve his right to object, but the Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. I understand that. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. May I ask the Parliamentarian to advise the Chair as to the circumstances under which the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) may offer an amendment either to the substitute or to the original amendment or to the text of this section of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield for that parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The original language of the bill, commencing on line 5, page 454 to page 497, is open to a perfecting amendment; likewise, the first substitute to strike out and insert is also.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, pursuing my parliamentary inquiry, what is the situation? If the request of the Senator from Tennessee for unanimous consent is granted and he is permitted to modify his amendment, then the substitute amendment is open—is his substitute open to amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If he is granted unanimous consent to modify his original amendment to embody the text of the second amendment, we are then back to the original situation and the matter would be open to amendment, as we were before the present situation occurred.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending request.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President——

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado will state it.

Mr. ALLOTT. As I understand it, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee proposes a unanimous-consent request——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator restate his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. ALLOTT. Has he withdrawn his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GORE. A rollcall vote has been ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed as a cosponsor of the pending substitute amendment.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be listed as a co-sponsor of the pending substitute amendment.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been waiting all day to get the floor. I have asked a number of Members to accommodate me but they have all been too busy. Now I hope that the Senate will indulge me for a few minutes while I do some business that I have been waiting to do all day.

LESSONS OF THE MYLAI INCIDENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, press accounts of the alleged brutal killings at Mylai have assailed the conscience of the Nation and have sent shock waves of protest reverberating throughout the world. The allegations concerning the incident at Mylai are of enormous significance in the future of the Vietnam war, because they have propelled the American people across a new psychological threshold with respect to the Vietnam war. Under the new conditions created by the Mylai disclosures, President Nixon's strategy for peace in Vietnam, as stated in his November 3 speech, is no longer acceptable even to the majority claimed for it.

Certainly, the deep revulsion caused by the Mylai disclosures is a reality which the President must now take into account. It is now much more difficult to state, as President Nixon did in Vietnam on July 30 to the soldiers of the 1st Infantry Division:

> I think history will record that this (war) may have been one of America's finest hours . . .

And, for President Nixon to persist in his November 3 strategy, which is so heavily dependent on acts within the control of both Saigon and Hanoi, is now likely to prove to be untenable. The profound corruption of which this war is capable has now been exposed; not alone because of the alleged brutality—horrible as that is—but because of its evidence of the hopelessness of our remaining as the stand-ins of the South Vietnamese themselves in a fight for their self-determination. The U.S. war effort in Vietnam has suffered from fatal flaws and inconsistencies; now they have all come to a focus together. The war against "external aggression" by North Vietnam, the war against Communist Chinese expansionism, the war to defend the right of self-determination in South Vietnam—so constantly expounded by President Johnson and Secretary Rusk—has now become a war where every stated objective is dubious and where there is grave doubt that the South Vietnamese themselves even want us there.

The price which has been paid by the American people—materially and psychologically—to fight this war and to sustain the growing unbridgeable discrepancy between reality and official pronouncements has reached intolerable proportions. A painful, damaging, and unprecedented alienation has developed between the enormous body of student groups and the administration of President Johnson and now of President Nixon and Vice President AGNEW.

The effect of the Vietnam war on many other young men who have gone to Vietnam to fight—among them the poor, the black, the dropouts—has been even crueler.

The task of a Senator at this point is not to make final judgments about what happened at Mylai as to individuals—there are established judicial proceedings to do this. Rather, I consider it to be the responsibility of a Senator to recognize the significance of the Mylai disclosures with respect to the broad policy decisions now pending before the Nation, and to urge the President—who must make the final, excruciating choices—to recognize their significance, too.

I believe it is essential to the Nation's well-being that President Nixon recognize that the whole psychological environment in the United States has been transformed by the Mylai reports. The arguments and reasoning which have been used to explain and support the "gradualist" policies of the Nixon ad-

ministration—notwithstanding the President's laudable decision to withdraw 60,000 troops—have given a sense of identity with the Vietnam policies and objectives of the Johnson administration. All this now has been undone at a stroke.

Inevitably, there will be powerful voices from within the administration counseling the President to take actions designed to blunt or counteract the effects of the Mylai reports. We will perhaps see efforts to arouse the public by counter revelations of atrocities by the Vietcong—and they are of course many times worse and much longer continued than even the worst we hear about Mylai. But this will prove to be of little comfort to us!

In my judgment, the proper course now for President Nixon is to lead the Nation out of Vietnam in the earliest and most considered manner possible and this requires a more rapid timetable that contemplated by his November 3 speech. The double veto that now exists over present withdrawal policy—one in the hands of Saigon and one in the hands of Hanoi—must be reclaimed. The time has passed quires a more rapid timetable than conditioned on improved political and military capabilities of the Thieu regime is a viable course for the United States; or, when a policy of withdrawal based on Hanoi's battlefield 'restraint' is a viable course for the United States.

The time has come for the President of the United States to lead the Nation clearly, quickly, and unequivocably out of Vietnam. And in this the U.S. Military Establishment also has a new responsibility. Here, too, is a test of the military establishment and its amenability to civilian control in the highest American tradition. In my judgment, it is now essential that the U.S. Military Establishment itself accept the responsibility for preparing the quickest and most orderly withdrawal from Vietnam. It must assess to the satisfaction of civilian control the pattern of U.S. withdrawal, consistent with battlefield security, and leaving the most favorable position which can be attained under the circumstances to the South Vietnamese forces.

I believe that it is essential that the U.S. Military Establishment undertake this task for two reasons. First, because it is its duty under orders to devise an orderly and effective withdrawal; and second, because the honor of our military forces demands it. Our forces have fought the war with great bravery and skill under most difficult circumstances. The same bravery and the same skill are now called upon to extricate our Nation from an impossible war situation. Our armed forces are capable of both.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13270), the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

AMENDMENT NO. 340

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment, which I ask to have printed under the rule.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have introduced, today for myself and Mr. CASE of New Jersey, an amendment to those provisions in the now-pending tax reform bill which relate to philanthropic activities.

We are properly concerned about the fact that some individuals have been able to use the present unlimited charitable tax deduction to avoid the payment of taxes altogether and that some foundations have abused their tax-exempt status. However, in seeking the quite proper objective of "tax reform," we must bear in mind that it is essential to the health of our society that the activities of private philanthropies be not undone, and yet that may well happen in the bill we have before us.

We must make every effort to preserve the flexibility and the capacity to innovate which philanthropic institutions have demonstrated in the past. These private institutions have demonstrated a capacity to respond more readily than governments to a wide variety of social needs. Moreover, by their very nature, the foundations are able to engage in experimental activities of great social value which public agencies cannot very well pursue. Certainly, in our efforts to prevent improper activities, we should not inhibit these important sources of creativity and innovation.

Some of the important tax changes proposed in respect of philanthropic activities are, I believe, being proposed without adequate realization of the effects they will have on philanthropic activities. We thus run the risk of seriously injuring one of the important institutional bases of our society. We run the dangerous risk of substantially cutting off the flow of adequate funds to our universities, to medical research, and to social welfare at the very time when there is widespread agreement that nongovernmental institutions which work in these areas, and are at least partially dependent upon philanthropy for these activities, are facing growing financial crises.

Mr. President, at the outset, I must emphasize that I support those provisions in the House-passed and Senate Finance Committee bills which would seek to insure that foundations distribute their funds for philanthropic purposes and which seek to correct abuses related to the business—as opposed to the philanthropic—activities of foundations. But, because their financial requirements will rise rapidly in the coming years, we should direct our attention toward tax reforms to increase, rather than inhibit, the net private giving available to philanthropy.

The amendment which I introduce today would establish a Presidential Commission on Philanthropic Activities. This Commission would undertake a broad and detailed study of philanthropy and of the effect of tax relief granted for such activities and report to the President and the Congress no later than June 30, 1971. In addition, this amendment would make the following changes in the tax reform bill now before us:

First. Those provisions of the Senate Finance Committee bill which would limit the tax-exempt life of certain foundations are deleted.

Second. Those provisions of the Senate bill which would require divestiture of stock ownership are deleted. However, provision is made to insure that foundations do not increase their holdings by purchase pending action on the report of the Presidential Commission.

Third. Those provisions of the Senate bill which would limit—beyond the extent presently permitted by existing law—the activities of foundations are deleted.

Fourth. The prohibitions of the Senate bill against self-dealing are extended to all foundations and not just to private foundations.

Fifth. The limitations of the Senate bill with respect to the use of foundation assets—that is, the investment of its corpus—are extended to all foundations and not just to private foundations.

Sixth. Except for the raising of the charitable contribution deduction to 50 percent and the repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction, the remaining provisions of the Senate bill affecting charitable contributions are deleted.

All items which would be deleted are specifically referred to the Presidential Commission for study and report.

THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION

I have urged the establishment of this Presidential Commission because I believe that it is vitally necessary that the basic issue of the tax incentive to philanthropic contributions, which is justified by social usefulness, be made the subject of study by an impartial and bipartisan high level commission. The Peterson commission, an independent body which has recently completed a study of foundations, found that there is so little information available that it is generally not possible to substantiate or refute many of the general charges of abuse and excess.

The Presidential Commission would be composed of 25 members chosen by the President on a nonpartisan basis according to the formula set forth in the amendment. There would be two Members each from the House and Senate, representatives from the legal and accounting profession, the major religions, educators, scientists, philanthropists, and representatives from the general public. This Commission would represent a broad cross section of contemporary American opinion and would be able to objectively address the issues which they have been commissioned to study.

The Treasury and the committees of Congress having jurisdiction over taxes would be expected to provide technical and other assistance as and when requested. In addition, the Commission would be able to retain consultants and other advisers as deemed necessary.

The Commission would be asked to examine the entire structure of exemptions from income tax granted by section 501 et seq. of the Code together with the charitable deductions granted by section

170 and related sections of the Code, including similar deductions granted under the estate and gift tax laws. Paramount in this examination—and an integral part of any such examination—would be a determination as to the value of such privately provided services to our society. Also the question of cost to the Government in granting this form of tax relief versus the cost of providing comparable services out of the general tax revenues would have to be considered.

The Commission would also be required to assess present Government supervision of the foundations and make recommendations for strengthened regulations. It would seek out the abuses and the facts that we presently do not have available to us—or available only in skeleton form. It is clear that better auditing procedures, more vigorous public disclosure requirements and strengthened sanctions for violators are needed.

The Commission would be asked to review the scope of activities for which tax concessions are granted to determine whether they are still as relevant to the needs of our society today as they were when the great bulk of them were established more than 50 years ago. It would also be asked to recommend to Congress and the administration new incentive approaches to philanthropic giving.

Another area of great importance which the Commission would be asked to study is the possibility of establishing a permanent body, separate and apart from the Internal Revenue Service, which would pass on public policy questions in the philanthropic tax-exempt area. I believe that such a body may be necessary, since very little that will be done in this area will be without social effect, and it is unwise to have the revenue-collecting decision and the public policy decision rest in the same hands, lest the revenue-producing decision take precedence to the detriment of the public good.

Pending the completion of the Commission's work, my amendment proposes that the House and Senate Finance Committee proposed changes in our internal revenue code affecting charitable contributions and tax treatment of private foundations as they relate to philanthropic activities be set aside and be referred to the Commission for further study, rather than changing existing law at this time.

In the report of the Finance Committee under the general heading, "A Tax Treatment of Private Foundations," changes in the tax code are recommended under 13 major headings. My amendment proposes to refer only three of these headings to the Commission. These are:

First. Limitation on tax exempt life: My amendment deletes these provisions of the bill and refers this question to the Commission for study and recommendation. I can understand the concern of the Senate Finance Committee in recommending this measure. Many foundations, even those with a considerable amount of public support, have independent governing bodies which are self-perpetuating. These organizations are said to be in no way susceptible to social and public pressures as a result, and are, therefore, frequently not responsive to need. These institutions are largely unique in our society; government has the voters to which it must be responsive, and as we are learning every day, colleges have their students and faculty and alumni who are demanding they be responsive. In my judgment, philanthropic institutions need some means which will insure responsiveness. Terminating tax-exempt existence after 40 years is not the answer. Some institutions should, perhaps, be terminated sooner; others after a much longer period, if at all. I would give the Presidential Commission, which I suggest, the opportunity to review the activities of foundations and to adopt a system to insure responsiveness to change and social need. I do not recommend that foundations be given the alternative of either becoming an operating foundation or a public charity or going out of business since I do not believe that anyone is in a position to determine today on this bill that 40 years is too long or too short or equally applicable to all.

Second. Stock ownership limitation: My amendment deletes this provision and forwards it to the Commission for further study. While I support philosophically the concept that foundations should be divorced from the control of businesses to the greatest possible extent, I have been impressed by the report made to the Senate Finance Committee by the Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy that "more than three-quarters of the assets of foundations were contributed in the form of appreciated intangible property. And more than half was stock of a company in which the donor and his family has an interest in excess of 20 percent"—page 38. This report has led me to the conclusion that we need to study this matter in greater detail.

Third. Limitations on the activities of foundations: The amendment I introduce would delete these provisions of the bill and refer this issue to the Presidential Commission for study and recommendation. We must be certain that our foundations can properly investigate and report on problems which confront our society and which may presently be, or which may become, the subject of legislation. Provisions which limit such activities must be carefully worded so that they are consistent with our true intent—that is, the prevention of so-called lobbying and of the furtherance of special interests. I do not believe that the provisions in this bill or in the House-passed bill satisfactorily meet our objective in this area. Certainly much greater understanding of the situation is required.

The other provisions of my amendment relate to the following:

Charitable contributions: I agree with the raising of the charitable contribution deduction to 50 percent and the repeal of the unlimited charitable deduction. Both represent the important measures of tax reform in the charitable contribution area and have significant revenue effect. However, I would recommend deletion and further study of other provisions in this bill dealing with charitable contributions. They do not have an important revenue effect, and their potential impact on private giving is not yet adequately understood.

Prohibition on self-dealing: Self-dealing has been an important area of abuse. My amendment imposes the same restrictions against self-dealing on all philanthropic institutions as are presently imposed against private foundations by the Finance Committee bill. I fail to understand why the element of public support makes the public charities any less susceptible to self-dealing than in the case of the private foundation. Both categories should be held to the same high standards. Instances of abuse in the public charity area can be as serious.

Limitations on the use of assets: This amendment would impose the same standards on public charities as the bill would impose on private foundations. My reasons are largely the same as in the case of the prohibitions against self-dealing. All philanthropic institutions should be held to the same high standard. In addition, I see just as much potential for abuse in the case of a public charity although the likelihood may not be as great.

In summary, my amendment seeks to capture the spirit of both the House and Finance Committee tax reform bills by incorporating major provisions. In terms of substance, I believe that my amendment goes even further to the heart of the matter by imposing the highest standards on all foundations whether public or privately and by initiating the first major review in 50 years of those provisions about which there is a need for further study. The further study will be conducted by a Presidential Commission of the highest caliber.

I have proposed this amendment only after consulting with many philanthropic leaders and with some of the leading foundations based in New York. I recognize—and commend my colleagues on the Senate Finance Committee for their praiseworthy efforts in improving significantly on the House tax reform bill, but, I remain concerned that some of the remaining tax changes as they relate to philanthropic contributions would dangerously decrease the amount of funds available for purposes of education and philanthropy. I have proposed my amendment as an alternative for my colleagues who are concerned not only with the grave issues of tax reform, but also with the grave issues of social welfare and innovation in a pluralistic society.

I urge the Senate to accept this amendment. It is essential to the health and well being of those philanthropic activities which have contributed to our national growth and progress and to that pluralism which has been so important to innovation and to discovery in the fields of science, social welfare, and the humanities.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I should like again to address the Chair with an inquiry concerning the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. STEVENS. Is it possible to offer an amendment to this substitute to raise the exemption back up to $1,000, or do we have to defeat the substitute in order to vote on the proposition the Senator from Tennessee originally offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last substitute is not open to amendment.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President——

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. This tactic that has just been used is one I disagree with. I should like to be respectful, as much as I can, as a new Member, but I would like to have voted on the $1,000 exemption. I believed in it. I stated when the poll was taken on this side that I believed in it, and I think that should have been conveyed to the other side. But in any event, I do not think we ought to be shut off from voting on the $1,000 proposition.

The exemption was $1,000 back in Lincoln's day. At the time of the first income tax ever adopted in this country, there was a $1,000 personal exemption; and here we are, at this time, dealing with a situation where we are shut off from voting on it because of a parliamentary tactic, apparently on the basis of who gets credit for suggesting the $800 idea.

I do not know what the leadership believes about this, but I would like to find out if it is possible to put this thing off until we consider the proposition that has been offered here. I have not even seen it yet. It seems to me that some of the developments here are likely to prevent us from getting a tax reform bill, if this sort of maneuvering continues.

AMENDMENTS NO. 338

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send four perfecting amendments to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I believe these perfecting amendments should be explained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendments, as follows:

On page 454 beginning with line 5 through line 19 on page 456, strike the language and insert the following:

"SEC. 801. PERSONAL EXEMPTIONS.

"(a) INCREASE TO $650 FOR 1970.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, and before January 1, 1971—

"(1) section 151 (relating to allowance of personal exemptions) is amended by striking out '$600' whereaver it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$650'; and

"(2) section 6013 (b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in case of certain returns of husband and wife) is amended by striking out '$600' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$650', and by striking out '$1,200' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,300'.

"(b) INCREASE TO $700 FOR 1971.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1970 and before January 1, 1972—

"(1) section 151 (relating to allowance of personal exemptions) is amended by striking out '$650' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$700'; and

"(2) section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in case of certain returns of husband and wife) is amended by striking out '$700' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$750', and by striking out '$1,400' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1500'.

"(d) INCREASE TO $800 FOR 1973 AND SUBSEQUENT YEARS.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972—

"(1) section 151 (relating to allowance of personal exemptions) is amended by striking out '$750' wherever it appears there and inserting in lieu thereof '$800'; and

"(2) section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in case of certain returns of husband and wife) is amended by striking out '$750' wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$800', and by striking out '$1,500', wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof '$1,600'.

"SEC. 802. LOW INCOME ALLOWANCE: INCREASE IN STANDARD DEDUCTION.

"(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 (relating to the standard deduction) is amended by striking out subsections (a), (b), and (c) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"'(a) STANDARD DEDUCTION.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the standard deduction referred to in this title is the larger of the percentage standard deduction for the low income allowance.

"'(b) PERCENTAGE STANDARD DEDUCTION.—The percentage standard deduction is an amount equal to the applicable percentage of adjusted gross income shown in the following table, but not to exceed the maximum amount shown in such table (or one-half of such maximum amount in the case of a separate return by a married individual):

"'Taxable years beginning in—

	Applicable percentage	Maximum amount
1970	10	$1,000
1971	13	1,400
1972	14	1,700
1973 and thereafter	15	2,000

"'(c) LOW INCOME ALLOWANCE.—

"'(1) IN GENERAL.—The low income allowance is an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) the basic allowance, and

"'(B) the additional allowance.

"'(2) BASIC ALLOWANCE.—For purposes of this subsection, the basic allowance is an amount equal to the sum of—

"'(A) $200, plus

"'(B) $100, multiplied by the number of exemptions.

The basic allowance shall not exceed $1,100.

"'(3) ADDITIONAL ALLOWANCE.—

"'(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection, the additional allowance is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of $850 over the sum of—

"'(i) $100, multiplied by the number of exemptions, plus

"'(ii) the income phase-out.

"'(B) INCOME PHASE-OUT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A)(ii), the income phase-out is an amount equal to one-half of the amount by which the adjusted gross income for the taxable year exceeds the sum of—

"'(i) $1050 plus

"'(ii) $650, multiplied by the number of exemptions.

"'(4) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS.—In the case of a married taxpayer filing a separate return—

"'(A) the low income allowance is an amount equal to the basic allowance, and

"'(B) the basic allowance is an amount (not in excess of $525) equal to the sum of—

"'(i) $100, plus

"'(ii) $100, multiplied by the number of exemptions.

"'(5) NUMBER OF EXEMPTIONS.—For purposes of this subsection, the number of exemptions is the number of exemptions allowed as a deduction for the taxable year under section 151.

"'(6) SPECIAL RULE FOR 1971 AND 1972.—For a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, and before January 1, 1973—

"'(A) paragraph (2) shall be applied by substituting "$1,000" for "$1,050";

"'(B) paragraph (3)(A) shall be applied by substituting "$800" for "850".

"'(C) paragraph (3)(B) shall be applied by substituting "one-fourth" for "one-half",

"'(D) paragraph (3)(B)(i) shall be applied by substituting "$1,000" for "$1,050",

"'(E) paragraph (3)(B)(ii) shall be applied by substituting "$700" ($750 for years beginning in 1972) for "$650", and

"'(F) paragraph 4(B) shall be applied by substituting "$500" for "$525".'"

Beginning on line 4 page 460 through page 473 strike the language and insert the following:

"(e) YEARS AFTER 1972.—Effective with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1972, section 141(c) (relating to low income allowance), as amended by subsection (a), is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) LOW INCOME ALLOWANCE.—The low income allowance in $1000 ($500, in the case of a married individual filing a separate return).'

"SEC. 803. TAX RATES.

"(a) RATES OF TAX ON INDIVIDUALS.—Section 1 (relating to the tax imposed) is amended to read as follows:

"'Section 1. Tax Imposed.

"'(a) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING JOINT RETURNS AND SURVIVING SPOUSES.—

"'(1) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1971.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, and before January 1, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of—

"'(A) every married individual (as defined in section 143) who makes a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and

"'(B) every surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)), a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	14% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$140 plus 15% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$290 plus 16% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	$450 plus 17% of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	$620 plus 19% of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$1,380 plus 22% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	$2,260 plus 25% of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	$3,260 plus 28% of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	$4,380 plus 32% of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	$5,660 plus 36% of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$7,100 plus 39% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$8,660 plus 42% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	$10,340 plus 45% of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$12,140 plus 48% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $48,000	$14,060 plus 50% of excess over $44,000.

"'If the taxable income is:

	The tax is:
Over $48,000 but not over $52,000	$16,060 plus 50% of excess over $48,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $56,000	$18,060 plus 53% of excess over $52,000.
Over $56,000 but not over $64,000	$20,180 plus 53% of excess over $56,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	$24,420 plus 55% of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	$31,020 plus 58% of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$37,980 plus 60% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$45,180 plus 62% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$57,580 plus 64% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$70,380 plus 66% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$83,580 plus 68% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	$97,180 plus 69% of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000	$110,980 plus 70% of excess over $200,000.

"'(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1973, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of—

"'(A) every married individual (as defined in section 143) who makes a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and

"'(B) every surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)),

a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:

	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	13.8% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$138 plus 14.8% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$286 plus 15.8% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	$444 plus 16.8% of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	$612 plus 18.8% of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$1,364 plus 21.8% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	$2,236 plus 24.5% of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	$3,216 plus 27.8% of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	$4,228 plus 31.5% of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	$5,588 plus 35.5% of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$7,008 plus 38.5% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$8,548 plus 41.5% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	$10,208 plus 44.3% of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$11,980 plus 47% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $52,000	$13,860 plus 49.3% of excess over $48,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	$17,804 plus 52% of excess over $56,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	$24,420 plus 53.8% of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	$30,500 plus 56.5% of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$37,980 plus 58.5% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$44,380 plus 61% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$56,500 plus 63% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$69,100 plus 64.5% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$82,000 plus 66.3% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	$95,280 plus 67% of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $240,000	$108,660 plus 68% of excess over $200,000.
Over $240,000 but not over $300,000	$135,860 plus 68.3% of excess over $240,000.
Over $300,000 but not over $400,000	$176,840 plus 68.5% of excess over $300,000.
Over $400,000	$245,340 plus 68.8% of excess over $400,000.

"'(3) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of—

"'(A) every married individual (as defined in section 143) who makes a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and

"'(B) every surviving spouse (as defined in section 2(a)), a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:

	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	13.5% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$135 plus 14.5% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $3,000	$280 plus 15.5% of excess over $2,000.
Over $3,000 but not over $4,000	$435 plus 16.5% of excess over $3,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000	$600 plus 18.5% of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000	$1,340 plus 21.5% of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000	$2,200 plus 24% of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000	$3,160 plus 27.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000	$4,260 plus 31% of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000	$5,500 plus 35% of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$6,900 plus 38% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$8,420 plus 41% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000	$10,060 plus 43.5% of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$11,800 plus 46% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $52,000	$13,640 plus 48.5% of excess over $44,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	$17,520 plus 51% of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	$23,640 plus 52.5% of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000	$29,940 plus 55% of excess over $76,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$36,540 plus 57% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$43,380 plus 60% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$55,380 plus 62% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$67,780 plus 63% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$80,380 plus 64.5% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	$93,280 plus 65% of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $240,000	$106,280 plus 66% of excess over $200,000.
Over $240,000 but not over $300,000	$132,680 plus 66.5% of excess over $240,000.
Over $300,000 but not over $400,000	$172,580 plus 67% of excess over $300,000.
Over $400,000	$239,580 plus 67.5% of excess over $400,000.

"'(b) HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS.—

"'(1) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1971.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, and before January 1, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual who is the head of a household (as defined in section 2(b)) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:

	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	14% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$140 plus 16% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$300 plus 18% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$660 plus 19% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,040 plus 22% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,480 plus 23% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$1,940 plus 25% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,440 plus 27% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$2,980 plus 28% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$3,540 plus 31% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,160 plus 32% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$4,800 plus 35% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	$5,500 plus 36% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	$6,220 plus 38% of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	$6,980 plus 41% of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$7,800 plus 42% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$9,480 plus 45% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	$11,800 plus 48% of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	$12,240 plus 51% of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$13,260 plus 52% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$15,340 plus 55% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	$18,640 plus 56% of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	$19,760 plus 58% of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000	$26,720 plus 59% of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000	$30,260 plus 61% of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	$33,920 plus 62% of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	$36,400 plus 63% of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$41,440 plus 64% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$49,120 plus 66% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$62,320 plus 67% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$75,720 plus 68% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$89,320 plus 69% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000	$103,120 plus 70% of excess over $180,000.

"'(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1973, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual who is the head of a household (as defined in section 2(b)) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	13.8% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$138 plus 15.8% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$296 plus 17.8% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$652 plus 19.8% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,048 plus 21.5% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,478 plus 24.3% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$1,964 plus 26.3% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,490 plus 29.5% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,080 plus 30.8% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$3,696 plus 33.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,366 plus 34.8% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,062 plus 38% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	$5,822 plus 39.3% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	$6,608 plus 41% of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	$7,428 plus 43.3% of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$8,294 plus 44.5% of excess over $28,00.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$10,074 plus 46.8% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	$11,946 plus 48.8% of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	$12,922 plus 50.8% of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$13,938 plus 51.5% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$16,010 plus 53.8% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	$19,238 plus 55.5% of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000	$20,348 plus 57% of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $70,000	$27,188 plus 57.3% of excess over $64,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $76,000	$30,626 plus 58% of excess over $70,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	$34,106 plus 60.3% of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	$36,518 plus 61.5% of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$41,438 plus 62.3% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$48,914 plus 64.5% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$61,814 plus 65.8% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$74,974 plus 66.5% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000	$88,274 plus 67.5% of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000	$101,774 plus 68.3% of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000	$115,434 plus 68.5% of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000	$183,934 plus 68.8% of excess over $300,000.

"'(3) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1972. In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual who is the head of a household (as defined in section 2(b)) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $1,000	13.5% of the taxable income.
Over $1,000 but not over $2,000	$135 plus 15.5% of excess over $1,000.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$290 plus 17.5% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$640 plus 19.5% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,030 plus 20.5% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,440 plus 22.5% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$1,890 plus 23.5% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,360 plus 26% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$2,880 plus 28% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$3,440 plus 29.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,030 plus 31.5% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$4,660 plus 33% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $24,000	$5,320 plus 35% of excess over $22,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $26,000	$6,020 plus 37% of excess over $24,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $28,000	$6,760 plus 39% of excess over $26,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000	$7,540 plus 41% of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000	$9,180 plus 44% of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $38,000	$10,940 plus 46.5% of excess over $36,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $40,000	$11,870 plus 48.5% of excess over $38,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000	$12,840 plus 50.5% of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$14,860 plus 52.5% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $52,000	$18,010 plus 54.5% of excess over $50,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $60,000	$19,100 plus 55.5% of excess over $52,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $64,000	$23,540 plus 56.5% of excess over $60,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000	$25,800 plus 57.5% of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $80,000	$32,700 plus 59.0% of excess over $76,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $88,000	$35,060 plus 60.0% of excess over $80,000.
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000	$39,860 plus 61.0% of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$47,180 plus 63.0% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000	$59,780 plus 64.0% of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000	$72,580 plus 65.0% of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $200,000	$85,580 plus 66.0% of excess over $160,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $240,000	$111,980 plus 66.5% of excess over $200,000.
Over $240,000 but not over $300,000	$138,580 plus 67.0% of excess over $240,000.
Over $300,000	$178,780 plus 67.5% of excess over $300,000.'

"(c) UNMARRIED INDIVIDUALS (OTHER THAN SURVIVING SPOUSES AND HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS).—

"(1) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1971.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, and before January 1, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a surviving spouse as defined in section 2(a) or the head of a household as defined in section 2(b)) who is not a married individual (as defined in section 143) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500	14% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	$70 plus 15% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	$145 plus 16% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	$225 plus 17% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$310 plus 19% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$690 plus 21% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,110 plus 24% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,590 plus 25% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,090 plus 27% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,630 plus 29% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,210 plus 31% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$3,830 plus 34% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,510 plus 36% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,230 plus 38% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$5,990 plus 40% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$7,590 plus 45% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$10,290 plus 50% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$13,290 plus 55% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$16,590 plus 60% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$20,190 plus 62% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$26,390 plus 64% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$32,790 plus 66% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$39,390 plus 68% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$46,190 plus 69% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000	$53,090 plus 70% of excess over $100,000.'

"(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1973, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a surviving spouse as defined in section 2(a) or the head of a household as defined in section 2(b)) who is not a married individual (as defined in section 143) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500	13.8% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	$69 plus 14.8% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	$143 plus 15.8% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	$222 plus 16.8% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$306 plus 18.8% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$682 plus 21.5% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,112 plus 24.3% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,598 plus 27% of excess over $8,000.

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,138 plus 30.5% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,748 plus 34% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,428 plus 36.8% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$4,164 plus 39.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,954 plus 42.3% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,800 plus 44.8% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$6,696 plus 46.8% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$8,568 plus 50.3% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$11,586 plus 53% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$14,766 plus 56.5% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$18,156 plus 58.5% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$21,666 plus 61% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$27,766 plus 63% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$34,066 plus 64.5% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$40,516 plus 66.3% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$47,146 plus 67% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$53,846 plus 68% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $150,000	$67,446 plus 68.3% of excess over $120,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$87,936 plus 68.5% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$122,186 plus 68.8% of excess over $200,000.'

"(3) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every individual (other than a surviving spouse as defined in section 2(a) or the head of a household as defined in section 2(b)) who is not a married individual (as defined in section 143) a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500	13.5% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	$67.50 plus 14.5% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	$140 plus 15.5% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	$217.50 plus 16.5% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$300 plus 18.5% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$670 plus 20.5% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1080 plus 23% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,540 plus 24.5% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,030 plus 27% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,570 plus 29% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,150 plus 31% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$3,710 plus 32.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$4,420 plus 34.5% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,110 plus 36% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$5,830 plus 38% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$7,350 plus 43.5% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$9,960 plus 48.5% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$13,870 plus 53.5% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$16,080 plus 57% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$19,500 plus 60% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$25,500 plus 62% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$31,700 plus 63% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$38,000 plus 64.5% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$44,450 plus 65% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$50,950 plus 66% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $150,000	$64,250 plus 66.5% of excess over $120,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$84,100 plus 67% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$117,600 plus 67.5% of excess over $200,000.[3]

"(d) MARRIED INDIVIDUALS FILING SEPARATE RETURNS; ESTATES AND TRUSTS.—

"(1) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1971.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1970, and before January 1, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every married individual (as defined in section 143) who does not make a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and of every estate and trust taxable under this subsection, a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500	14% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	$70 plus 15% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	$145 plus 16% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	$225 plus 17% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$310 plus 19% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$690 plus 22% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,130 plus 25% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,630 plus 28% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,190 plus 32% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,830 plus 36% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,550 plus 39% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$4,330 plus 42% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$5,170 plus 45% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$6,070 plus 48% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$7,030 plus 50% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$9,030 plus 53% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$12,210 plus 55% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$15,510 plus 58% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$18,990 plus 60% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$22,590 plus 62% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$28,790 plus 64% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$35,190 plus 66% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$41,790 plus 68% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$48,590 plus 69% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000	$55,490 plus 70% of excess over $100,000.[1]

"(2) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING IN 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1971, and before January 1, 1973, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every married individual (as defined in section 143) who does not make a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and of every estate and trust taxable under this subsection, a tax determined in accordance with the following table:

"'If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $500	13.8% of the taxable income.
Over $500 but not over $1,000	$69 plus 14.8% of excess over $500.
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500	$143 plus 15.8% of excess over $1,000.
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000	$222 plus 16.8% of excess over $1,500.
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000	$306, plus 18.8% of excess over $2,000.
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000	$682 plus 21.8% of excess over $4,000.
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000	$1,118 plus 24.5% of excess over $6,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000	$1,608 plus 27.8% of excess over $8,000.
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000	$2,164 plus 31.5% of excess over $10,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000	$2,794 plus 35.5% of excess over $12,000.
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000	$3,504 plus 38.5% of excess over $14,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000	$4,274 plus 41.5% of excess over $16,000.
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000	$5,104 plus 44.3% of excess over $18,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000	$5,990 plus 47% of excess over $20,000.
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000	$6,930 plus 49% of excess over $22,000.
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000	$8,890 plus 52% of excess over $26,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000	$12,010 plus 53.8% of excess over $32,000.
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000	$15,238 plus 56.5% of excess over $38,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000	$18,628 plus 58.5% of excess over $44,000.
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000	$22,138 plus 61% of excess over $50,000.
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000	$28,238 plus 63% of excess over $60,000.
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000	$34,538 plus 64.5% of excess over $70,000.
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000	$40,988 plus 66.3% of excess over $80,000.
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000	$47,618 plus 67% of excess over $90,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000	$54,318 plus 68% of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $150,000	$67,918 plus 68.3% of excess over $120,000.
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000	$88,408 plus 68.5% of excess over $150,000.
Over $200,000	$122,658 plus 68.8% of excess over $200,000.[1]

"(3) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER 1972.—In the case of a taxable year beginning after December 31, 1972, there is hereby imposed on the taxable income of every mar-

ried individual (as defined in section 143) who does not make a single return jointly with his spouse under section 6013, and of

" 'If the taxable income is:
Not over $500
Over $500 but not over $1,000
Over $1,000 but not over $1,500
Over $1,500 but not over $2,000
Over $2,000 but not over $4,000
Over $4,000 but not over $6,000
Over $6,000 but not over $8,000
Over $8,000 but not over $10,000
Over $10,000 but not over $12,000
Over $12,000 but not over $14,000
Over $14,000 but not over $16,000
Over $16,000 but not over $18,000
Over $18,000 but not over $20,000
Over $20,000 but not over $22,000
Over $22,000 but not over $26,000
Over $26,000 but not over $32,000
Over $32,000 but not over $38,000
Over $38,000 but not over $44,000
Over $44,000 but not over $50,000
Over $50,000 but not over $60,000
Over $60,000 but not over $70,000
Over $70,000 but not over $80,000
Over $80,000 but not over $90,000
Over $90,000 but not over $100,000
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000
Over $120,000 but not over $150,000
Over $150,000 but not over $200,000
Over $200,000

The tax is:
13.5% of the taxable income.
$67.50, plus 14.5% of excess over $500.
$140, plus 15.5% of excess over $1,000.
$217.50, plus 16.5% of excess over $1,500.
$300, plus 18.5% of excess over $2,000.
$670, plus 21.5% of excess over $4,000.
$1,100, plus 24% of excess over $6,000.
$1,580, plus 27.5% of excess over $8,000.
$2,130, plus 31% of excess over $10,000.
$2,750, plus 35% of excess over $12,000.
$3,450, plus 38% of excess over $14,000.
$4,210, plus 41% of excess over $16,000.
$5,030, plus 43.5% of excess over $18,000.
$5,900, plus 46% of excess over $20,000.
$6,820, plus 48.5% of excess over $22,000.
$8,760, plus 51% of excess over $26,000.
$11,820, plus $52.5% of excess over $32,000.
$14,970, plus 55% of excess over $38,000.
$18,270, plus 57% of excess over $44,000.
$21,690, plus 60% of excess over $50,000.
$27,690, plus 62% of excess over $60,000.
$33,890, plus 63% of excess over $70,000.
$40,190, plus 64.5% of excess over $80,000.
$46,640, plus 65% of excess over $90,000.
$53,140, plus 66% of excess over $100,000.
$66,340, plus 66.5% of excess over $120,000.
$86,290, plus 67% of excess over $150,000.
$119,790, plus 67.5% of excess over $200,000.' "

On line 19 page 480 after "part IV" insert "and V".

Beginning on line 7 on page 481 through page 497. Strike the language and insert the following:

"SEC. 804. COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT SOURCE ON WAGES.

"(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—Section 3402(a) (relating to requirement of withholding) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) REQUIREMENT OF WITHHOLDING.—In the case of wages paid after December 31, 1969, or the 15th day after the date of the enactment of the Tax Reform Act of 1969 (whichever is later), every employer making payment of wages shall deduct and withhold upon such wages (except as otherwise provided in this section) a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. Such tables shall correspond in form to the tables in effect under this subsection on December 31, 1969. For purposes of applying such tables, the term "amount of wages" means the amount by which the wages exceed the number of withholding exemptions claimed, multiplied by the amount of one such exemption as shown in subsection (b)(1)'.

"(b) PERCENTAGE METHOD OF WITHHOLDING.—

"(1) WAGES PAID IN 1970.—Effective with respect to wages paid during 1970, the table contained in section 3402(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Percentage method withholding table

" 'Payroll period	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$12.50
Biweekly	25.00
Semimonthly	27.09
Monthly	54.17
Quarterly	162.50
Semiannual	325.00
Annual	650.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.80'

"(2) WAGES PAID DURING 1971.—Effective with respect to wages paid during 1971, the table contained in section 3402 (b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Percentage method withholding table

" 'Payroll period	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$13.50
Biweekly	27.00
Semimonthly	29.00
Monthly	58.00
Quarterly	175.00
Semiannual	350.00
Annual	700.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	1.90'

"(2) WAGES PAID IN 1972.—Effective with respect to wages paid during 1972, the table contained in section 3402 (b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Percentage method withholding table

" 'Payroll period	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$14.45
Biweekly	28.90
Semimonthly	31.25
Monthly	62.50
Quarterly	187.50
Semiannual	375.00
Annual	750.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	2.10'

"(2 WAGES PAID AFTER 1972.—Effective with respect to wages paid after 1972, the table contained in section 3402(b)(1) is amended to read as follows:

" 'Percentage method withholding table

" 'Payroll period	Amount of one withholding exemption:
Weekly	$15.40
Biweekly	30.80
Semimonthly	33.50
Monthly	67.00
Quarterly	200.00
Semiannual	400.00
Annual	800.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	2.20' "

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I think the majority leader's request that there be an explanation of these perfecting amendments is certainly in order. This is an exceedingly important matter, a matter that I have discussed with the distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. Late this afternoon I went over them in detail with the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, as a courtesy to him, so that he would be completely aware of what I had in mind and why I intended to offer these perfecting amendments, at this time as a substitute for his amendment.

The amendments provide tax relief close to the same amount, and phased in gradually, as does the committee bill. They provide, however, an increase in the personal exemption up to $800 by 1973. They provide a low-income allowance of $1,000, and increase the standard deduction as the Senate Finance bill does, but set the increases off 1 year from the committee bill schedule, and provide relief for single persons and some rate reductions.

In effect, what I have tried to do is stay as close as possible to the bill which the Committee on Finance has worked on for many months.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PASTORE. Is it in order to move that these perfecting amendments be laid on the table?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That motion would be in order.

Is there a sufficient second on the request for the yeas and nays?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, could we have the action on the request for the yeas and nays first?

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Does the rollcall that has been ordered in any way affect the pending unanimous-consent request that the perfecting amendments be considered en bloc?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They will be considered en bloc, and voted on together.

Mr. GORE. Consent was not so granted. How does the rollcall affect that lack of consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair asked if there were objections, and heard none.

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee was advised that no such action was taken by the Chair. I was on my feet, awaiting his statement on the request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Would the Senator like the record read back?

Mr. GORE. Yes. The majority leader suggested it, did he?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. GORE. At any rate, the RECORD will show.

Mr. President, I understood that the

majority leader asked for an explanation. I was on my feet awaiting the submission of the unanimous-consent request. If the unanimous-consent request was granted, I was not aware of it. The RECORD would show. I would like to have the RECORD read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The official reporter will read the RECORD.

The Official Reporter of Debates (Mr. Grant E. Perry) read as follows:

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I send four perfecting amendments to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I withdraw my request.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the amendment was a substitute for the pending amendment?

Mr. PERCY. It is a perfecting amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. In substitution of the perfecting amendment? I understood the Senator to say that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four perfecting amendments were offered to the language of the bill to be stricken out.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I had intended originally to offer a substitute amendment, as I advised the distinguished Senator from Tennessee, feeling it to be a courtesy to him.

I feel it rather unusual when the procedure has been outlined so clearly that an amendment would be offered for a $1,000 exemption, as stated by the Senator from Alaska, then $900, and then $800, that immediately upon being notified that I intended to offer a substitute and told the Senator from Tennessee, he saw fit immediately to rush in with an $800 exemption.

As I advised him last week, I felt I could not vote for his kind of amendment because it would be irresponsible as far as the budget is concerned and as far as the action of the administration and Congress in fighting inflation is concerned.

I hope the Senator is now in agreement that the $1,000 exemption, which would occasion a tremendous deficit to the budget at this particular time and jeopardize every effort that the Congress and the administration have made to fight inflation, certainly would not be in the best interest of the country.

It is for this reason that I feel we should stay as close as possible to the committee bill which provides many of the reforms and improvements that the Finance Committee has seen fit to make in its recommendations. It is certainly something that the Senate should now consider.

I do feel that there is a great deal to be said for increasing the personal exemption. Certainly, as the Senator from Tennessee has indicated many times on the floor of the Senate, one simply cannot raise a child for $50 a month. And people year after year after year have seen the same $600 exemption provided now for 26 years, yet we recognize that the cost of living has gone up many times since that original provision was made in our tax law.

I certainly concur in principle with the Senator from Tennessee that we should have an increase in the personal exemption. However, I think that we should struggle as best we can not only to keep our action fiscally responsible, but also to preserve as many of the principles as possible that the Finance Committee has worked out.

It is for this reason that I have graduated the increase in the personal exemption provision I am now offering so as to increase the personal exemption just $50 in the first year, in 1970. It would be increased from $600 to $650 in 1970, to $700 in 1971, to $750 in 1972, and to $800 in 1973 and subsequent years. However, the 10 percent standard reduction with a $1,000 ceiling is increased to a 15 percent standard deduction with a $2,000 ceiling, as it has been presented in the Finance Committee bill that is pending.

The amendment provides that the percentage of standard deduction is to be 13 percent with a $1,400 ceiling in 1971, 14 percent with a $1,700 ceiling in 1972, and 15 percent with a $2,000 ceiling in 1973 and subsequent years. This is the same increase offered in the committee bill. However, it has been phased in, one year later, so as to lessen the financial impact in the early years when inflation is our greatest enemy, particularly so which respect to poor people and people who are living on fixed incomes. We preserve the provision but delay its enactment for the one year.

The amendment provides for a low income allowance of $1,000—$500 for a married couple filing separate returns—in 1973 and subsequent years.

Under the committee bill, the low income allowance would be $1,100 for 1972 and subsequent years. However, the additional $100 is not needed to maintain the same level of tax free income due to the increase in the personal exemption.

The amendment provides for a phase-out of the low-income allowance in 1970, 1971, and 1972 as the income of the taxpayer increases similar to the phase-out provided in the committee bill but adjusted to take account of the increase in the personal exemption.

The amendment provides new rate schedules for single persons consistent with the principle of the committee bill that a single person shall pay no more than 20 percent greater tax than a married couple with the same taxable income. A new rate schedule, consistent with the principle of the committee bill, is also provided for heads of households with rates one-half way between those provided in the new rate schedule for single persons and the rate schedule for married couples.

The amendment provides no rate reduction for 1971. Under the rate schedule applicable in 1972, one-fourth of the total rate reduction of the committee bill is provided and in 1973, one-half of the total rate reduction of the committee bill is provided. It would be the expressed hope that fiscal conditions would permit three-fourths of the total rate reduction to be applicable in 1974 and the full schedule in 1975 and subsequent years.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee did not take into account any rate changes. The committee labored long and hard to strike a balance that was equitable and effective.

It recognized that in closing loopholes and changing procedures that have been followed for many years by higher income people that those higher income people will now be paying substantially higher taxes as a result. And over a period of time there should be an adjustment in all tax rates.

I believe the figure used shows an average of about 5 percent tax reduction for all taxpayers.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in view of the statement the Senator made earlier to the effect that the procedure appeared to him to be a bit unusual, I would like to have his consent to recall the RECORD.

The able senior Senator from Illinois did advise the senior Senator from Tennessee some time approximately 2 hours ago that he was preparing and contemplating the offering of a substitute amendment, which he stated he did out of courtesy. And I appreciate that.

I advised the Senator that the senior Senator from Tennessee had his own substitute prepared in case it became necessary or advisable so to offer it.

I had also prepared additional amendments, of which the Senator was advised in the RECORD, that might possibly be offered.

I think the RECORD should show that there has been some jockeying underway during the course of the afternoon. It appears that a clear majority of the Senate wishes to raise the personal exemption to $800. The senior Senator from Tennessee recalled the possibility that as a result of diligent work, procrastination, and maneuvering, an attempt was made—that might be successful—to steal away the amendment to provide an increase in the personal exemption.

After conferring with the leadership and his colleagues on this side of the aisle, it was determined and agreed that it would be the better part of wisdom, though the vote would be close on the $1,000 proposal, to vote instead on $800.

It seemed to be surer for $800. So the senior Senator from Tennessee rose and sought recognition, obtained recognition, and offered the amendment. The senior Senator from Tennessee sees nothing unusual about this, if "unusual" means anything more than a rare use of the rules of the Senate. The rules are there for all to use.

If the Senator will yield one step further, the senior Senator from Tennessee has had the staff analyze the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois. It provides a revenue loss estimated at $12.8 billion. It is a mixture of low-income allowance, rate changes, and an increase in the personal exemption; and it is an expensive amendment, may I say to the Senate.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I appreciate the explanation. I should like to reaffirm that I feel it is an unusual procedure to indicate that we are going to vote on a $1,000 exemption and then to

have an $800 exemption suddenly before us. But I think—and I trust—it is a recognition that the $12 billion cost to the budget of the $1,000 exemption would be exorbitant, could not be absorbed, and should not be proposed at this time in view of the fight against inflation.

The figures given by the distinguished Senator with reference to the revenue loss that would be incurred by the proposals I am making are totally erroneous. The loss is very slight in the early years, whereas the loss is very heavy in the distinguished Senator from Tennessee's proposals.

In fiscal 1970 and 1971 we will still be fighting the battle of inflation, and in those years that loss will run close to $5 billion under the Senator from Tennessee's proposals. The figures I have received from the Treasury Department on the proposals I have made are less than a billion dollars in those same years.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator's amendment proposes a low-income allowance of $1,000. Is that correct?

Mr. PERCY. That is correct—phased in by 1973.

Mr. GORE. What would be the revenue loss of this amendment when fully effective?

Mr. PERCY. I have only the composite figures—the total effect of the amendment—from the Treasury Department. The composite effect in revenue loss in the first year against the Finance Committee bill is $400 million.

Mr. GORE. When it is fully effective. The Treasury Department has been condemning the amendment which the senior Senator from Tennessee has offered and has given alarming figures as to what its effect would be when fully effective. Now I am asking the Senator from Illinois what would be the revenue effect of his low-income allowance when fully effective. It happens to be identical with the one I offered originally.

Mr. PERCY. The full effect would be $5.8 billion, when the full $800 exemption——

Mr. GORE. This is not the question I asked the Senator. I asked the Senator—I am taking one step at a time—what would be the full revenue effect of his low-income allowance when fully effective. The answer is $2 billion.

Mr. PERCY. I think the overall figure is $5.3 billion, and I can give the Senator the best estimates we have now. In the first year, about one-half billion dollars would be the effect; in the second year, approximately $400 million; in the third year, $600 million; and in the fourth year, $3.8 billion.

The reason why I think it is exceedingly important that we have the bulge at the end rather than at the beginning is that if the economy cannot absorb or take that kind of impact, we still can do something about it. But if the impact is in 1970 and 1971, as it would be in the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, there is nothing we can do about it, and we simply know that we have added and pumped several billion dollars more each year into the inflationary fires, which are roaring now and are running rampant.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The Senator said that he is unable to give the Senate an estimate of the effect of his low-income allowance.

Mr. PERCY. The low-income allowance is similar to that in the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Then, the answer is that, when fully effective, the effect would be the same.

Mr. PERCY. Exactly the same.

Mr. GORE. That is, $2 billion.

What would be the effect of the Senator's amendment with respect to the standard deduction of 15 percent?

Mr. PERCY. Again, I cannot give the Senator broken-down figures. We will have those figures by tonight. The best estimates the Treasury can give are in the composite total. We can compute this very quickly, because it is exactly the same as the effect of the committee provision, but it is moved back 1 year, so that it will have no effect in 1970, and lessens the effect of this measure as against the Finance Committee measure. There will be no impact in 1970. It removes the impact until 1971, and then it will be the same.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Rather than go through each one of these items, when the Senator does not have the tabulation himself as to the effect of his amendment, and if the Senator will yield, I shall be glad to give my own staff's estimate.

Mr. PERCY. I certainly will, with the understanding that we both should accept figures certified to by the Treasury, or possibly by our own Finance Committee personnel, rather than our respective staffs.

Mr. GORE. If the distinguished Senator from Illinois will confer with the technical staff of the committee, he will find that the technical staff of the committee will verify the estimates of my own staff. They worked together very closely. According to my staff, the revenue loss of the low-income allowance is $2 billion.

Mr. PERCY. That is exactly the same as the Senator's provision in his own amendment. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

The standard deduction of 15 percent, or a given amount, $1.373 billion.

Mr. PERCY. There is no change in 1970. So there can be no effect if there is no change.

Mr. GORE. I am speaking of when the reductions become fully effective.

The revenue loss from the rate reductions, one-half those in the committee bill, is $2.249 billion; the revenue loss from the single persons provision, $445 million; the revenue loss from personal exemption, $6.6 billion—making a total of $12.8 billion. The substitute amendment which I have offered will represent a revenue loss of $8.8 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Will the Senator suspend until the Senate is in order?

The staff personnel of Senators will take seats or leave the Chamber. The Chair, on its own initiative, instructs the Sergeant at Arms to question the staff personnel as to whether they are of immediate need in the Chamber, and if not, to request them to leave the Chamber immediately.

All staff personnel not immediately needed by their respective Senators will please leave the Chamber.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the revenue loss under the substitute amendment which I have offered would be $8.8 billion, which is approximately what the revenue loss would be under the terms of the committee bill, which loss is accomplished primarily through rate changes. So there is practically no more revenue loss from my amendment than is provided by the committee bill while the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, according to the estimates I have—which I believe he will find will be agreed to by the technical staff—would be $12.8 billion.

I do not wish to press the point any further except to make one more reference. The Senator again refers to this as an unusual procedure. There is nothing unusual whatever in a Senator modifying his own amendment. Indeed, this is the usual procedure. The only thing that is rare about this procedure is that I did not wish to modify my amendment be consent. I wished to modify it by substitute amendment, which I did. I suggest there is nothing unusual except that it does not happen often.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to repeat again the figures estimated by the Treasury Department. The figures of the Senator from Tennessee are without reform. The figures that should be kept in mind as a comparison between the two bills we are comparing are as follows: For 1970 the committee bill would bring about a revenue loss of $500 million. The best estimate as to the revenue loss in the first year impact, 1970, under the proposal by the Senator from Tennessee is $2.3 billion more than the committee bill while the amendment I have offered would provide a net loss of $500 million more than the committee bill.

I would say that is a whale of a difference in the impact on the economy, the impact on inflation, and the impact on every family in this country if we had that much more in the economy at that stage.

In 1971 the net effect of all the changes I have proposed would be a loss in revenue, between my provisions and the provisions of the bill by the committee, of $400 million. The net effect of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee in 1971 is a loss of revenue of $2.5 billion more than the committee.

To be fair I would like to continue this point because by 1972, unless inflation is so rampant and we have had to go into controls, there would be plus revenue in the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee by about $100 million in 1972. In the proposals I have presented there

would be a plus of $300 million, or in the same year $200 million more.

When the full impact of rate reductions, personal exemptions, and standard deductions has taken place, there would be a revenue loss of $3.8 billion in 1973. In the provision of the Senator from Tennessee there would be a net plus of $100 million.

I think the difference we are dealing with here in the provisions I have put in is that my provisions would preserve the integrity of the bill worked on by the Committee on Finance. It maintains those provisions but lessens their impact. In order to put in an increase in the personal exemption we have scaled down the provisions but they are there. They will be in the law, and they are principles that will guide us in the future. They are principles we can count on as we move ahead.

Furthermore, the impact is substantially less in the early years. These are years when we are fighting inflation. Certainly, therefore, if $3.8 billion were pumped back into the economy in 1973, who is wise enough to say we will not need that revenue at the consumer level? We certainly do not need it now. Now is when the impact of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee would be adverse on the Treasury and the economy. Later we have plenty of time to make provision for it. This is a great difference. I have tried to preserve the work which has been done so ably and so skillfully by members and the staff of the Finance Committee. We have tried to provide something to take to conference that will give us leeway and that would give us the kind of revenue measure the Senator talked about in his opening remarks before the Senate.

This is as simple as I can explain it. I am sorry we did not have detailed statistics on the provisions, but in my judgment this represents a superior alternative and something that is in line with the President's letter to the distinguished minority leader tonight. I have gone over that letter with extreme care to make certain we meet the ends the President said we must meet to provide for reform, to provide a more equitable sharing of the tax load, and a lightening of the impact on the economy today when we cannot afford more money being pumped into the economy.

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

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, there seems to be some disagreement on the floor of the Senate about the figures used. I wish to ask the Senator whether the figures he is using are based on inquiries directed to the Treasury Department officials. As I understand the situation, the Senator consulted with them and worked closely with them, and the figures he used are figures they provided. Is that correct?

Mr. PERCY. The Senator is absolutely correct. Technical personnel from the Department of the Treasury, as well as officials from the Office of the Secretary and the Under Secretary worked intimately to devise a way to increase the personal exemption, but to do so in a fair fashion. The figures are the best estimate the Treasury Department could provide.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may address an inquiry to the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I understand we are now trying to work out time under which we can vote on the Percy perfecting amendment, and if it shall become necessary, on the Gore amendment thereafter.

I would like to ask the distinguished majority leader if he is prepared to propose a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the prayer tomorrow——

Mr. PASTORE. Which we need so badly. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANSFIELD (continuing). That there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, to be concluded at the hour of 10:30 a.m.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that beginning at the hour of 10:30 there be a time limitation on the pending collective perfecting motion by the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, and that the vote occur at 11:30 a.m.; and that would include the possibility of tabling a motion at that time, if any Senator so desires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That at the conclusion of the vote on the Percy perfecting amendments, there be a time limitation of 20 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Republican leader, or whomever he may designate; 10 minutes apiece—the vote to occur on the Gore amendment at that time, amended or otherwise, at 10 minutes to 12.

Mr. GORE. There is my substitute and the——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, the substitute.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator has allowed no time for the votes. He has just set a vote at 11:30 and then a vote at 10 minutes to 12, but no time for the vote itself, so that would leave no time——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Twenty minutes after the vote, at the conclusion of the 20 minutes—a vote on the Gore substitute, yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I suggest that the time be controlled by the Senator from Tennessee and the chairman of the committee or whomever he may designate.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, for the purpose of asking a question of the distinguished majority leader, we have to have two rollcalls. There are two substitutes that we will be voting on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the third one?

Mr. GORE. The original amendment as amended. There will be a vote on his. There will be a vote on my substitute, and then there will be a vote on the amendment as amended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes—they will follow one another in sequence.

Mr. CURTIS. That makes sense, yes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on all three amendments.

The yeas and nays on all three amendments were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield to me?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there will be no votes tonight.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address a question to the majority leader——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, incidentally, the unanimous request is under the usual formula.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the majority leader yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Do I correctly understand that all three of these measures will be printed in the RECORD so that Senators will be able to read them in the RECORD that will come out tomorrow morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. They will be printed in the RECORD because I understand that the Senator from Illinois has asked that that be done, or if he has not, he will.

Mr. HOLLAND. If they are going to be printed, I should also like to ask the distinguished Senator from Tennessee whether his substitute amendment will also be printed in the RECORD?

Mr. GORE. It has been submitted for the RECORD and I will submit at the conclusion some tables showing precisely its effects. It will all be in the RECORD tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, all amendments will be printed in the RECORD. Without objection the unanimous-consent request is agreed to.

The unanimous-consent agreement, later reduced to writing, is as follows:

Ordered, That on December 3, 1969, following the prayer and approval of the Journal, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until 10:30 a.m.

Ordered further, That the debate on the Percy perfecting amendments to the bill (No. 338), or any motions or amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour, beginning at 10:30 a.m., to be equally divided and controlled between the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), to be followed immediately by a vote thereon. Following the disposition of the Percy amendment, debate on the Gore substitute (No. 337) shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the minority leader, or someone designated by him, to be followed immediately by a vote thereon, and then immediately following that vote a vote will be taken on the Gore substitute amendment (No. 304) whether amended or not.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would hope that such information as can be made available to us, both on the modifications proposed to his amendment by the Senator from Tennessee, and also

those suggested by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), be made available in the RECORD, tonight if possible, because some of us—I am one of them—would like to understand as best we can what we will be voting on tomorrow as regards the merits or demerits of the relative proposals.

I believe I understand what the Senator from Tennessee had in mind when he made his motion. I have had some explanation available both before and during the debate with regard to the suggestions of the Senator from Illinois, but I would still hope very much that, insofar as it can be done, the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Tennessee try to let us know precisely what they have in mind.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana will suspend.

The Senate will please be in order. Under rule XIX the Chair is required to maintain decorum in the Senate on his own initiative.

The Senator from Louisiana may proceed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would hope that both sponsors of the amendments will make available to us as much information as can be made available for the RECORD overnight because any Senator, such as the Senator from Louisiana, who prefers the committee bill as it was reported, will have to vote upon two amendments and he would like to have all the information he can when he votes on them.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD appropriate tables which will explain the provisions of the amendments I have made.

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

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

COMPARISON OF MAJOR TAX RELIEF PROVISIONS OF PERCY, GORE, AND COMMITTEE BILLS

	1970	1971	1972	1973
Low income allowance:				
Percy	$1,050, phaseout 2:1	$1,000, phaseout 4:1	$1,000, phaseout 4:1	$1,000.
Gore	$1,000, phaseout 4:1	$1,000, phaseout 4:1	$1,000	$1,000.
Committee	$1,000, phaseout 2:1	$1,100, phaseout 15:1	$1,100	$1,100.
Personal exemption:				
Percy	$650	$700	$750	$800.
Gore	$700	$800	$800	$800.
Committee	$600	$600	$600	$600.
Standard deduction:				
Percy	10 percent, $1,000	13 percent, $1,400	14 percent, $1,700	15 percent, $2,000.
Gore	10 percent, $1,000	10 percent, $1,000	$1,000	$1,000.
Committee	13 percent, $1,400	14 percent, $1,700	15 percent, $2,000	15 percent, $2,000.
Rate relief:				
Percy	0	0	¼ committee reduction	½ committee reduction.
Gore	0	0	0	0.
Committee	0	⅛ of total relief	Total relief	Total relief.
Single person:				
Percy	0	Maximum of 20 percent over joint return rate.	Maximum of 20 percent over joint rate.	Maximum of 20 percent over joint rate.
Gore	0			
Committee	0			
Total relief:				
Percy	$2,300,000,000	$5,500,000,000	$8,700,000,000	$12,800,000,000.
Gore	$4,000,000,000	$7,500,000,000	$8,900,000,000	$8,900,000,000.
Committee	$1,700,000,000	$5,100,000,000	$9,000,000,000	$9,000,000,000.
Revenue change as compared to committee bill:				
Percy	−$500,000,000	−$400,000,000	+$300,000,000	−$3,700,000,000.
Gore	−$2,300,000,000	−$2,600,000,000	+$100,000,000	+$100,000,000.

COMPARISON OF REVENUE EFFORTS BY PROVISIONS OF PERCY, GORE, AND COMMITTEE BILLS

[In millions of dollars]

	1970	1971	1972	1973
Low income allowance:				
Percy	600	550	550	550
Gore	550	550	550	550
Committee	625	625	625	625
Change in phaseout of low income allowance:				
Percy	0	146	146	1,507
Gore	146	146	1,507	1,507
Committee	0	1,062	2,027	2,027
Increase in standard deduction:				
Percy	0	1,087	1,587	1,648
Gore	0	0	0	0
Committee	1,087	1,325	1,373	1,373
Increase in personal exemption:				
Percy	1,700	3,267	4,839	6,406
Gore	3,267	6,406	6,406	6,406
Committee	0	0	0	0
Rate reduction:				
Percy	0	0	1,125	2,249
Gore	0	0	0	0
Committee	0	1,687	4,498	4,498
Tax treatment of single persons:				
Percy	0	445	445	445
Gore	0	420	420	420
Committee	0	445	445	445
Total:				
Percy	2,300	5,500	8,700	12,800
Gore	4,000	7,500	8,900	8,900
Committee	1,700	5,100	9,000	9,000

The following table shows the percentage increase or decrease in tax by income levels under the committee bill, the Gore $800 amendment and the Percy plan:

Adjusted gross income class	Committee bill increase or decrease from present law (percent)	Gore $800 plan increase or decrease from present law (percent)	Percy plan increase or decrease from present law (percent)
0 to $3,000	−66.1	−72.5	−73.7
$3,000 to $5,000	−30.3	−36.2	−38.5
$5,000 to $7,000	−17.0	−23.0	−26.3
$7,000 to $10,000	−10.9	−16.2	−22.1
$10,000 to $15,000	−10.3	−10.5	−17.8
$15,000 to $20,000	−8.6	−7.5	−12.8
$20,000 to $50,000	−7.2	−5.0	−8.8
$50,000 to $100,000	−4.8	−.6	−3.7
$100,000 and over	+2.6	+10.3	+6.3
Total	−10.1	−10.0	−15.0

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How does the Senator take care of single people?

Mr. PERCY. There is no change from the Senate Finance Committee bill. As I read in my opening statement, special provisions have been made in the Finance Committee bill, and they are preserved in this amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. How could the Senator preserve them and change the rates at the same time? I understand that the Senator did change the rates.

Mr. PERCY. Yes, but proportionate benefits are offered to single people and they are preserved by this amendment—single, that is, head of a household, as well as a single individual—they are preserved by the amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. One thing is not clear. I think I have it clear, and so does the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), but others may not. The Senator's perfecting amendments go up to the original text of the bill as reported by the Finance Committee, right?

Mr. PERCY. Well——

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from New York for that purpose?

Mr. PERCY. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JAVITS. Are perfecting amendments as submitted by the Senator from Illinois perfecting amendments to that provision of the bill which is deleted by the Gore substitute as reported by the Finance Committee?

Mr. PERCY. They are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. JAVITS. Therefore, if the Percy amendments—I use that colloquial term—prevail, then the matter sought to be stricken by the Senator from Tennessee will be as amended by the Percy amendments; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. And if the Percy amendments fail, then they are washed out and they do not do anything to the Gore substitute, do they?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. They do not affect the Gore substitute in any way. They could affect the original text.

Mr. JAVITS. Exactly. I thank the Chair. I think that is very important for all Senators to note, because one might get the impression that the Senator from Illinois is amending the Gore substitute, but he is not. It will be necessary to defeat the Gore substitute even if we have carried the amendments of the Senator from Illinois, in order to give effect to what the Senator from Illinois is trying to do; is that not correct?

Mr. PERCY. That is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. It is very important that Senators understand exactly what the pattern is on which they will be voting tomorrow, and that there will be a third vote that will come on the resulting product from those first two; is that not correct?

Mr. PERCY. That is right.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I hope that all Senators will carefully note this colloquy before they come into the Chamber to vote tomorrow, because it has been very clearly stated, especially if one favors the third amendment——

Mr. JAVITS. If you like it.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, if you like it. [Laughter.]

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the minority leader for that explanation.

Mr. GORE. I am confused. They have been trying to find a way to do that all afternoon. [Laughter.]

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the tables I referred to earlier showing the impact of my subtsitute proposal to increase the personal exemption to $800.

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

TABLE 1.—COMPARISON OF INCREASE IN PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO $800 UNDER GORE PROPOSAL TO H.R. 13270 LOW-INCOME ALLOWANCE

Number in family	Amount of nontaxable income allowed under present law	Amount of nontaxable income under low income allowance	Amount of nontaxable income under proposal 1970	Amount of nontaxable income under proposal 1971
1	$900	$1,700	$1,700	$1,800
2	1,600	2,300	2,400	2,600
3	2,300	2,900	3,100	3,400
4	3,000	3,500	3,800	4,200
5	3,700	4,100	4,500	5,000
6	4,400	4,700	5,200	5,800
7	5,100	5,300	5,900	6,600
8	5,800	5,900	6,600	7,400

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON OF INCREASE IN PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO $800 UNDER GORE PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270—TAX ON FAMILY OF 4 (ASSUMES NONBUSINESS EXPENSES=20 PERCENT OF INCOME)

AGI	Tax under present law	Tax under H.R. 13270 1	Tax under proposal 1
$3,000	0	0	0
3,500	$56	0	0
4,000	112	$65	0
5,000	230	200	$112
7,500	552	516	418
10,000	924	868	772
12,500	1,304	1,228	1,152
15,000	1,732	1,636	1,556
17,500	2,172	2,056	1,996

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE 2.—COMPARISON OF INCREASE IN PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO $800 UNDER GORE PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270—TAX ON FAMILY OF 4 (ASSUMES NONBUSINESS EXPENSES=20 PERCENT OF INCOMES)—Continued

AGI	Tax under present law	Tax under H.R. 13270 1	Tax under proposal 1
$20,000	$2,660	$2,508	$2,460
25,000	3,708	3,492	3,484
50,000	11,060	10,452	10,700
100,000	31,948	29,692	31,484
500,000	249,300	226,644	248,740

1 Provisions as effective for taxable years beginning in 1971.

TABLE 3.—COMPARISON OF INCREASE IN PERSONAL EXEMPTION TO $800 UNDER GORE PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270 TAX ON MARRIED COUPLE WITH NO DEPENDENTS [ASSUMES NONBUSINESS EXPENSES=20 PERCENT OF INCOME]

AGI	Tax under present law	Tax under H.R. 13270 1	Tax under Gore proposal 1
$2,300	$87	0	0
$3,000	170	$91	$56
$4,000	290	228	200
$5,000	418	375	354
$7,500	772	724	696
$10,000	1,152	1,084	1,076
$12,500	1,556	1,468	1,468
$15,000	1,996	1,888	1,908
$17,500	2,460	2,324	2,360
$20,000	2,960	2,784	2,860
$25,000	4,044	3,816	3,932
$50,000	11,600	10,956	11,420
$100,000	32,644	30,316	32,412

1 Provisions as effective for taxable years beginning in 1971.

TABLE 4.—COMPARISON OF TAX REDUCTION UNDER GORE $800 PERSONAL EXEMPTION PROPOSAL AND H.R. 13270—TAX REDUCTION FOR FAMILY OF 4

[Assumes nonbusiness deductions equal 20 percent of income]

AGI	Present law	Tax reduction under H.R. 13270	Percentage decrease under H.R. 13270 1	Tax reduction under Gore proposal 1	Percentage decrease under Gore proposal
$3,000	0	0	0	0	0
$3,500	$56	$56	100.0	$56	100.0
$4,000	112	47	42.0	112	100.0
$5,000	230	30	13.0	118	51.3
$7,500	552	36	6.7	134	24.3
$10,000	924	56	6.6	152	16.3
$12,500	1,304	76	5.8	152	11.6
$15,000	1,732	96	5.5	176	10.2
$17,500	2,172	116	5.3	176	8.1
$20,000	2,660	152	5.7	200	7.5
$25,000	3,708	216	5.8	224	6.0
$50,000	11,060	608	5.5	360	3.2
$100,000	31,948	2,256	7.1	464	1.4

1 Provisions as effective for taxable years beginning in 1971.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of yesterday, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 3, 1969, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 2, 1969:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE

Michael Collins, of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

U.S. MINT

Hildreth Frost, Jr., of Colorado, to be Assayer of the Mint of the United States at Denver, Colorado, vice Earl F. Haffey.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE

Joe McDonald Ingraham of Texas to be U.S. Circuit Judge, Fifth Circuit vice a new position created under Public Law 90–347, approved June 18, 1968.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

Lt. Gen. Arthur C. Agan, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Jr., [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Robert J. Friedman, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.