

ment has never permitted any kind of television at all, good, bad or indifferent. There the people are spared this problem by the thoughtful men who rule them.

LOWERING THE VOTING AGE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Sun-Times of December 1, 1969, put into proper perspective the need for lowering the voting age in America.

I believe this is a most timely editorial and performs a notable public service.

The editorial follows:

LOWER VOTING AGE

A plank in The Sun-Times' platform calls for a voting age lower than 21. We have suggested that the Constitutional Convention could consider such a change when it meets to modernize the state's basic charter.

Now, the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Violence has lent its considerable support to a reduction in the voting age, suggesting a minimum age of 18.

The commission contended that much of the frustration of today's youth, and some of the violent manifestations of that frustration, might be eased if youth were given earlier access to the ballot box. Milton S. Eisenhower, commission chairman, said also that "there is a lot of good common sense in the statement that those who are old enough to carry out the foreign policy of this country by offering their lives in war are also old enough to decide (through voting) if they are to have a war."

The Sun-Times, which has supported a reduced voting age since 1954, took a position similar to that of the commission's two years ago. Recognizing that dissent was rising among the young, we said: "While violence must not be countenanced . . . the right to dissent must be protected. The best way to protect that right is to channel it constructively in a way that will encourage

response from national leaders. The answer is to channel dissent through the ballot box."

Granting of the right to vote should not, of course, be considered a means of lowering the decibel count, or a means of buying society's way out of uncomfortable situations created by youthful questioning and vigor. The fundamental reason for lowering the voting age is that, because of improved education and communications, today's younger generation is smart enough and alert enough to vote as wisely as any older age group does.

It won't be easy to lower the voting age. Citizens of Hawaii, one of the four states with a voting age under 21, last year rebuffed an effort to lower the standard from 20 to 18. Also, entrenched politicians always are fearful of unleashing a new bloc of potentially independent voters.

Nonetheless, the voting age should be lowered, as the violence commission has said, and as we have said so often. And since the Congress is reluctant to act, and since the Illinois Legislature has failed to act, the matter should certainly be on the agenda for the Constitutional Convention.

WHAT MORE, FOR PEACE, COULD MR. NIXON DO?

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 10, 1969

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald on December 4 asked a reasonable question: What more could the President reasonably do to obtain a just peace?

The implied answer was "nothing." Most of the Nation agrees that the President is doing all that can be done in that regard.

The text of the Herald editorial follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 4, 1969]

WHAT MORE, FOR PEACE, COULD MR. NIXON DO?

Hawks and doves in the House became birds of a feather in voting 333 to 55 for a

resolution endorsing President Nixon's efforts to negotiate a "just peace" in Vietnam.

For that reason the resolution, which seems to mean all things to all men, is meaningless. But it does serve to highlight the Nixon program in Vietnam which goes far beyond the position of the Johnson administration and, indeed, rather out-doves the rejected minority plank in the 1968 Democratic platform.

That plank, which was howled down in Chicago, called for immediate cessation of the bombing of North Vietnam and of the offensive search and destroy missions by combat units, for a negotiated withdrawal of troops by opponents in the hostilities and for a negotiated coalition government that would include the Communists.

In his speech Nov. 3, Mr. Nixon "set forth our peace proposals in great detail," as follows:

"We have offered the complete withdrawal of all outside forces within one year.

"We have proposed a cease-fire under international supervision.

"We have offered free elections under international supervision with the Communists participating in the organization and conduct of the elections as an organized political force . . ."

To be sure, Hanoi rejected these proposals but in other respects the President was acting on his own.

He had already withdrawn unilaterally the 60,000 troops—including 20 per cent of all combat troops—he promised would be out by Dec. 15.

He has put into effect the Vietnamization plan announced in March.

He has worked out a plan for the withdrawal of a U.S. troops and their replacement by Vietnamese.

He has continued the bombing suspension ordered just before the election last year by President Johnson, who also decreed no other change whatsoever in his own Vietnam program.

So Mr. Nixon has gone beyond the dove at Chicago and he has reversed most of the Johnson policy. Thus it is all the more remarkable to us that the vote Tuesday on the House resolution was not unanimous. What more, as of today, could the President reasonably have done?

SENATE—Thursday, December 11, 1969

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

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

God of our fathers, who in times past hast called men to serve Thee in the Government of this Nation, and hast not ceased to call, call us this day from life on all lower levels to service in the higher realm of Thy kingdom of righteousness and truth. Bless the labor of the Members of this body for the welfare of the whole Nation. Keep us from running out or wearing out until our work is done. When nerves grow taut and spirits tense, bring us to Thy peace. Walk with us amid the difficulties and uncertainties of the day's work that we may have Thy light upon our pathway, and with joyful hearts and radiant spirits bring to completion the divine intention for all men: For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, December 10, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Committee on Banking and Currency be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Air Force.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Graham W. Watt, of Ohio, to be Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. MARSHALS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of U.S. marshals.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—THE AIR FORCE, THE ARMY, THE NAVY, AND THE MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 576 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

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

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
REVOLVING FUND

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 9233) to amend title 5, United

States Code, to promote the efficient and effective use of the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission in connection with certain functions of the Commission, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with amendments, on page 4, after line 3, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 8341(e) of title 5, United States Code, as amended by section 206(b) of Public Law 91-93 (83 Stat. 140), shall be effective as of October 20, 1969.

And, after the amendment just above stated, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following at the end thereof:

"(g) Each annuity payable from the Fund based on involuntary separation and having a commencing date after November 1, 1969, but before January 2, 1970, shall be increased, from the commencing date of the annuity, by 5 percent."

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 581), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The basic purpose of H.R. 9233 is to increase the scope of the reimbursable services for which the revolving fund of the Civil Service Commission may be used. In 1952, Congress appropriated \$4 million to be established by the Civil Service Commission as a revolving fund to finance full-field investigations conducted by the Commission for other departments and agencies (5 U.S.C. 1304(e)). The cost of the investigations to the Commission is paid by the agencies into the revolving fund so that the fund is continually replenished (5 U.S.C. 1304(f)).

Since 1952, the Civil Service Commission has been called upon to perform a number of additional services, which are reimbursable, for the departments and agencies. Among these services are training courses, executive seminar centers, examining Peace Corps applicants, and scores of other services performed for agencies under individual agreements involving reimbursement.

This bill provides that the revolving fund may be used to finance all reimbursable services performed by the Commission for other Government departments and agencies if those services are covered by budget estimates submitted to the Congress for that fiscal year.

COST

No additional cost is involved.

STATEMENT

The Civil Service Commission states that in 1968 a general overhaul of its accounting system was completed and that a new system has been installed. With use of revolving-fund financing limited to investigations only, budgeting and control over funds have become difficult, and the Commission's financial structure has been made unduly complex. These conditions contribute to lack of efficient program administration. Revolving-fund financing of all reimbursable activities combined with the revised accounting system, will correct these deficiencies.

This measure was recommended by the

Civil Service Commission in 1968. In the 90th Congress, the House passed a similar measure; and the Senate approved its provisions as part of another bill. Final action, however, was not taken prior to adjournment.

AMENDMENTS

The committee has amended H.R. 9233 by the addition of two sections unrelated to the revolving fund.

Section 2 corrects an error in the effective date of survivor annuity protection for the children of a Federal employee who died with fewer than 5 years' service between October 20, 1969, and November 1, 1969. The amendment makes the survivor annuity protection effective on the date of enactment of Public Law 91-93 (October 20, 1969) rather than the effective date included in Public Law 91-93 (November 1, 1969). Thus the children of such an employee would be entitled to a survivor annuity. The committee knows of one such case. The cost of the amendment would be minimal.

Section 3 would amend section 8340 of title 5, United States Code, to provide a 5-percent cost-of-living annuity increase for those who retire after November 1, 1969, and before January 2, 1970, and whose retirement is based upon involuntary separation. Subsection 8340(b) of title 5, as amended by Public Law 91-93, approved October 20, 1969, authorized a 5-percent cost-of-living annuity increase for annuitants on the rolls as of November 1, 1969.

The Department of Defense advises that it is closing a number of bases and reducing the size of its civilian work force. On October 29, 1969, the Department announced its intention of eliminating approximately 27,000 civilian positions. The timing of the announcement allowed employees affected only 2 days in which to decide whether to undergo the forthcoming reduction in force or to retire and receive the 5-percent annuity increase.

It is the view of the Department—and the committee agrees—that it was not possible, in the time span available, for many employees to make reasoned decisions on a matter of such importance.

Section 3 would remedy the inequity by extending eligibility for the 5-percent annuity adjustment for 2 months to those involuntarily separated—for the period after November 1, 1969, but before January 2, 1970.

COST

The Secretary of Defense states that he is unable to estimate the number of employees facing involuntary separation who would avail themselves of the extension. Therefore, he cannot determine the cost of this provision. The best estimate is that the cost to the retirement fund would be approximately \$3,000 per retiree over the full length of the annuity.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H.R. 13000) to implement the Federal Employee Pay Comparability System, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission, and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

SOUTHWEST METROPOLITAN WATER AND SANITATION DISTRICT, COLO.

The resolution (S. Res. 239) to refer S. 2807, together with all accompanying papers, to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2807) entitled "A bill for the relief of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District, Colorado", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the Chief Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims; and the Chief Commissioner of the United States Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an excerpt from the report (No. 91-584), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The purpose of the resolution is refer S. 2807 entitled "A bill for the relief of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District, Colorado," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims; and the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States, or a gratuity, and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

STATEMENT

The Executive Office of the President in its report to this committee opposes S. 2807 but states that if the claim is to receive further consideration, Senate Resolution 239 would be an appropriate means for this purpose and if this resolution be passed, it would be glad to further review and comment on the bill in light of the Chief Commissioner's report.

The Office of the Deputy Attorney General opposes S. 2807, but states that "whether peculiar equities of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District are such as to justify special relief from Congress in this case is, of course, a legislative rather than a judicial determination."

The Department of the Army in its report to this committee recognizes that there may exist equitable considerations in this case which the Congress may determine justify granting of the relief sought and further states that the Department in view of the difficulty present in the determination of the amount of compensation due, if any, and of the desirability for a thorough review of the claim to determine whether sufficient equities are present to justify relief, referral of the bill S. 2807 to the Court of Claims, as provided for in Senate Resolution 239, would be appropriate. The Department of the Army would have no objection to Senate Resolution 239.

Copies of the reports of the Department of the Army, the office of the Deputy Attorney General and the Executive Office of the President are attached hereto and made a part hereof.

The facts relative to this claim are set forth in the report of the Department of the Army as follows:

"The Southwest Metropolitan Water and

Sanitation District was organized in 1961 and is a governmental subdivision of the State of Colorado. The district encompasses about 6,000 acres in Arapahoe, Douglas, and Jefferson Counties. The outfall sewer, which is the subject matter of the bill, was constructed to service a planned industrial park at Blake-land, Colo.

"The industrial park, comprising about 500 acres, was established by the Rio Grande Land Co., a subsidiary corporation of the Denver & Rio Grande Western Railway. Acquisition for the park, for resale, began in 1954. Sales were made by the land company in 1963 to the International Pipe & Ceramics Corp., and in 1964 to the U.S. Rubber Co., both of which firms have constructed industrial facilities. These plants are served by the outfall sewer constructed by the district from the Littleton sewage disposal plant, Littleton, Colo., to the industrial park. The district also furnishes potable water to the plants.

"The Chatfield Dam and Reservoir project was authorized by the act approved May 17, 1950, and is one unit of a comprehensive plan for flood control of the South Platte River and its tributaries. Funds for initial construction and land acquisition were appropriated in 1966 and construction and land acquisition were commenced in 1967. The damsite is located in the South Platte River immediately downstream of the confluence of the South Platte River and Plum Creek, approximately 8 miles south of Denver, Colo. It is estimated that approximately 6,135 acres of land will be required for the project, of which about 1,075 acres are within the boundaries of the Southwest Metropolitan Water and Sanitation District. A major portion of the industrial park will be taken.

"The basis for the relief sought by the district is the loss of lands, particularly within the industrial park, which constitute a portion of its tax base for repayment of its bonded indebtedness. With further development of the industrial park foreclosed by construction of Chatfield Dam, the district's capability of repaying its bonded indebtedness is seriously impaired. It is understood that the amount of the recovery sought by the district represents the cost incurred by it in construction of sewer and water facilities to serve the industrial park.

"Present plans of the Department of the Army are to negotiate a contract with the district for the relocation of the affected portions of its facilities. The large outfall sewer serving the park will be left undisturbed, as it will be able to continue to operate under project conditions without any adverse effects either to it or to the Chatfield project, and will continue to serve the two existing industrial facilities, which will not be affected by the project.

"It is noted that, while the district is apparently seeking to recover the entire cost of constructing the sewer and water facilities involved, some of the capacity of these facilities will continue to be utilized. In addition, although the present high mill levy has tended to depress the market value of lands lying within the district, future urbanization of the area within the district's boundaries, which is within the metropolitan area of Denver, Colo., may be anticipated which would broaden the tax base and its immediate effect upon the district's ability to discharge its indebtedness may be of temporary rather than permanent duration. Complete factual data concerning the facilities are not available so a recommendation concerning the amount of the payment cannot be made by the Department of the Army.

"We note that there has been referred to your committee Senate Resolution 239, 91st Congress, which would refer the bill to the Chief Commissioner of the U.S. Court of Claims for preparation of a report to the Senate giving such findings of fact and conclusions as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against

the United States, and the amount, if any, due the claimant.

"The Department recognizes that there may exist equitable considerations in this case which the Congress may determine justify granting of the relief sought. However, the Department considers that, in view of the difficulty present in the determination of the amount of compensation due, if any, and of the desirability for a thorough review of the claim to determine whether sufficient equities are present to justify relief, referral of the bill S. 2807 to the Court of Claims, as provided for in Senate Resolution 239, would be appropriate. The Department of the Army would have no objection to Senate Resolution 239."

In view of all of the foregoing the committee believes that there is sufficient conflicting evidence of the claimant and the Government to warrant the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims to make his findings and conclusions as to whether or not there is a legal or equitable claim existing against the United States and report thereon to the Congress.

The committee therefore recommends that the resolution, Senate Resolution 239, be agreed to.

WYLO PLEASANT

The bill (H.R. 11503) for the relief of Wylo Pleasant, doing business as Pleasant Western Lumber Co.—now known as Pleasant's Logging & Milling, Inc.—was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* an excerpt from the report (No. 91-585), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE

The proposed legislation would authorize the payment of \$12,000 to Wylo Pleasant, doing business as Pleasant Western Lumber Co. (now known as Pleasant's Logging & Milling, Inc.) in full settlement of his claim for losses sustained in performing a timber sales contract with the Forest Service as the result of performing work elsewhere at the request of Government personnel.

STATEMENT

The Comptroller General of the United States has no objection to the enactment of this legislation as amended in the House of Representatives. The House report on H.R. 11503 relates the following:

"The bill, H.R. 11503, was introduced in accordance with the recommendations of the Comptroller General transmitted to the Congress in accordance with the meritorious claims provisions of section 236 of title 31 of the United States Code. In accordance with the provisions of that section the Comptroller General has determined that the claim of Wylo Pleasant contains in the language of that section "such elements of legal liability or equity as to be deserving of the consideration of the Congress."

"The contract referred to in the bill was a timber sales contract dated November 17, 1959, with the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture. This contract was designated No. 12-11-092-29 and provided for an estimated 3,843,000 board feet of timber to be cut in the Tower Mountain area of the Rio Grande National Forest by November 30, 1962.

"The Forest Service established the appraised value for the timber at \$6 per thousand board feet. The successful bid submitted by the contractor was \$9.61 per thousand board feet which became the tentative contract rate.

"Section 2B of the timber sale contract provides for adjustments to the \$9.61 tentative contract rate, based on fluctuations in the quarterly market price indexes for Engelmann spruce. The contract specified a base payment rate of \$4 per thousand board feet which was set forth in the advertisement for bids. This rate is a minimum rate representing the floor below which the selling price cannot be reduced by subsequent price adjustments no matter how much the relevant market prices fall below the original lumber price index. The contract has been extended three times to December 31, 1969, pursuant to section 5a3 of the contract, and this is a relevant fact in view of the Government-induced delay involved in this matter.

"The sale contract originally specified that rate adjustments would be based on the 1953-54 Western Pine Association (currently the Western Wood Products Association) quarterly adjusted lumber price index for Engelmann spruce. The contract stated the lumber price index to be \$86.63 per thousand board feet. This price index was to be used as a basis for determining the subsequent changes in the market price indexes.

"The Comptroller General in his explanation noted that under the provisions of the Tower Mountain contract the sale timber is subdivided into blocks, or payment units, and is released for cutting by payment units, ordinarily upon the request of the timber purchaser. The units are charged for, and the required deposits are made, at the adjusted rates in effect when the timber units are released for cutting.

"Thus, in November 1962, at the time of the first contract extension, the market price index for Engelmann spruce lumber had fallen from the original \$86.63 to \$75.32 per thousand board feet. Accordingly, the adjusted payment rate for the Tower Mountain contract would have been \$4 per thousand board feet for any blocks of timber released during the quarter ending December 31, 1962.

"During the second quarter of 1966, due to a rising market, the stumpage rate required to be paid by the contractor increased substantially because of application of the section 2B escalation clause. However, on May 22 and June 15, 1961, prior to beginning the logging of the Tower Mountain sale, the contractor had purchased two additional timber sales in the Middle Cross Creek and West Cross Creek sales units of the Rio Grande National Forest. Both of these sales were salvage sales of timber that had become insect infested. In addition, the contractor continued to log another insect salvage sale on the Upper Pass Creek sales unit which he had purchased on September 24, 1957.

"The contractor states that he was directed by the Forest Service to cease logging operations in the Tower Mountain area and concentrate on harvesting the insect salvage sales. It is the contractor's position, therefore, that operation of the insect salvage sales at the direction of the Government entitled him to an extension of time for the Tower Mountain sale equivalent to the time spent operating the insect salvage sales. The contractor also contends that the stumpage rate should have been frozen at \$4 since it understood from comments made by representatives of the Forest Service that in such cases it was Forest Service policy to freeze the payment conditions (apparently meaning to stop any further adjustments to the payment rate by suspending the escalation clause contained in the contract for a period of time) for the same period of time that the contractor was engaged in harvesting the insect salvage sales. The contractor has cited in support of this contention Forest Service Handbook, title 2400, paragraph 2433.12, which provides in pertinent part that—

"There may be cases in which it is to the advantage of the United States to terminate

the adjustment provision and extend the sale at flat rates."

"The administrative office reports that, while it may have urged the contractor to bid on the two insect-infested sales and may have agreed to consider favorably future requests for extension of sales already under contract, it can find no evidence to show that either party considered any such urging as constituting a directive to operate those sales in preference to Tower Mountain. In view of the report of the officials denying that they neither directed cessation of logging operations on Tower Mountain nor promised to freeze the rates in such event, the Comptroller General was unable to find a legal basis for reforming the contract to reduce the stumpage rate to \$4 per thousand board feet as requested by the contractor.

"The committee is impressed by the fact that the officials of the Forest Service admit that Mr. Pleasant was urged to bid on the salvage sales of timber that had become insect infested and to give priority to cutting such salvage timber. Further the Comptroller General states that he was advised that favorable consideration would be given to extending the Tower Mountain contract period, and therefore it is not only possible but probable that Mr. Pleasant was misled in believing that he would have the time extended for cutting the Tower Mountain timber for the same period of time that he was engaged in harvesting insect sales without inclusion of the escalation clause of the contract. Since this is true and since the Government did derive a considerable benefit in that the spread of infestation was successfully controlled in the Rio Grande National Forest, which undoubtedly resulted in substantial savings to the Government, the Comptroller General concluded the claim does contain such elements of equity, as to be deserving of consideration of the Congress under the provisions of the act of April 10, 1928, 45 Stat. 413, 31 U.S.C. 236, which provide as follows:

"When there is filed in the General Accounting Office a claim or demand against the United States that may not lawfully be adjusted by the use of an appropriation theretofore made, but which claim or demand in the judgment of the Comptroller General of the United States contains such elements of legal liability or equity as to be deserving of the consideration of the Congress, he shall submit the same to the Congress by a special report containing the material facts and his recommendation thereon."

"The General Accounting Office received a letter dated April 15, 1969, from the contractor enclosing assigned statement agreeing to accept the sum of \$12,000 in full and final settlement of his claim. Mr. Pleasant's original claim was submitted in the amount of \$14,680.02. In a letter dated February 20, 1969, he had stated that his losses then amounted to over \$17,000. At the time General Accounting Office representatives examined the records of the Forest Service on the Tower Mountain sale it was determined that as of July 31, 1968, Mr. Pleasant had been charged about \$27,000 for the timber cut, whereas had he paid the \$4 rate the charge to him would have been about \$15,000. Thus, at that time, the amount of Mr. Pleasant's claim, as verified by the General Accounting Office, was \$12,000. It was therefore the conclusion of the Comptroller General that a bill be enacted to authorize payment of that amount.

"In view of the facts outlined above and referred to in the recommendations of the Comptroller General, the committee concluded that this matter is a proper subject for legislative relief. The equitable considerations referred to by the Comptroller General provide a firm basis for relief in this instance and establish the meritorious nature of the claim. Accordingly it is recommended that the bill be considered favorably."

After a study of all of the foregoing to-

gether with the letter of the Comptroller General of the United States the committee concurs in the action of the House of Representatives and recommends that the bill (H.R. 11503) be considered favorably.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS AMENDMENT OF 1969

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2523) to amend, extend, and improve certain public health laws relating to mental health, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1969".

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS, EXTENSION OF DURATION

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 101. (a) Section 201 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2681) is amended (1) by striking the word "and" which appears immediately before "\$70,000,000", and (2) by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", \$95,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; and \$115,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973.

(b) Section 207 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2687) is amended by striking out "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

ALLOTMENTS TO STATES; INCLUSION OF TRUST TERRITORY

Sec. 102. (a) The first sentence of subsection (a) of section 202 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2682) is amended by striking out "and Guam," and inserting in lieu thereof "Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(b) The second sentence of such subsection (a) is amended by inserting after "State" the first time it appears ", other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands."

(c) Such subsection (a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Sums so allotted to the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to it for such purpose for the next two fiscal years (and for such years only), in addition to the sums allotted to it for such purpose for each of such next two fiscal years."

(d) Section 401(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2691(a)) is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and, for purposes of this title and title II only, includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(e) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to allotments under section 202 from funds appropriated for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1970.

PERCENTAGE OF ALLOTMENTS AVAILABLE FOR STATE PLAN ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 103. (a) Effective with respect to expenditures referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (c) of section 403 of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 made after June 30, 1970, such paragraph (42 U.S.C. 2693) is amended by striking out "2 per centum" and inserting in lieu thereof "5 per centum".

(b) (1) The first sentence of section 403 (c) (1) of such Act is further amended—

(A) by inserting "for any fiscal year" immediately after "title II";

(B) by striking out "during such year";

(C) by striking out "for a year" and inserting in lieu thereof "for any fiscal year"; and

(D) by striking out "for such year".

(2) Section 403(c)(1) of such Act is further amended by inserting immediately after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "Amounts made available to any State under this paragraph from its allotment or allotments under part A of title II for any fiscal year shall be available only for such expenditures (referred to in the preceding sentence) during such fiscal year or the following fiscal year."

COST OF LAND INCLUDED IN COST OF CONSTRUCTION

SEC. 104. Effective with respect to projects approved after June 30, 1970, under title II of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, section 401(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "architect's fees, but excluding the cost of offsite improvements and the cost of the acquisition of land" and inserting in lieu thereof "architect's fees and the cost of the acquisition of land, but excluding the cost of offsite improvements."

FEDERAL SHARE TO BE MAXIMUM; HIGHER SHARE FOR DISADVANTAGED AREAS

SEC. 105. Effective with respect to projects approved after June 30, 1970, under part A of title II of such Act—

(1) section 402 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2692) is amended by striking out "or title II";

(2) subsection (h) of section 401 of such Act is amended by redesignating clauses (1) and (2) as clauses (A) and (B), respectively, by inserting "(1)" after "(h)", by inserting under part C of title I after "with respect to any project", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) (A) The term 'Federal share' with respect to any project approved under part A of title II means the portion of the cost of construction of such project to be paid by the Federal Government under such part A.

"(B) The Federal share with respect to any project approved thereunder in the State shall, except as provided in paragraph (3), be an amount equal to 66½ per centum, or the Federal percentage for the State, if lower, or such lesser amount as may be determined by the State agency designated in the State plan. Prior to the approval of the first such project in the State during any fiscal year, such State agency shall give the Secretary written notification of the maximum Federal share established pursuant to this paragraph for such projects in such State to be approved by the Secretary during such fiscal year and the method of determining the actual Federal share to be paid with respect to such projects; and such maximum Federal share and such method of determining the actual Federal share for such projects in such State approved during such fiscal year shall not be changed after such written approval has been given.

"(3) In the case of any facility or center which provides or will, upon completion of the project for which application has been made under part A of title II, provide services for persons in an area designated by the Secretary as a rural or urban poverty area, the maximum Federal share shall be equal to such per centum of the costs of the construction of the project as may be determined by the State, except that such per centum shall not exceed 90 per centum.

PERIOD FOR PROMULGATING FEDERAL PERCENTAGES

SEC. 106. Section 401(j)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "August 31" and inserting in lieu thereof "September 30".

TITLE II—GRANTS FOR OPERATION OF COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

FEDERAL SHARE

SEC. 201. Effective with respect to cost of establishment and operation of any center, for any period after June 30, 1970, for which a grant has been or is made under subsection (a) of section 220 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688), subsection (b) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Grants for such costs for any center under this part (other than grants made from funds made available under section 224(b)) may not exceed—

"(1) except as provided in paragraph (2), 75 per centum of the costs for each of the first two years after the first day of the first month for which such grant is made with respect to such center, 60 per centum of such costs for the third year after such first day, 45 per centum of such costs for the fourth year after such first day, 30 per centum of such costs for each of the next six years after such first day; and

"(2) in the case of grants to any center which provides services for persons in an area designated by the Secretary as a rural or urban poverty area, 90 per centum of such costs for each of the first two years after the first day of the first month for which such grant is made with respect to such center, and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next eight years after such first day.

No grant shall be made under this section, in the case of any center referred to in paragraph (1), for any period of time which is later than the last year referred to in paragraph (1), or, in the case of any center referred to in paragraph (2), for any period of time which is later than the last year referred to in paragraph (2)."

INITIATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF SERVICES

SEC. 202. (a) Section 224 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688d) is amended (1) by inserting "(a)" immediately after "Sec. 224," and (2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (b):

"(b) Not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount appropriated for grants pursuant to subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary to make grants to local public or nonprofit private organizations to cover up to 100 per centum of the costs (but in no case to exceed \$50,000) of projects, in areas designated by the Secretary as rural or urban poverty areas, for assessing local needs for mental health services, designing mental health service programs, obtaining local financial and professional assistance and support for community health services, and fostering community involvement in initiating and developing community mental health services. In no case shall a grant under this subsection be for a period in excess of one year; nor shall any grant be made under this subsection with respect to any project if, for any preceding year, a grant under this subsection has been made with respect to such project."

(b) Section 221(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is amended (1) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), (2) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof "; and", and (3) by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(6) In the case of a grant from funds made available pursuant to section 224(b), the Secretary is satisfied, upon the basis of evidence supplied by the applicant, that persons broadly representative of all elements of the population of the area will be given an opportunity to participate in the project with respect to which application for such grant is made."

MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT

SEC. 203. (a) Paragraph (4) of such subsection (a) of section 221 of the Community

Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the Secretary determines that there is satisfactory assurance that (A) the services to be provided will constitute an addition to, or a significant improvement in quality (as determined in accordance with criteria of the Secretary) in services that would otherwise be provided, and (B) Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds, including third party health insurance payments, that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the program described in paragraph (2) of this subsection; and"

(b) Section 221(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (2) of this subsection, the requirement therein with respect to essential elements of comprehensive mental health services shall not apply, in the case of an application for a grant to any center which will provide services in an area designated by the Secretary as an urban or rural poverty area, for the eighteen-month period commencing on the date such applications is filed, if the Secretary is satisfied that such center will meet such requirement prior to the end of such period."

CONTINUATION GRANTS

SEC. 204. Section 221(b) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688a) is amended by striking out "1970" each place it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1973".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 205. (a) The first sentence of section 224(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688d), as amended by section 202(a) of this Act, is amended (1) by striking out the word "and" which appears immediately after "1969" and (2) by inserting immediately after "1970," the following: "\$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973."

(b) The second sentence of section 224(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688d), as amended by section 202(a) of this Act, is amended by striking out "seven" and inserting in lieu thereof "fifteen".

STAFFING, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE GRANTS FOR CENTERS

SEC. 206. (a) Effective with respect to costs of operation of any center, for any period beginning after June 30, 1970, for which a grant has been or is made under subsection (a) of section 220 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688), such subsection is amended by striking out "a portion of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations under section 223) of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation" and inserting in lieu thereof "a portion of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations under section 223) of operation, staffing, and maintenance".

(b) The heading of part B of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688 et seq.) is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR INITIAL COSTS OF OPERATION OF CENTERS"

TITLE III—ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTIC ADDICT REHABILITATION

EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS FOR FACILITIES FOR ALCOHOLICS AND NARCOTIC ADDICTS

SEC. 301. (a) Section 261(a) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 2688o) is amended by striking out "and \$25,000,000 for the next fiscal year" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and

\$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972".

(b) Subsection (a) of such section 261 is further amended by inserting before the period at the end of the first sentence the following: "and section 246".

(c) Section 261 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (c):

"(c) (1) Not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to the preceding provisions of this section for any fiscal year shall be available to the Secretary to make grants to local public or nonprofit private organizations to cover up to 100 per centum of the costs (but in no case to exceed \$50,000) of projects for assessing local needs for programs of services for alcoholics or narcotic addicts, designing such programs, obtaining local financial and professional assistance and support for such programs in the community, and fostering community involvement in initiating and developing such programs in the community. In no case shall a grant under this subsection be for a period in excess of one year; nor shall any grant be made under this subsection with respect to any project if, for any preceding year, a grant under this subsection has been made with respect to such project.

"(2) A grant under this subsection with respect to any project may be made only if the Secretary is satisfied, upon the basis of evidence supplied by the applicant, that persons broadly representative of all elements of the population of the area will be given an opportunity to participate in the development of the project with respect to which application for such grant is made."

(d) Subsection (b) of such section 261 is amended by striking out "three" and inserting in lieu thereof "ten", and by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, or the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1972".

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS; ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTIC ADDICTION

SEC. 302. Effective with respect to the cost of construction of any facility, for any period beginning after June 30, 1970, for which a grant from appropriations under section 261 of such Act has been or is made, subsection (b) of section 241 of such Act, subsection (d) of section 243 of such Act, and subsection (b) of section 251 of such Act are each amended by striking out "66 $\frac{2}{3}$ " and inserting in lieu thereof "90".

STAFFING, OPERATION, AND MAINTENANCE GRANTS; ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTIC ADDICTION

SEC. 303. (a) (1) Effective with respect to the costs of operation of any facility, for any period after June 30, 1970, for which a grant from appropriations under section 261 of such Act has been or is made, subsection (a) of section 242 of such Act is amended by striking out "a portion of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary) of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation" and inserting in lieu thereof "a portion of the costs (determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary) for operating, staffing, and maintenance".

(2) Effective with respect to the costs of operation of any facility, for any period beginning after June 30, 1970, for which a grant from appropriations under section 261 of such Act has been or is made, subsection (a) of section 243 of such Act is amended by striking out "compensation of professional and technical personnel" and inserting in lieu thereof "operation, staffing, and maintenance", and subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "compensation of professional and technical personnel" and inserting in lieu thereof "operation, staffing, and maintenance".

(3) Effective with respect to the costs of operation of any facility, for any period beginning after June 30, 1970, for which a grant from appropriations under section 261 of such Act has been or is made, subsection (a) of section 251 of such Act is amended by striking out "the costs, determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary, of compensation of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation" and inserting in lieu thereof "the costs, determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary, for the staffing, operation and maintenance", and subsection (c) of such section 251 is amended by striking out "Grants made under subsection (a) for the cost of compensation of professional and technical personnel" and inserting in lieu thereof "Grants made under subsection (a) for the costs of operating such facilities".

(b) Effective with respect to costs of establishment and operation of any facility for any period after June 30, 1970, for which a grant has been or is made under subsection (a) of section 242, 243, or 251 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act (42 U.S.C. 2688g, 2688h, 2688k), subsection (b) of section 242 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Grants for such costs for any facility under this section may be made only for the period beginning with the first day of the first month for which such a grant is made and ending with the close of ten years after such first day; and such grant with respect to any facility may not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for each of the first two years after the first day of the first month for which such grant is made with respect to such facility and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next eight years after such first day."

DIRECT GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS; ALCOHOLISM

SEC. 304. Part C of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by redesignating section 246 as section 247, and adding after section 245 a new section 246 to read as follows:

DIRECT GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS

"SEC. 246. The Secretary is authorized during the period beginning July 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1972, to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency or organization to cover part or all of the cost of (A) developing specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of public health services for the prevention or treatment of alcoholism, or developing inservice training or short-term or refresher courses with respect to the provision of such services; (B) training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services; (C) conducting surveys and field trials, to evaluate the adequacy of the programs for the prevention and treatment of alcoholism within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs; and (D) programs for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics which the Secretary determines are of special significance because they demonstrate new or relatively effective or efficient methods of delivery of services to such alcoholics."

DIRECT GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS; NARCOTIC ADDICTS

SEC. 305. (a) Section 252 of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended (1) by striking out "1970" and inserting in lieu thereof "1972", (2) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (B), and (3) by adding immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: "; and (D) programs for treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts which the Secretary determines are of special significance because they demonstrate new or relatively effective or efficient methods of delivery of services to such narcotic addicts".

(b) The heading to such section 252 is amended to read as follows: "DIRECT GRANTS FOR SPECIAL PROJECTS".

TITLE IV—MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

CONSTRUCTION AND STAFFING OF TREATMENT FACILITIES

SEC. 401. The Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART F—MENTAL HEALTH OF CHILDREN

"GRANTS FOR TREATMENT FACILITIES

"SEC. 271. (a) Grants from appropriations under section 272(a) may be made to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations (A) to assist them in meeting the costs of construction of facilities to provide mental health services for children within the States, and (B) to assist them in meeting the costs, determined pursuant to regulations of the Secretary, of the staffing, operation, and maintenance of (i) facilities providing such services which were constructed with grants made under this part or part A, or (ii) existing facilities which provide new mental health services for children.

"(b) The grant program for construction of facilities authorized by subsection (a) shall be carried out consistently with the grant program under part A of the Act except to the extent, in the judgment of the Secretary, special considerations make differences appropriate; but (1) before the Secretary may make a grant under such subsection for the construction of a facility for the provision of mental health services to children he must find that the application for such grant meets the requirements of section 205(a)(5) (relating to the payment of prevailing wages), and (2) the amount of any such grant with respect to any project shall be such percentage of the cost thereof, but not in excess of 90 per centum as the Secretary may determine.

"(c) Grants for the costs of staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities providing mental health services to children, authorized by subsection (a) of this section, may not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for each of the first two years after the first day of the first month for which such grant is made with respect to such facility, and 75 per centum of such costs for each of the next eight fiscal years after such first day. No grant may be made for any period of time which is later than the last year referred to in this subsection.

"(d) Grants may be made under this section only with respect to (1) facilities which are part of or affiliated with a community mental health center providing at least those essential services which are prescribed by the Secretary, or (2) where there is no such center serving the community in which such facilities are to be situated, facilities with respect to which satisfactory provision (as determined by the Secretary) has been made for appropriate utilization of existing community resources needed for an adequate program of prevention and treatment of mental health problems of children.

"(e) No grant shall be made under this section with respect to any facility unless the applicant for such grant provides assurance satisfactory to the Secretary that such facility will make available a full range of treatment, liaison, and followup services (as prescribed by the Secretary) for all children and their families in the service area of such facility who need such services, and will, when so requested, provide consultation and education for personnel of all schools and other community agencies serving children in such area.

"SEC. 272. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and \$45,-

000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, for grants authorized under this part.

"(b) There are also authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for each of the next thirteen fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to continue to make grants with respect to any project under this part for which a staffing operation and maintenance grant was made under this section for any fiscal year ending before July 1, 1973".

TITLE V—MISCELLANEOUS

APPROVAL BY NATIONAL ADVISORY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

SEC. 501. (a) Section 303(b) (42 U.S.C. 242a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by inserting after the words "subsection (a)" the following: "or under title II of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, as amended".

(b) Part E of the Community Mental Health Centers Act, as amended, is amended by adding a new section 264 at the end thereof to read as follows:

"APPROVAL BY NATIONAL ADVISORY MENTAL HEALTH COUNCIL

"SEC. 264. Grants under this title may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, established by section 217(a) (42 U.S.C. 218(a)) of the Public Health Service Act."

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I recommend to the Senate enactment of S. 2523, to amend, extend, and improve the community mental health center program.

This program was started in 1963. It was a response to recognition that the millions afflicted with mental illness recover sooner and more fully when they have treatment and care in their home communities. The old practice of sending people to State institutions was better than no care at all. But rates of admission to these institutions soared after World War II. Mental hospitals were crowded with men and women whose sheer numbers prevented individual treatment.

Under the program begun in 1963, local health agencies were encouraged to develop a unified mental health service to serve a local population. Continuity of care and inclusion of a basic group of essential services were stressed. As a result of this improved local care, plus great advances in medication, the need to hospitalize the mentally ill has greatly declined, and the length of hospitalization for emergency cases has been greatly shortened.

We are already reaping great returns from this program, in other words. But it is still not available to many millions of Americans. In 1963, we envisioned 2,000 centers, each to serve an average of 100,000 people. From July 1965 when the first center was funded until the end of fiscal year 1969, 376 centers had been funded. By the time the present law expires next June, it is anticipated that only 450 centers will have been funded, when 2,000 are needed.

So the number funded is still less than a fourth of the number needed. And many of these funded are not yet operational, due to difficulty in gaining local financial support to sustain them after Federal support runs out.

Therefore, in extending the law for 3 years, the Committee on Labor and Pub-

lic Welfare has also amended it to assure Federal support for operation of the centers for a total of 10 years, rather than the 51 months now permitted, and has provided a higher level of Federal participation in construction and operation of centers to be located in low income communities. It is in areas of widespread poverty, both urban and rural, where the most difficulty is encountered in setting up a center. Yet, it is these very communities, and the people in them, who need centers the most.

In addition, the committee added a special section to encourage development of children's services within the centers. Mental and emotional disturbances among children and young people afflicts some 8 million; fewer than half a million of them receive appropriate attention. Services for children and adolescents need to be specially designed for them, and professional people need to be specially trained to handle their problems.

Finally, the committee extended for 2 years rather than 3 the grants for alcoholism and narcotic addiction services within the centers. This was because our Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics is making a separate study of these problems, and working to develop a long-range program.

Enactment of S. 2523 will assure extension of one of the most effective health programs we have. More people suffer from the blight of emotional and mental illness than from all physical illnesses combined. We are making great strides in treating it effectively. I urge that we expand, enlarge, and continue this progress. This bill does expand, enlarge, and continue this progress.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "To amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend and improve the program of assistance under that act for community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, to establish programs for mental health of children, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 91-583), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

BACKGROUND

The bill reflects the committee's determination to respond to mounting evidence that the mentally ill recover sooner and more fully when they have a comprehensive treatment program in the home community. It was this determination that led to enactment in 1963 of Public Law 88-164 (title II). That act authorized grants to meet part of the cost of constructing community-based treatment facilities, and marked the beginning of the community mental health centers program.

Because newly developing centers were shown to need funds to help meet the initial costs of their operation, the act was amended in 1965 to provide grants to cover part of initial costs for professional and technical staff. In 1967, the act was further amended

to extend construction and staffing grants through fiscal year 1970.

In 1968, the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Act and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act were added in growing recognition of the detriment to persons and communities from alcoholism and narcotics addiction.

The total program has been guided by fundamental concepts of a catchment area of specified population size to be served, continuity of care, and inclusion in all centers of a basic group of essential services. Thus, a center affords unified treatment and rehabilitation for the general population of the community.

From July 1965, when the first center was awarded a grant, until the end of the fiscal year 1969, 376 community mental health centers had been funded. These centers are located in every State, and will provide services to 52 million people when fully operative. They will serve every kind of community—rural, suburban, urban, Appalachia, and Great Plains.

Applicants include State and local government units, public mental hospitals, public and nonprofit private general hospitals, independent mental health clinics, charitable institutions, and community mental health boards.

By June 30, 1970, when present law expires, about 62 million people will be served by an anticipated 450 centers.

S. 2523 will extend the program for 3 years, and make changes designed to speed the organization of centers, and improve their services.

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

The bill extends for 3 years the authorization for construction grants for community mental health centers, as follows:

- \$95 million for fiscal year 1971;
- \$115 million for fiscal year 1972;
- \$115 million for fiscal year 1973.

Section 104 amends present law to permit the cost of acquisition of land to be included in the cost of construction. This change is especially important to low-income communities, where the high cost of land has often been a prohibitive factor in the establishment of centers.

The present minimum Federal share of one-third of construction cost is eliminated. The two-thirds maximum is retained, except that in poverty areas, as defined by the Secretary, the Federal share may go as high as 90 percent.

GRANTS FOR OPERATION

A major hindrance to the creation of centers has been the limited Federal support for their operation. Present law permits such support for only 51 months, and for only a portion of salaries of professional and technical people employed in them. In order to organize and develop quality services, the center must have assistance for a greater share of operating costs and for a longer period of time. Federal support now starts at 75 percent of salaries the first 15 months, and declines to 30 percent the fourth and final year thereafter. Thus, Federal staffing grants account for only 40 percent of the average center's first year operating cost, and a declining rate in succeeding years.

The committee therefore recommends that all operational expenses be covered in the continuation grants (section 206), and that the Federal share continue at 30 percent for 6 additional years (section 201).

An exception is made for centers to serve poverty areas. Here, the committee bill permits the Federal grant to cover 90 percent of operating costs the first 2 years and 75 percent for 8 years thereafter.

A change is made in existing law to permit centers to begin operation in poverty areas without furnishing all the "essential" services as defined by regulation. Centers in these areas will be given 18 months in which to furnish all these five services (day care,

outpatient care, inpatient care, 24-hour emergency service, and education and consultation).

It is the hope of the committee every effort will be made to provide full services as soon as possible.

Authorization of grants for initial operating expenses is extended for 3 years, as follows:

\$60 million for fiscal year 1971;

\$60 million for fiscal year 1972;

\$80 million for fiscal year 1973.

Authorization for continuation grants is open, as it is in present law.

ALCOHOLISM AND NARCOTICS ADDICT REHABILITATION

The committee decided to extend this section of the law for 2 years, rather than 3, because its Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics is separately studying this area, and working to develop a long-range program for alcoholism and narcotics addiction.

The authorization for all construction, operating costs, and special project grants is in one sum, fixed by the bill at \$25 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$30 million for fiscal 1972.

However, construction grants may cover 90 percent of the total cost, all operating expenses are included in continuation grants, and such grants may cover 90 percent of operating costs for the first 2 years and 75 percent for 8 additional years.

The committee notes with disappointment that the alcoholism portion of the Narcotic Addiction and Alcoholism Amendments of 1968 has not yet been implemented, although alcoholism is a major mental health problem in the United States. It directly affects over 5 million persons, plus their families and associates.

In an effort to stimulate imaginative treatment for both alcoholics and narcotics addicts, the committee added an authorization for the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make direct grants for special projects, not necessarily tied in with a community mental health center. These grants may be for specialized training programs, training of personnel, the conducting of surveys, or to support programs for treatment and rehabilitation which demonstrate new techniques or show special promise of effectiveness.

SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

The committee added to existing law a new category of aid for community mental health centers, to encourage them to provide services aimed at children and adolescents.

The recent report of the Joint Commission on Mental Health of Children so recommended, after noting that 10 to 12 percent of the under-18 population needs mental health services. Of these estimated 8 million emotionally disturbed young people, only about 500,000, or 6 percent, receive appropriate attention.

All centers funded under the act do provide some services for children; but few provide a comprehensive program oriented to meet their special needs.

Therefore, the committee bill authorizes grants for construction and to operate these special services, as follows:

\$18 million for fiscal year 1971;

\$30 million for fiscal year 1972;

\$45 million for fiscal year 1973.

Continuation grants may be made out of this authorization to support the operation of children's services for a total of 10 years, covering 90 percent of their costs the first 2 years, and 75 percent for 8 additional years.

A new service applicable to children is required. The applicant must assure that follow-up service will be provided, so the disturbed child will have continuous supervision in his dealings and relationships with schools and other community agencies.

GRANTS FOR INITIATION OF A PROGRAM

Another crucial new provision in the bill allows up to 5 percent of money appropriated for initial operating grants to be used in poverty areas without any matching requirement, to help local communities in poverty areas do the organizational groundwork leading to development of a community mental health program. This groundwork includes assessment of local mental health needs, the design of appropriate services, and acquiring financial support. Grants for this work may go only to local agencies.

The same arrangement is made in the bill for initiation of alcoholism and narcotics addiction programs as an incentive for their development.

STATE ADMINISTRATION

Another provision in the bill increases from the existing 2 percent to 5 percent the amount of a State's construction allocation that may be applied to the cost of administration of the State plan. This change was prompted because of the small amounts available to States with minimum construction allocations. However, the current maximum of \$50,000 is retained.

The committee included in the bill S. 3101, by Senator Dominick, allowing these funds to remain available for State use in the year following the year of allocation.

ADDITION OF TRUST TERRITORY

The definition of the term "State" has been amended to include the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, previously excluded. The territories will be allowed to use their allocations for 3 years, since these allocations are very small.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2809) to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President. The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be passed over.

ALEX G. W. MILLER

The bill (S. 1389) for the relief of Alex G. W. Miller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Alex G. W. Miller shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of October 25, 1959, and the periods of time he has resided in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of such Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-587), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization.

JAMES HIDEAKI BUCK

The bill (H.R. 2208) for the relief of James Hideaki Buck was considered,

ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-583), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill to facilitate the adjustment of status as an immediate relative of the adopted child of citizens of the United States.

SA CHA BAE

The bill (H.R. 4560) for the relief of Sa Cha Bae was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-589), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Sa Cha Bae. The bill provides for payment of the required visa fee, and for deduction of an appropriate visa number.

PAGONA ANOMERIANAKI

The bill (H.R. 5133) for the relief of Pagona Anomerianaki was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-590), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant to the adopted daughter of U.S. citizens the status of a first-preference immigrant, which is the status normally enjoyed by the natural-born alien sons and daughters of U.S. citizens.

PANAGIOTIS, GEORGIA, AND CONSTANTINA MALLIARAS

The bill (H.R. 6600) for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-591), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to grant the status of permanent residence in the United States to Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras. The bill provides for payment of the required visa fees, and for deduction of appropriate visa numbers.

LIDIA MENDOLA

The bill (H.R. 10156) for the relief of Lidia Mendola was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-592), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill is to deem the adopted daughter of lawful residents of the United States to be a child within the meaning of section 101(b)(1)(E) of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

PERCY ISPAS AVRAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2102) for the relief of Percy Ispas Avram, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the periods of time Percy Ispas Avram has resided in the United States and any State since his lawful admission for permanent residence on December 15, 1962, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Percy Ispas Avram."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-593), explaining the purpose of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to enable the beneficiary to file a petition for naturalization. The bill has been amended in accordance with established precedents and to correct the spelling of the beneficiary's name.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That concludes the call of the calendar, Mr. President.

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS, 1970—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13763) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of December 9, 1969, pp. 37946-39947, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, the House concurred in all Senate amendments except No. 37. The only real difference between the two Houses on this appropriation bill was on amendment No. 37, which related to the west front of the U.S. Capitol.

The House bill provided \$2 million for preparation of detailed plans and specifications for extending the west central front. The Senate bill struck this provision and substituted an appropriation of \$250,000 to be transferred to the National Park Service for use in conducting studies to determine the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front. The conference agreement which has been adopted in the House will provide an appropriation of \$2,275,000. The language reads that not to exceed \$250,000 shall be used for the employment of independent, nongovernmental engineering, and other services for studying and reporting on the feasibility and cost of restoring the west central front, under such terms and conditions as the Commission for Extension of the Capitol may determine. The language further provides that pending completion of the restoration study and report, none of the funds shall be available for any further work toward extension of the west central front.

The language provides further that after the submission of such a report and study, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending the west central front unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission certain criteria. Among these criteria are:

First, that the work can be done without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons and that the west front can be made safe and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

Second, that restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space that would be required under the extension plan;

Third, that the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described and specified as to form the basis for performance under a competitive fixed-price contract;

Fourth, that the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

Fifth, that the time schedule for accomplishing restoration would not exceed the time projected for accomplishing the extension plan.

Should the restoration study meet all five of the conditions I have described, the Capitol Building Commission would then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore.

In the statement on the part of the managers of the House it has been made very clear that the Senate and the House desire the Commission to secure the services of a completely independent group

to make this study and this group should have no previous connection with proposals to either extend or restore the west central front.

Mr. President, I believe a fair compromise has been agreed to and I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I understand it, the conference report has not yet been agreed to. I have some concern about this matter, and I might require a rolcall if we cannot reach an agreement.

Mr. MONTOYA. If the Senator from Wisconsin has any questions, I would be willing to answer them.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have serious reservations with regard to the agreement reached by the House-Senate conferees on the legislative appropriations bill. There was really only one point of disagreement on this bill. There was cooperation between the Senate and House on all other points.

I thought the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTOYA), the chairman of the subcommittee, handled this extremely well. But there was one point on which there was sharp disagreement because, as we know, the House had passed a bill providing for \$2 million to begin a \$45 million project for the extension of the west front of the Capitol. The Senate discussed this matter at some length, and by a 2-to-1 margin, the Senate rejected the notion of proceeding with the extension of the west front, provided no money for the extension, and provided \$250,000 for a study of the feasibility of restoration.

Frankly, although the House and Senate did reach an agreement in conference, I, for one, refused to sign the conference report so far as it pertains to this amendment.

Nevertheless, I believe we can make useful floor history today in discussing the amendment. We can inform the Commission for the Extension of the U.S. Capitol, which has been charged by the conference agreement with overseeing a restoration study of the west front, exactly how we interpret the language of the conference report. In this way, the Commission can proceed with an adequate knowledge of what the Senate expects of it, as it contracts for the restoration study.

My major reservation to this provision, arises from the conference committee's decision to place the matter in the hands of a Commission, which by its very title—"Commission for the Extension of the United States Capitol"—can be expected to favor extension rather than restoration. In other words an extension commission will be commissioning a restoration study.

However, the Commission is made up of honorable men, including the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished minority leader, and other of our colleagues in both Houses of Congress. Furthermore, it would appear to me from the language of the conference report that the one noncongressional member of the Commission—J. George Stewart—who is deeply committed to extension would be barred from taking part in the process of selecting the firm or firms performing the restoration study. Mr. Stewart and his office have been com-

pletely committed to extension of the west front since early in this decade. Over 6 years ago—on June 5, 1963—Mr. Stewart told the Legislative Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee:

I am on record as advocating extension and reconstruction of the west front at an early date.

I believe that the following language in the conference report would be considered by the Senate to bar Mr. Stewart's participation in the selection of a restoration study firm:

The conferees of both Houses are agreed that the nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services engaged by direction of the Commission to study and report on the feasibility and cost of restoration should be, in the Commission's opinion, completely independent, with no previous connection with proposals to either extend or to restore the west central front, including any expressed predisposition for or against the extension or the restoration of the west central front.

I believe that it would be a patent conflict of interest if, given this language, Mr. Stewart, who strongly supports extension, were to play a role in choosing the firm to do the restoration study.

I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from New Mexico this question: The language on page 5 of the report indicates that the firm to make the study on the feasibility of restoration of the west central front of the Capitol should be, as I quoted earlier, "completely independent with no previous connection with proposals to either extend or to restore the west central front, including any expressed predisposition for or against the extension or the restoration of the west central front."

First, would this mean that the determination would be made by the Commission but without that decision being influenced by the Architect of the Capitol or his Office?

Second, it is my understanding that it will be necessary for the independent firm to work with the contracting officer, who will give them an interpretation of the contract during the 6 months' study and will provide details and information needed to complete the study. Can the chairman of the subcommittee assure the Senate that this function can be performed independently of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol, inasmuch as the Architect is the principal advocate of extension and is recognized as completely opposed to restoration?

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, and I think he will agree with me that we both recognize the Commission for the Extension of the Capitol is the administering agency of the will of Congress in this matter. I would expect the Commission for Extension of the Capitol to be completely cognizant of the vote taken here in the Senate with respect to this issue and what considerations played a part in arriving at the vote here in the Senate on the issue. I believe the vote and the debate eloquently expressed the feeling that this evaluation and feasibility study should be done completely independent of the Office of the Architect and that the Commission should undertake to insure that a firm is selected sep-

arate and apart from any possible loyalty or leaning toward the Architect's wishes. The conference report has endorsed this plan. The conference report enunciates it and I would certainly express, as part of the history of this legislation, the urgent desire on the part of the Senate conferees as well as the Senate that the Architect not play any dominant or substantial or significant part in this endeavor, but that the Commission should speak as one authority in trying to bring about a completely independent study as described herein.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I appreciate the response.

It might well be asked if, in the absence of Mr. Stewart's recommendation, the Commission can make an informed choice. Certainly. In fact this is a golden opportunity for the Commission to lay to rest claims that a favored few firms have been engaged for all work contracted for by the Commission and the Capitol Architect's office. This can be done by inviting all qualified firms to submit their qualifications, by making the selection process a matter of public record, and by seeking the advice of the General Services Administration and the Interior Department's historic buildings staff in evaluating potential contractors. These are suggestions only, but they would guarantee full acceptance by the Congress and the American people of the result of the restoration study.

I would also hope that the Commission, because it has in the past taken a firm stand in support of extension, would release to the Congress and the public the restoration study and its result as soon as they were made available. If the study shows restoration to be feasible then the Congress should have an opportunity to decide on whether to extend or restore. Thus the Commission ought not to proceed with extension without consulting Congress if restoration is feasible.

We should all recognize that the Commission will fairly evaluate the possibility of restoration. I know that they will keep Congress and the public informed of the progress of the restoration study. Given all of these conditions I am very hopeful that we can lay to rest once and for all the question of whether the west front of the Capitol should be restored or extended.

This Senator expresses the hope and desire that the Commission will designate and retain a person or agency that will handle day-to-day details during the 6 months' study on behalf of the Commission, and that that person or agency be assigned apart from the Architect of the Capitol or his office inasmuch as that office has taken a clear and conspicuous position on this matter.

Mr. MONTROYA. I would certainly agree and express the hope that the Commission would do just that.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator, who is the chairman of the subcommittee, that I think he has done a very fine job in this regard. I think the House has gotten a considerable concession from the Senate. I think the Senate should know that what we have done is to provide that the study of the feasibility of restoration

must meet certain specific criteria, that it must be done on the basis of a fixed price, cannot be open-ended, must cost less than \$15 million which is a third as much as extension, and has to be done in a way so as not to evacuate part of the capital for a longer period than extension would require. Other criteria are specified.

The Commission will be the judge of whether these criteria of feasibility are met. We are leaving it up to the Commission which has been studying this matter to determine whether or not this restoration feasibility study meets certain very strict criteria. Under the circumstances this is the best we can do in a very difficult situation.

I think the chairman did an excellent job and I thank him for his patience and consideration.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his kind remarks. I also wish to say to this body that the Senator from Wisconsin made a very valuable contribution in trying to resolve this issue. I believe the solution we arrived at is a worthy solution and that it approximates the position the Senate has expressed heretofore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

WEST FRONT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I do not intend to object, but I would like to take this opportunity to present some views and comments on the question of the west front extension.

Once again I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New Mexico (Mr. MONTROYA) for permitting me to testify on this question, and for exploring in the kind of detail he and his committee did, the whole question of the extension.

I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) for providing such leadership on this entire question, because it is a matter, I think, of great significance. Although it is initially a matter of small funding, the potential is for a considerable outlay—some \$45 million.

I know the very deep consideration that the chairman of this committee gave to this entire project, and I would like to take this opportunity to comment on the action of the conference committee.

When the House bill came over here, carrying in it \$2 million for beginning the work on extending the Capitol's west front, I was pleased to have the opportunity to testify against the extension. We have never had an independent study of the feasibility of costs of restoration, and that consequently my recommendation was to authorize such a study. This was reinforced by the need to hold down all but the most vital public works spending when inflation is such a peril to a sound economy.

The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended, and the Senate overwhelmingly approved, this position. Those of us concerned with the preservation of the last original remaining portion of the Capitol were greatly heartened.

The conference committee's resolution of the two differing versions of the bill is somewhat mixed, from my own viewpoint. On the one hand, no work on extension can go forward until after a study on restoration. On the other hand, the study's criteria are very restrictive, and the identity of the organization to carry out the study is less than clear.

It is my hope that the Commission on the Extension of the U.S. Capitol—the entity charged with administering this bill's mandate—will be imaginative and sensitive in selecting a study contractor, and in monitoring the study itself. For example, I am sure that the American Institute of Architects, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and other organizations would be pleased to advise and consult on the study. I would hope that the Commission would invite their expert and committed suggestions.

We must not forget that if the west front is extended, we will have shrouded the last remaining original exterior portion of the Capitol forever from view. It now stands as it stood when our first Presidents saw it. We do not often have an opportunity to preserve something so priceless. But when we do, then we should be vigilant to do so.

Let me thank the Senator from New Mexico and once again commend him for his work.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment of the House

to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"EXTENSION OF THE CAPITOL

"For an additional amount for 'Extension of the Capitol', \$2,275,000, to be expended under the direction of the Commission for Extension of the United States Capitol as authorized by law: *Provided*, That such portion of the foregoing appropriation as may be necessary shall be used for emergency shoring and repairs of, and related work on, the west central front of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$250,000 of the foregoing appropriation shall be used for the employment of independent nongovernmental engineering and other necessary services for studying and reporting (within six months after the date of the employment contract) on the feasibility and cost of restoring such west central front under such terms and conditions as the Commission may determine: *Provided, however*, That pending the completion and consideration of such study and report, no further work toward extension of such west central front shall be carried on: *Provided further*, That after submission of such study and report and consideration thereof by the Commission, the Commission shall direct the preparation of final plans for extending such west central front in accord with Plan 2 (which said Commission has approved), unless such restoration study report establishes to the satisfaction of the Commission:

"(1) That through restoration, such west central front can, without undue hazard to safety of the structure and persons, be made safe, sound, durable, and beautiful for the foreseeable future;

"(2) That restoration can be accomplished with no more vacation of west central front space in the building proper (excluding the terrace structure) than would be required by the proposed extension Plan 2;

"(3) That the method or methods of accomplishing restoration can be so described or specified as to form the basis for performance of the restoration work by competitive, lumpsum, fixed price construction bid or bids;

"(4) That the cost of restoration would not exceed \$15,000,000; and

"(5) That the time schedule for accomplishing the restoration work will not exceed that heretofore projected for accomplishing the Plan 2 extension work: *Provided further*, That after consideration of the restoration study report, if the Commission concludes that all five of the conditions hereinafore specified are met, the Commission shall then make recommendations to the Congress on the question of whether to extend or restore the west central front of the Capitol."

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the notion of the Senator from New Mexico.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a tabulation which gives by appropriation line item in the bill the comparisons of the budget, estimates, House bill, Senate bill, and final conference report.

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

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, H.R. 13763

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget esti- mates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
SENATE					
Vice President and Senators					
Compensation of the Vice President and Senators.....	\$3,762,565	\$4,703,270		\$4,685,530	\$4,685,530
Mileage, President of the Senate and Senators.....	58,370	58,370		58,370	58,370
Expense allowance, Vice President, majority and minority leaders.....	16,000	16,000		16,000	16,000
Total, Vice President and Senators.....	3,836,935	4,777,640		4,759,900	4,759,900
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Vice President.....	262,216	281,187		281,187	281,187
Offices of the majority and minority leaders.....		106,930		106,930	106,930
Offices of the majority and minority whips.....	42,188	68,730		68,730	68,730
Office of the Chaplain.....	17,711	17,711		17,185	17,185
Office of the Secretary.....	1,621,287	1,675,448		1,675,448	1,675,448
Committee employees.....	3,908,360	4,017,014		4,017,014	4,017,014
Conference, majority.....	114,691	115,619		115,619	115,619
Conference, minority.....	114,691	115,619		115,619	115,619
Administrative and clerical assistants to Senators.....	22,250,010	24,656,608		24,656,608	24,656,608
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper.....	4,871,271	4,915,909		4,915,909	4,915,909
Offices of the secretaries to the majority and minority.....	192,554	196,612		196,612	196,612
Total, salaries, officers and employees.....	33,394,979	36,167,387		36,166,861	36,166,861
Contingent Expenses					
Senate policy committee.....	507,490	473,440		473,440	473,440
Automobiles and maintenance.....	50,880	50,880		50,880	50,880
Furniture.....	31,190	31,190		31,190	31,190
Expenses of inquiries and investigations.....	6,592,225	6,646,755		6,646,755	6,646,755
Folding documents.....	46,355	46,355		46,355	46,355
Mail transportation (motor vehicles).....	16,560	16,560		16,560	16,560
Miscellaneous items.....	4,528,600	5,751,636		5,708,986	5,708,986
Postage.....	109,020	120,133		120,133	120,133
Stationery.....	361,200	377,850		377,850	377,850
Communications.....	15,150	15,150		15,150	15,150
Total, contingent expenses.....	12,213,670	13,529,949		13,487,299	13,487,299
Other, Senate					
Legislative counsel.....	364,085	374,100		374,100	374,100
Payment to widow of Hon. E. L. Bartlett.....	30,000				
Payment to widow of Hon. Everett McKinley Dirksen.....				49,500	49,500
Total, other.....	394,085	374,100		423,600	423,600
Total, Senate.....	49,839,669	54,849,076		54,837,660	54,837,660

Footnotes at end of table.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, H.R. 13763—Continued

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES					
Gratuity, deceased Member	\$90,000		\$42,500	\$42,500	\$42,500
Salaries, Mileage for the Members, and Expense Allowance of the Speaker					
Compensation of Members	16,135,700	20,085,000	20,074,000	20,074,000	20,074,000
Mileage of Members and expense allowance of the Speaker	200,000	180,000	180,000	180,000	180,000
Total, Members compensation and mileage	16,335,700	20,265,000	20,254,000	20,254,000	20,254,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees					
Office of the Speaker	143,845	151,850	151,850	151,850	151,850
Office of the Parliamentarian	134,420	152,310	152,310	152,310	152,310
Compilation of precedents of House of Representatives	13,210	13,210	13,210	13,210	13,210
Office of the Chaplain	17,965	17,965	17,965	17,965	17,965
Office of the Clerk	2,050,000	2,237,900	2,205,000	2,205,000	2,205,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms	2,352,000	3,016,650	2,950,000	2,950,000	2,950,000
Office of the Doorkeeper	2,065,000	2,298,130	2,275,000	2,275,000	2,275,000
Office of the Postmaster	612,110	1,625,870	625,870	625,870	625,870
Committee employees (standing roll)	5,200,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
Special and minority employees:					
6 minority employees:	142,245	182,885	182,885	182,885	182,885
House Democratic steering committee	53,710	59,040	59,040	59,040	59,040
House Republican conference	53,710	59,040	59,040	59,040	59,040
Majority floor leader, office	111,915	119,915	119,915	119,915	119,915
Minority floor leader, office	101,295	111,295	111,295	111,295	111,295
Majority whip, office	75,990	90,990	90,990	90,990	90,990
Minority whip, office	75,990	90,990	90,990	90,990	90,990
Caucus rooms, 2 clerks	18,745	18,745	18,745	18,745	18,745
Technical assistants, attending physician	15,780	16,845	16,845	16,845	16,845
Official reporters of debates	316,570	324,410	324,410	324,410	324,410
Official reporters to committee	311,015	322,040	322,040	322,040	322,040
Committee on Appropriations (investigations)	890,000	890,000	890,000	890,000	890,000
Office of the legislative counsel	403,890	465,595	465,595	465,595	465,595
Total, salaries, officers, and employees	15,159,405	16,565,675	16,442,995	16,442,995	16,442,995
Members' Clerk Hire					
Clerk hire	41,192,500	47,200,000	47,000,000	47,000,000	47,000,000
Contingent Expenses of the House					
Furniture	4 (250,000)	240,000	240,000	240,000	240,000
Miscellaneous items	8,000,000	5,460,000	4,960,000	4,960,000	4,960,000
Government contributions		3,240,000	3,240,000	3,240,000	3,240,000
Reporting hearings	368,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000
Special and select committees	4,950,000	6,850,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
Telegraph and telephone	3,500,000	3,750,000	3,650,000	3,650,000	3,650,000
Stationery (revolving fund)	1,308,000	1,308,000	1,308,000	1,308,000	1,308,000
Postage stamps	320,390	320,390	320,390	320,390	320,390
Revision of laws	30,750	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Leadership automobiles:					
Speaker	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250
Majority leader	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250
Minority leader	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250	14,250
New edition, District of Columbia Code	75,000				
New edition, United States Code		150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
Total, contingent expenses	18,594,890	21,724,140	21,074,140	21,074,140	21,074,140
Total, House of Representatives	91,372,495	105,754,815	104,813,635	104,813,635	104,813,635
JOINT ITEMS					
Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures	55,000	90,000	55,000	55,000	55,000
Contingent Expenses of the Senate					
Joint Economic Committee	430,650	477,165	441,165	477,165	468,165
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy	398,605	400,595	400,595	400,595	400,595
Joint Committee on Printing	210,885	212,855	212,855	212,855	212,855
Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies	400,000				
Contingent Expenses of the House					
Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation	531,905	597,650	597,650	597,650	597,650
Joint Committee on Defense Production	107,950	107,950	107,950	107,950	107,950
Office of the attending physician	56,000	61,800	70,800	70,800	70,800
Capitol Police					
General expenses	134,000	136,000	134,000	134,000	134,000
Capitol Police Board	900,000	909,936	900,000	900,000	900,000
Education of Senate and House Pages					
Expenses	113,160	112,307	112,307	112,307	112,307
Official Mail Costs					
Expenses	9,473,000	10,161,000	10,161,000	10,161,000	10,161,000
Statements of Appropriations					
Preparation	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000
Total, joint items	12,824,135	13,280,258	13,206,322	13,242,322	13,233,322
ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL					
Salaries, Office of the Architect	775,000	855,300	825,000	825,000	825,000
Contingent expenses	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Capitol buildings	2,084,700	2,157,400	2,002,400	2,127,400	2,127,400
Extension of the Capitol		2,000,000	2,000,000	250,000	2,275,000
Capitol Grounds	792,300	874,100	842,100	874,100	874,100
Senate Office Buildings	3,052,900	3,310,000	3,310,000	3,310,000	3,310,000
Extension of additional Senate Office Building site		1,250,000		1,250,000	1,250,000
Senate garage	68,800	76,600		76,600	76,600
House Office Buildings	5,145,600	5,479,000	5,479,000	5,479,000	5,479,000
Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional House Office Building (liquidation of contract authorization)	(527,000)	(1,398,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)	(107,000)
Capitol Power Plant (operation)	2,954,500	3,462,000	3,512,000	3,512,000	3,512,000
Expansion of facilities, Capitol Power Plant (Liquidation of contract authorization)		(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)	(300,000)
Structural and mechanical care	1,013,000	1,052,800	1,047,000	1,047,000	1,047,000
Reappropriation	327,000		60,000	60,000	60,000
Furniture and furnishings	350,000	378,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building		18,410,000	2,800,000	2,800,000	2,800,000
Total, Architect of the Capitol	16,613,800	39,255,200	18,967,500	22,011,100	24,036,100

Footnotes at end of table.

SUMMARY OF THE BILL, H.R. 13763—Continued

Item	New budget (obligational) authority, 1969	Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, 1970	House bill	Senate bill	Conference action
BOTANIC GARDEN					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$587,500	¹ \$599,800	\$599,800	\$599,800	\$599,800
Total, Architect of the Capitol, including Botanic Garden.....	17,201,300	39,955,000	19,567,300	22,610,900	24,635,900
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS					
Salaries and expenses.....	18,019,300	¹ 19,380,000	19,085,000	19,061,500	19,061,500
Transfer from HEW.....	(478,000)	(478,000)			
Copyright Office, salaries and expenses.....	2,987,800	3,140,000	3,128,000	3,124,000	3,124,000
Legislative Reference Service, salaries and expenses.....	² 3,820,000	⁴ 4,196,000	4,135,000	4,135,000	4,135,000
Distribution of catalog cards, salaries and expenses.....	7,300,000	7,728,000	7,728,000	7,728,000	7,728,000
Books for the general collections.....	665,000	840,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Books for the law library.....	125,000	140,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
Books for the blind and physically handicapped, salaries and expenses.....	6,668,000	7,015,000	7,000,000	6,997,000	6,997,000
Organizing and microfilming the papers of the Presidents, salaries and expenses.....	118,800	118,800	118,800	118,800	118,800
Collection and distribution of library materials (special foreign currency program):					
Payments in Treasury-owned foreign currencies.....	1,807,600	1,907,000	1,603,000	1,603,000	1,603,000
U.S. dollars.....	201,400	213,000	199,000	199,000	199,000
Total, Library of Congress.....	41,712,900	44,677,800	43,886,800	43,856,300	43,856,300
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE					
Printing and binding.....	31,000,000	30,300,000	30,300,000	30,300,000	30,300,000
Office of Superintendent of Documents, salaries and expenses.....	8,178,000	¹ 10,052,000	9,750,000	9,650,000	9,650,000
Selection of site, general plans, and designs of buildings.....		² 3,600,000			
Payment to GPO revolving fund (for special improvements).....		6,500,000			
Total, Government Printing Office.....	39,178,000	50,452,000	40,050,000	39,950,000	39,950,000
GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE					
Salaries and expenses.....	59,614,000	63,184,000	63,000,000	63,000,000	63,000,000
Grand total, new budget (obligational) authority.....	311,742,499	372,152,949	284,524,057	342,310,817	344,326,817
Consisting of—					
1. Appropriations.....	311,415,499	372,152,949	284,464,057	342,250,817	344,266,817
2. Reappropriation.....	327,000		60,000	60,000	60,000
Memorandum—					
1. Appropriations and reappropriations including appropriations for liquidation of contract authorizations.....	312,269,499	373,850,949	284,931,057	342,717,817	344,733,817

¹ As amended in H. Doc. 91-100.² As amended in S. Doc. 91-37.³ As amended in H. Doc. 91-140.⁴ To be derived by transfer from funds previously appropriated under this head.⁵ As amended in H. Doc. 91-113.⁶ Submitted in H. Doc. 91-154.⁷ As amended in H. Doc. 117.⁸ Plus \$50,000 by transfer.**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, 1970**

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 559, H.R. 14916.

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

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14916) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I 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. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, I report to the Senate the 1970 appropriations bill for the District of Columbia, H.R. 14916, in the amount of \$645,342,000, which is \$37,764,300 below the House bill and \$107,602,300 below the revised budget estimate. Although the bill and the report reflect the economies which the committee was compelled to make in restricting the appropriation to funds available to the District government, it is important to note that significant new programs have been begun in an effort to make the District government responsive to the needs of the District's citizens and to improve the quality of life here. Among these are:

First and foremost, full funding of every dollar requested for the police department and the courts and implementation of all priority programs in the President's recommendation to curb crime in the District of Columbia. Crime in the Nation's Capital is a national disgrace and the committee has dealt with the problem as a matter of grave concern and utmost importance.

Second, new personnel have been provided in the executive office to assist the city's able new executive team to implement creative and resourceful new methodology and to revitalize old programs to make them more responsive to the needs of the people living here, the almost 20 million visitors, and all Americans who desire that the Nation's Capital be the type of city upon which they

can look with pride—not only in its spectacular beauty, but in the quality of its institutions as well.

Third, a record school operating budget with priorities as to programs and the allocation of available funds established by the city government and board of education—not by a committee sitting far from the day-to-day problems of improving education for those who need it most to survive and compete in today's world.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia who for many years had this job as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia and did such a tremendously effective one that none of us who follow him will be able to achieve the diligence and the ability the distinguished Senator put into his work.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am very grateful for the kind remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin. I merely interrupted to invite attention to the fact that the committee report is not on the desk of each Senator. I think it would be well if someone would instruct the pages to put the committee report on the desk of each Senator.

Inasmuch as the Senator so kindly yielded to me, I want to take this opportunity to say that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has, in my judgment, performed admirably as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on

the District of Columbia. He has done an excellent job and has been most diligent.

He brings to the Senate today a good bill and committee report when one considers the limited revenues available. I have seen the report prior to today but I thought it should be on the desk of each Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. That concerns me also, but I am delighted that the Senator is insisting on the committee report being on the desk of each Senator. I think that the Senate in an appropriation bill involving such enormous amounts of money, should know what it is doing. That is the function of the committee report. We worked hard on it. It is a good report.

In this regard, let me attempt to set the record straight on what I believe to be one of the greatest misapprehensions with reference to the problems of this city, namely, that the problems of the schools are directly related to congressional neglect. There are contained in the report accompanying this bill comparative tables on expenditures per pupil and professionals per 1,000 pupils in eight comparable jurisdictions, together with a statement of appropriations for the District of Columbia public schools for the last 10 years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these tables be printed in the RECORD.

COMPARISON OF PUPIL ENROLLMENT AND PROFESSIONAL STAFF PER 1,000 PUPILS FOR THE YEARS 1964-65 AND 1968-69 (EXCEPT WHERE INDICATED, WHEN LATEST AVAILABLE DATA ARE GIVEN) IN 8 SELECTED SCHOOL SYSTEMS HAVING AN ENROLLMENT OF OVER 90,000 PUPILS

	Pupil enrollment		Professional staff per 1,000 pupils			
	Fiscal year 1965	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1965		Fiscal year 1967 or 1968, total professional staff	
			Teachers	Total professional staff		
Washington, D.C.	141,396	152,400	37.7	41.8	58.8	1968
Atlanta	107,770	114,184	37.7	40.5	42.1	1967
Baltimore	188,020	192,362	34.5	39.5	49.3	1968
Boston	94,266	97,766	39.4	43.5	55.2	1968
Cleveland	151,242	153,043	33.9	37.9	40.3	1967
Milwaukee	120,045	130,540	35.7	38.7	36.3	1967
San Francisco	91,577	93,672	41.0	44.7	43.0	1967
St. Louis	114,987	116,102	34.2	38.7	39.7	1967

Note: Data for this study were obtained from Educational Statistics of the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and from the Research Division of the National Education Association.

APPROPRIATIONS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS, 1959-69

Fiscal year	Operating expenses	Capital outlay	Federal funds	Total
1959	\$44,043,668	\$8,920,300	(1)	\$52,963,968
1960	47,184,500	6,911,000	(1)	54,095,500
1961	51,632,700	6,944,000	(1)	58,576,700
1962	54,016,210	8,886,000	(1)	62,902,210
1963	59,504,750	7,693,000	(1)	67,197,750
1964	63,860,593	15,626,000	\$1,751,280	81,237,873
1965	72,038,300	14,405,100	3,280,626	89,724,026
1966	75,641,500	17,568,950	15,375,280	108,585,730
1967	86,114,000	30,105,100	15,088,882	131,307,982
1968	101,876,900	49,054,600	20,577,268	171,508,768
1969	115,931,930	35,950,900	20,442,499	172,325,329
1970 (as recommended)	122,583,000	28,132,400	20,799,000	171,514,400

¹ Unobtainable.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the table on professionals per 1,000 shows that the District of Columbia with 58.8 professionals per 1,000 in 1968 is far ahead of such cities as Atlanta with 42.1, San Francisco with 40.3, or Milwaukee with 36.3. There might be some varia-

tion, inasmuch as the latter three figures were the latest available, which were for 1967, and the Washington figure is for 1968. However, the spread is so great as to make the fact clear.

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

1969-70 SCHOOL YEAR ESTIMATES¹¹
EXPENDITURE PER PUPIL IN EIGHT COMPARABLE CITIES

School system	Expenditure per pupil	Costs relating to capital outlay projects included	Present and anticipated future costs of retirement programs included
Atlanta	\$772.00	No	Yes
Baltimore	814.19	No	Yes
Boston	885.00	No	Yes
Cleveland	800.00	No	Yes
Milwaukee	840.06	No	Yes
St. Louis	871.87	Yes ¹²	Yes
San Francisco	830.00	No	Yes
Average of expenditures in above jurisdictions.	830.00		
District of Columbia (budgeted).	982.00	No	No

¹¹ Data based on estimated average daily attendance and supplied Senate Appropriations Committee by school systems concerned. In the District of Columbia, average daily attendance computations are considered to be 91 percent of average daily membership computations. Also included in the per student cost figure are Federal grants which the District of Columbia estimates will be \$79 per student for fiscal 1970.

¹² Including \$29.06 per pupil as employer contribution to teachers retirement.

¹³ However last successful bond issue was passed in 1962 and there is no existing authority to issue additional bonds.

¹⁴ The District of Columbia school budget provides only \$4,000,000 of \$19,100,000 estimated by the U.S. Treasury Department as being necessary to fully fund present and anticipated future costs of the District of Columbia Teachers Retirement System. When adjusted to include full funding of Teachers Retirement System, District of Columbia per pupil cost would be \$1,094.51.

that the average of seven comparable cities computed on the basis of average daily attendance is \$830 with none exceeding \$900, and each reporting to the committee that the estimate reflected full funding for present and anticipated future costs of retirement programs for teachers and other school personnel. For the District of Columbia, per-pupil expenditure computed as above on an average daily attendance basis is \$982, as provided in this bill. This estimate does not take into consideration full funding of present and future costs of retirement programs for District school personnel. If this figure were adjusted to include full funding of retirement costs, as it is understanding the other cities reporting to the committee have done, the figure for the District would become \$1,094.51. This compares with the \$830 per-pupil average in other cities so the District pays more than 30 percent more per pupil than the average of comparable cities and 23 percent more than the next highest.

The last of the three tables clearly shows that at least for the last 10 years the Congress has been most responsive in providing for the educational needs of the District.

Fourth, in addition, the bill, as recommended, provides full support of the programs proposed to deal with the very grave narcotics problem confronting the District and significant new funds—\$1.4 million—and personnel—215—for the District of Columbia General Hospital.

There is no question in my mind that the narcotics problem is closely tied in with crime and that one of the big reasons for the phenomenon of increase in crime in the District of Columbia and the Nation at a time when we have unparalleled prosperity and very low unemployment is the need of many drug addicts for money to purchase drugs, and the only way they can do it is by committing crimes.

Last, but by no means least important, are the funds provided in the bill for sufficient modernized equipment which, as soon as it can be made available, will make possible the long sought goal of bi-weekly collection of refuse at every residence from the far southeast to the far northwest.

While the report makes clear that the committee strongly supports the able Commissioner and outstanding City Council and Board of Education, it deals forthrightly with the problems of budgeting within available resources, cooperation with the Congress, reprogramming of activities, and restriction of supplemental appropriations.

The committee report also points out that total Federal assistance in the District of Columbia, as estimated by the General Accounting Office, is in excess of a half billion dollars per year—or, more graphically, it is an equivalent to \$2,381 for every family in the District of Columbia. Also noted is the often overlooked fact that the Federal contribution to the District's budget of \$100 million is \$30 million in excess of the amount which the Federal Government would be required to pay in real property taxes,

which of course it is not, either here or anywhere else.

The question of soaring personnel rolls which committee estimates constitute a ratio of one District of Columbia employee to every six employed District citizens has been a matter of grave concern to this committee as to its sister committees in both Houses of the Congress.

In other words, if you take all the people employed in the District of Columbia, one out of six works for the District of Columbia Government.

The committee fully supports the personnel limitation imposed in the Revenue Act, and when considered in conjunction with the personnel freeze proposed by the Commissioner, the bill before you establishes a limitation which is almost 700 below the 41,500 which was established through the revenue bill's personnel ceiling. The committee also strongly urges vigorous and inclusive study and critical analysis of the District's present and future manpower needs with a first-year goal of reducing by at least 1,000 the total of authorized positions established in this bill.

Because only a portion of the year remains for the District of Columbia to undertake a capital outlay program, and because of the committee's feeling that the District of Columbia has a special obligation to respond to the President's request to curtail new construction starts, the bill, as recommended, is \$70 million below budget estimates and \$30 million below the House bill. These reductions are primarily related to funding and scope and are within priorities established by the District Government.

When we made this cut we did not make it arbitrarily. We made it on recommendations to us of the Mayor, and of city officials who indicated projects that could be stretched out or deferred in response to President Nixon's request that we curtail Federal construction wherever it could be done.

Included is the full amount of \$40 million for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, \$28 million for public school construction, and initial funding for a new jail, new District of Columbia court building, and a new administration building.

There is one error in the hearing record that should be noted. Upon inquiry the committee has been informed that certain information relating to the pay of District of Columbia chauffeurs was incorrectly computed and reported to the committee by the District of Columbia government, and therefore, appears incorrectly in the hearing record.

On page 1105, the calendar 1968 gross salary, including overtime of the chauffeur to the Commissioner, is correctly stated \$16,951.69—a combination of \$6,385.60 in regular pay and \$10,566.09 in overtime. There was also, however, a submission of regular pay from January 1 to June 14, 1969 as \$3,474.40 and overtime for the same period as \$9,381.59. The latter figure was a result of an erroneous computation in the District's Department of Highways and Traffic and should correctly read \$5,907.19. This rate of pay projected through calendar 1969 would result in a total pay of the Commissioner's chauffeur of \$17,791.10.

The committee strongly supports the District's very capable Commissioner and believes that we of the Nation's Capital are fortunate to have him as the leader of the District government. We are also aware of his dedication to the people of the District and his untiring effort to meet the almost limitless demands upon his time.

It goes without saying, however, that there are countless other responsible government officials who have virtually impossible schedules to meet who are not furnished transportation of any type, much less a chauffeured limousine.

I shall not object to the Chief Executive Officers of the District government being furnished a limousine—if he feels he needs one—and driver who is reasonably compensated for reasonable daily requirements. It is my position, however, that additional chauffeurs and limousines for District officials are a luxury that the District—which for the lack of resources has been compelled to curtail and eliminate so many vital and needed projects—cannot afford. To pay a chauffeur more than \$17,000 a year, no matter how many hours a day he works, is hard for taxpaying American citizens anywhere to understand. This practice should stop now.

Let there be any doubt, I make specific reference to the six other chauffeurs whose pay cost alone was over \$50,000 in calendar 1968. These are listed on page 1105 of the committee hearings. In addition, I include a number of others throughout the District government who serve largely as personal drivers although their titles and job descriptions do not identify them as such.

Last, let me state, in no uncertain terms, that the committee fully recognizes its obligations to provide the funds that are necessary not only to continue and expand the physical beauty of this Capital City, but to improve the quality of life here. At the same time, the committee recognizes that money is only part of the problem. Washington residents should show a deeper and broader willingness to work and help their educational, law enforcement, and administrative officials.

With the greater amount of funds devoted by this city and the Federal Government to education, to welfare, and to law enforcement in relation to population than elsewhere in the Nation, the results in a better life are not forthcoming. The answer must lie in securing a greater participation and a deeper sense of responsibility from this city's residents.

Mr. President, I understand the distinguished Senator from Missouri may have an amendment to offer.

Before the Senator from Missouri gets the floor, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text, provided that no point of order shall have been considered to have been waived by reason of this order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 2, line 3, after "1970", strike out "\$107,000,000" and insert "\$100,000,000".

On page 2, line 15, after "(D.C. Code, Sec. 9-220 (b); 81 Stat. 339)", strike out "\$77,763,000" and insert "\$60,263,000"; and, in line 19, after the word "fund", where it appears the first time, strike out "\$74,735,000" and insert "\$57,235,000".

On page 3, line 4, after the word "expenses", strike out "\$39,209,000" and insert "\$39,201,000".

On page 4, line 14, after the word "purposes", strike out "\$130,324,000" and insert "\$129,724,000".

On page 5, line 15, after the word "amended", strike out "\$140,077,000" and insert "\$137,767,000".

On page 6, line 7, after the word "Park", strike out "\$18,337,000" and insert "\$16,984,000".

On page 6, line 16, after the word "Health", strike out "\$137,382,000" and insert "\$134,638,000".

On page 8, line 10, after the word "only", strike out "\$18,450,000" and insert "\$18,006,000".

On page 8, line 18, after the word "only", strike out "\$33,340,000" and insert "\$33,019,000".

On page 10, line 15, after the word "expanded", strike out "\$149,928,000" and insert "\$119,943,700"; and, in line 18, after the word "That", strike out "\$65,170,000" and insert "\$15,024,000".

AMENDMENTS NO. 394

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I have amendments at the desk, No. 394, which I offer for myself and Senators GOODELL, KENNEDY, and MATHIAS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with.

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

The amendments (No. 394) are as follows:

On page 2, line 4, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$108,706,000".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "\$39,201,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,971,000".

On page 4, line 14, strike out "\$129,724,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$130,801,000".

On page 5, line 16, strike out "\$137,767,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$141,250,000".

On page 6, line 7, strike out "\$16,984,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,419,000".

On page 6, line 17, strike out "\$134,638,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$137,297,000".

On page 8, line 11, strike out "\$18,006,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$18,206,000".

On page 8, line 19, strike out "\$33,019,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$33,101,000".

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this amendment, No. 394, is offered by myself and cosponsored by Senators GOODELL, KENNEDY, and MATHIAS.

Mr. President, this amendment would restore to the District of Columbia budget \$8,706,000 which the committee has set aside as a reserve to finance possible future increases in the salaries of District police, firemen, and teachers.

In order to find the money for this reserve in a budget which had already been heavily cut—some \$99 million below the District request and \$29 million below the amount approved by the House—the committee reached into the budget base and reduced the level of

funds for current programs by an average of about 2 percent across the board. The effect is the same as any other budget cut. It means the District will have an \$8.7 million cut on top of the \$99 million reduction otherwise made by the committee.

The departments which will suffer and the amounts involved as a result of creating this reserve are as follows:

Schools (millions)-----	\$3.14
Health (millions)-----	1.23
Welfare (millions)-----	1.40
Fire department-----	580,000
Corrections-----	360,000
Federal City College-----	240,000
Washington Tech Institute-----	103,000
Recreation-----	245,000
Library-----	116,000
All others (millions)-----	1.27

In seeking to have this salary reserve eliminated, I do not mean to leave the impression that there will be no pay increases. On the contrary, as the chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Subcommittee considering the legislation, I believe there is an excellent chance the increases will be approved in this Congress, although it will not be until the next session in 1970.

But I do not believe that we ought to deprive our schools and our health programs to pay for them. The District has requested, and I for one strongly support, the authorization of new revenue to cover whatever increases are granted. Any other course would, in my view, be fiscally irresponsible. The District budget has already been cut by \$99 millions and some of its most urgently needed programs have had to be cut back sharply. Additional reductions could seriously impair the efforts of the District government to begin meeting the enormous backlog of problems in this city.

I know that the senior Senator from Wisconsin has acted with the greatest reluctance in setting aside this reserve. He did so on the judgment that there is little chance of new revenue being approved by the Congress to pay for the salary increases which almost certainly will be enacted. I disagree with that view, but I respect and admire the Senator's adherence to the principle of fiscal responsibility even when it means taking a painful course.

Nevertheless, I feel compelled to introduce this amendment and in its support I would make four principal points:

First. The salary legislation in question is not likely to be passed in this session of Congress, and it may be many weeks into the next session before it is acted upon. At the present time neither the Senate nor the House District Committees have reported bills, and the House has not even held hearings as yet. Certainly, it is premature to say that there is no chance that this legislation will contain revenue measures sufficient to meet the cost of the increases.

Second. By setting aside a salary reserve to cover these prospective increases, the committee tends to foreclose any chance there may be of getting additional revenue. Again, as the chairman of the principal Senate legislative subcommittee involved, I am confident that we can make the case for this revenue, and I would note in this connection, that the

Bureau of the Budget has fully supported the District's request. It prejudices the issue, however, to provide for a salary reserve and I believe that action, if allowed to stand would just about eliminate any chance we have.

Third. Further, I submit that a salary reserve is unnecessary regardless of what happens to the District request for new revenue to pay for salary increases. Assuming the worst and the District is not given new revenue, it would have no choice but to make room for the increases by cutting back its other programs. In short, it would have to do about what the committee has done in setting aside a salary reserve. The difference is that the District will have the opportunity at least to make a case for the additional revenue.

Fourth. Finally, I would note that the House Appropriations Committee took no action to provide for these prospective salary increases even though it was aware that such legislation is pending. I think that in itself is evidence that there is indeed a chance that new revenue to meet the costs of any salary increases will be forthcoming.

The amendment I have sent to the desk contains a number of line item changes, but its purpose is quite simple. It would restore the cuts made to establish the salary reserve by:

First. Increasing the Federal payment from \$100 million to \$108,706,000, which would be higher than the \$107 million approved by the House but below the \$110 million authorized this year.

Second. Putting back the appropriations which were taken from the various departments as their share of this reserve.

Mr. President, the District of Columbia budget has already been cut to a point where many urgently needed programs will be jeopardized. It cannot afford to absorb these additional cuts, and it is unnecessary, in my judgment, to make them at this time.

Mr. President, so that what we are discussing here does not remain in the realm of the vague, the ethereal, and the unidentifiable, I think it is appropriate that we consider some of the matters, some of the programs, which will inevitably have to fall by the wayside if the position of the Senator from Wisconsin prevails. In other words, when you cut \$3.14 million from the District of Columbia school budget, something has to give. Some program that is either in being or contemplated will have to be eliminated.

What are some of these programs that would inevitably have to be canceled in order to place \$3.14 million of school funds into a contingency reserve? It is my information that they would include the following:

Orders for new textbooks, library books, and other school supplies would have to be canceled.

A freeze would have to be placed on all nonteaching positions, including teacher aides.

There would have to be a sharp curtailment of school dental examination and school health services, including testing of children for hearing and vision problems.

Let us consider these matters for a moment because they would be directly affected by the funds the Senator seeks to strip from the educational budget.

In recent weeks, much has been said and written in the public arena concerning the inadequacies of public education throughout this country—and much, specifically, with respect to the District of Columbia. Can the U.S. Senate, at this particular time in history, say that it is going to cut back on an educational program that already, in the minds of almost every knowledgeable educator in the country, is inadequate? Are we going to cancel orders for new textbooks? Are we going to fail to expand the public school libraries?

We heard much testimony at President Nixon's Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health held here in the Nation's Capital in the past few days, about the inadequacy of diet and consequences for the health of youngsters, and their ability to adjust in school and absorb education. With these facts in mind, are we going to cut back on the health services of the District's public schools? Is this fiscally prudent? Is it normally prudent?

Are we so obsessed and possessed by our zeal for neat figures on a balance sheet that we are willing to cut back on the textbooks, health services, and ancillary teaching personnel connected with the District's public schools?

Mr. President, I for one am not.

Another reduction that will have to be made as a result of this reserve is \$1.23 million in public health services.

What will that cut mean to the District? It will mean a reduction in birth control services, crippled children's services, and in the availability of infant and preschool and maternity clinics open to the public. It will mean an elimination of some visits by public health nurses.

It will mean an elimination of community health education programs which are designed to foster better health standards and practices. It will mean a reduction in the number of persons who will be treated in the community mental health and retardation program and an increase in the physician-patient ratio.

It will mean a cutback in the services of the Glenn Dale Hospital for tuberculosis and other chronic diseases. The options there are, increasing the nurse-patient ratio, deferring needed maintenance cost, or closing some of the wards and discharging some of the employees.

Mr. President, these health services reductions could mean a cutback in the immunization program. This could lead to an increase in the incidence of communicable diseases. These are some of the hard choices that will have to be made—the atrocious choices that will be forced upon Mayor Washington and the District of Columbia government if this \$1.23 million is stripped from the health budget. This comes at a time when the Nation's health has to rank on anyone's list as one of the top five priority issues in this country.

Is the U.S. Senate, which has jurisdiction of the District of Columbia—sadly speaking, insofar as the people of the District is concerned—going to say to its citizens: "We will cut back on

health. We are not moving forward. We are not even standing still. We are going to cut you back \$1.23 million. We are going to reduce the availability of birth control services. We are going to reduce the availability of infant and preschool and maternity clinics."

Is this the kind of answer that the U.S. Senate wishes to give to the residents of the District of Columbia? I do not think that any of them ever asked that this Congress take control of their destiny. It was foisted upon them years and years ago. I daresay if the option were theirs to get out from under the yoke of Congress, the vote would be overwhelming to so do. However, for so long as Congress has the distasteful and unhappy responsibility of controlling the destiny and the welfare of the hundreds of thousands of residents of the District, can it in conscience tell them that, "Although as Members of the Senate we advocate expanding better health care services for the rest of this Nation"—and I am a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Health—"and although we are going back to our home States where we are politically accountable and give our usual pious speeches in favor of expanding and improving health services, when it comes to doing something for the people of the District of Columbia, to whom we are not politically accountable, we will cut back health programs by \$1.23 million."

What do these cuts mean in the correctional field? The dollar figure is \$263,000. No issue is talked about more in this day and age than law and order, safety on the streets, punishing the offenders, taking care of them when they are in jail, preventing them from abusing each other, and so forth.

So we go home to our respective States and tell the voters how much we are for law and order, how we are for building bigger and better prisons. And what do we do for the nonvoters of the District of Columbia? Apparently we are going to cut their correctional program \$360,000. And in so doing, we will leave vacant about 80 prison guard positions in the city jail, the Women's Detention Center, the Lorton Reformatory, and the Lorton Youth Center.

One does not have to be an expert in penology or have a graduate degree in criminology to understand what this will mean. All one has to be is to be a daily subscriber of the local press and he will quickly learn that there is already inadequate supervision of the institutions I have mentioned.

Almost daily there are reports of drug abuse and attacks on other inmates.

We decry these things. We say, "Isn't it deplorable? Isn't it awful?" But then how do we act? We cut back 80 positions in the number of prison guards in these same institutions.

What does this reserve mean insofar as recreation is concerned? Well, in dollars, it seems \$245,000. But, what does it mean in terms of humanity? What does it mean in terms of people, not figures, but people.

It means that 15 large swimming pools, which normally would open May 15, next summer will not open until July 1. It

means that day camps, that normally open on May 15, next summer will not open until July 1.

It means that 165 playground facilities for school children, which normally open on June 15, will not open until July 1.

It means the closing of the mobile recreation program which brings recreational facilities to the poor and the infirm.

It eliminates the position of 20 young leader aides who work with juveniles in the streets.

Perhaps it does not mean an awful lot to the 100 of us whether the swimming pools open on May 15 or July 1. It is perhaps of little immediate consequence to us in terms of the enjoyment of those facilities. However, I would say it means an awful lot to those who do not have the kind of recreational opportunities and facilities available to so many of us.

We talk about crime in the streets. We talk about it in the summer months. We are always reminded of the hot summers that commenced with Watts and continued with Newark and Detroit.

We remember what happened last summer.

The summertime can be troublesome. Children are out of school. Time lays heavily on their hands. We worry about these things and talk about them among ourselves in the corridors. We say that we have to devise programs to help the youth in the summer. We vote for a large amount of funds for the summer job corps.

We try to get the Nation's businessmen to emphasize summer jobs.

That is our thinking.

These are the things we favor for public consumption nationwide. And we are deemed to be modern, progressive thinkers.

We say this, but when we apply our philosophy to the District of Columbia, the unrepresented, we then say, "Well, delay the opening of your swimming pools from May 15 to July 1. There will be enough time to splash around in the months of July and August. You don't have to be in the pool in June. It is not a make or break situation."

To me this is an indication of cynicism. We advocate a sound public program for our Nation. Yet we sadly fail to not apply the same policies in our treatment of those who are under our charge by no choice of their own—the residents of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I think if we proceed with this reserve, if we set aside this \$8.7 million, two things will happen:

First, we will be foreclosing any chance of getting additional revenue in order to pay for the salary increases that unquestionably are forthcoming.

I am for those increases. So is the Senator from Wisconsin. And I dare say there would be almost a unanimous vote in the Senate in favor of this legislation which would apply to teachers, police, and firemen.

But, if we set up this reserve, then it is inescapable that there will be no additional funding to pay for those salary increases, and those budget cuts that I

have enumerated will of necessity go into effect.

That is the financial argument. That is the budget argument. That is the dollars-and-cents bookkeeping argument. And I think it is a persuasive one, in its own right.

But, we will also be doing a second thing. This is not dollars and cents. This is not the kind of thing that a certified public accountant can put down neatly on a ledger sheet with red ink or black ink and strike a balance. This is not the kind of thing one can approach with the precision of figures or arithmetic. But it is the kind of thing that one can feel in his heart and knows to be true. If we go ahead with these cuts, we are telling the people of the District of Columbia that, they are not to participate fully in the benefits of the abundant society that we espouse for the rest of the country.

I do not think any one of us would go to our respective States—I know I would not go to my State of Missouri—and say, "Gentlemen, I'll tell you what I've done for you. I'm canceling your new textbooks. I'm going to curtail your public educational health services, even though I know many students come to school with deplorable health conditions and need help. But I'm going to cut those back for you, my good citizens, and I'm going to cut the number of nurses and the maternity care center.

"I know you have a bad crime situation in Missouri, you 4½ million people who sent me to the Senate, but I'm going to help you out by cutting your correctional program and cutting back the number of guards, so that the inmates can go at each other with even more reckless abandon. I'm going to cut your day care and day camp programs in the summer and restrict the operable dates of your swimming pools as narrowly as I possibly can. My good citizens of Missouri, I want to tell you how progressive and forward looking I am, how imaginative I am, in serving your public interest."

If I went to my State and made those recommendations, I guess that would be my farewell address, as well it should be, to the electorate of my constituency. How is it that I would be reluctant to make those recommendations in my own State, as indeed I think any Member of the Senate would be with respect to his State? How is it we can so easily, so casually, make similar recommendations to those to whom we are not politically accountable? I think I have already answered my question. We are not politically accountable to the residents of the District of Columbia. They cannot elect us, and they cannot defeat us. What they have to say about how we manage their destiny is of little moment or of little concern.

I ask, Mr. President, that the Senate give its respectful attention to what I think is embodied within this amendment. Its significance transcends the \$8.7 million involved. It indicates to me the true feeling of the U.S. Senate toward the voteless people of the District of Columbia.

Finally, let me say this: I think political observers would agree that insofar as District of Columbia appropria-

tions are concerned—especially in recent years—the House of Representatives has been, shall we say, enormously cautious in its allocation of funds while the Senate has been, shall we say, somewhat more enlightened. Yet, in this instance we find that the budget, as recommended by the Senate committee, is \$29 million below the amount approved by the House.

So with this bill we are taking a new turn in the course of governmental history so far as the District is concerned. Now the House can be considered the enlightened body, sensitive to the District's needs; and the Senate will be the cautious, citadel of fiscal integrity. I much prefer the older arrangement.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri wish to have his amendments considered en bloc?

Mr. EAGLETON. Yes.

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

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

Mr. EAGLETON. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I do not want to deny the Senator from Wisconsin the opportunity to immediately rebut or address the Senator from Missouri, but I would like to compliment the Senator from Missouri.

I have an amendment which is not as far reaching as his. It is amendment No. 418, which I intend to offer later. It deals with another item which has been stricken from the bill, that of community centers.

It is not, I suppose, a profitable business for a Senator from Missouri or a Senator from Indiana to become overly exercised about what is going on in the District of Columbia. We do not have any constituents living here. But I think it is absolutely imperative for all the Members of this body to realize that, as the law reads now and as the Constitution is structured, we are indeed the representatives of the people of the District of Columbia, and we have a deep responsibility to see that they get the kind of government they deserve.

I salute the Senator from Missouri for taking the lead in this area. I think we must do everything we can in this body to see that the District of Columbia becomes truly an example to the rest of this Nation—indeed, to the entire world—as to what enlightened government can do with respect to municipal leadership and representation and organization. I intend to support the Senator, and I salute him again for his efforts.

Mr. EAGLETON. I thank the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri obviously feels very deeply and very sincerely about this matter. He is an extremely eloquent speaker, and I think that his statement this morning and his amendment serve useful purpose.

What we have done in going below the House figure in the area of District operations is simply to recognize—and I think it is almost impossible to expect that this is going to happen—that unless Congress, the House and the Senate, both pass one more revenue act and pass it in

a few months, the cuts we recommend here will have to be made.

The Senator from Missouri spent some time in detailing the inhumanity of these cuts and the shortsightedness of these cuts and the lack of enlightenment in these cuts. These cuts were recommended to us by Mayor Washington and the City Council. We are doing exactly what Mayor Washington asked us to do—no more and no less. These are his recommendations.

I am sure that the position taken by the Senator from Missouri does reflect the feeling of the City Council and the Mayor, that they would like to be able to proceed without making cuts of this kind, without setting aside a reserve; but, under the circumstances, I think that would be irresponsible.

Let us consider: We now are acting in December on an appropriation bill for fiscal 1970, the fiscal year having begun July 1, 1969.

Mr. President, this is a disgraceful situation. This is something that should never happen. It is something that no responsible chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia should permit to happen, if it possibly can be avoided. Why are we permitting it to happen? It is being permitted to happen because we waited 5 months for a revenue act. We could not act until it was passed. But it did not pass until relatively a few weeks ago.

The Senator from Missouri said there will be another revenue act. I suppose it will be a very hot day in January, when we get another revenue act this promptly.

Everyone I have talked to has agreed that the likelihood of getting another revenue act passed is nil. This means that in the event we knock out this reserve, either there will be no salary increase for teachers, no salary increase for policemen, and no salary increase for firemen, or the cuts we provide will have to be made under circumstances far more difficult and under those circumstances there will be real misery in health services and law and order services. Instead of a moderate 2-percent cutback for 6 months, you will have a 6-percent cutback for 2 months.

I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, at this point I ask for the yeas and nays.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I wish to respond to the two points made by the Senator from Wisconsin. First, with respect to the delay the Senator mentions in the enactment of the tax authorization measures. There was a delay. I wish to set the record straight, however, that such delay as did result was not the work of the Senate and most certainly not of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Senate.

The District government submitted its recommendations to the House on January 14, 1969. That is about as early in the year as it could be done. It passed the House on August 11, 1969, 7 months later. It was referred to the Senate on

August 13. We commenced hearings on August 14, just about as quickly as they could be begun after receiving the report—only 1 day later. It was passed by the Senate on October 3, after time out for 3-week summer vacation.

As far as expedition of the tax authorization bill is concerned, the record of the Senate is commendable.

My second point is that I think the Senator from Wisconsin, and I am sure it is done unwittingly, leaves the impression that the District of Columbia recommends these budget cuts. That is very important. Let us set that straight. I wish to read from the letter of Assistant Mayor Fletcher, which was also signed by Mayor Washington. The letter is dated November 20, 1969, and it reads as follows:

The Commissioner strongly favors enactment of the salary proposals for policemen, firemen, teachers, and school officers, so long as the Congress also authorizes the revenue to finance the costs of those proposals. In the Commissioner's view, it would be imprudent and not responsible fiscal policy to enact the one without the other.

Now, I wish to direct attention to the language, "so long as the Congress also authorizes the revenue to finance the costs of those proposals."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. EAGLETON. If I may, I would like to finish my thought. What happened is that the District government was asked by the Senator from Wisconsin and me, "What would happen, Mr. Mayor, and what would you do if we foisted this reserve on you? Where would you make these cuts if we foisted this upon you?"

He said:

I do not want it that way because I believe these salaries should be taken care of by additional revenue, but if it is thrust upon me I would be forced to make the cuts as follows.

That is the origin of the cuts enumerated in my amendment, some of which I have referred to earlier.

I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I think what the Senator said about the delay in the Revenue Act is exactly correct. The District asked for the money early in January; the House passed it in August.

Does the Senator really think if we have no reserve in this bill the House District Committee and the House are going to act in the next few weeks to pass any revenue act? Is this a reasonable and responsible expectation?

Mr. EAGLETON. It might surprise the Senator, but I do. In the first place, the House has never taken any position with respect to setting up the kind of reserve the Senator from Wisconsin envisions.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That was the House Appropriations Committee.

Mr. EAGLETON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about the House District of Columbia Committee. They, not the Appropriations Committee, act on the revenue bill.

Mr. EAGLETON. That is right, but as the Senator will acknowledge there is

some interplay, some back and forth relations between these two committees.

I am not going to quote bookmaker odds on whether it is a 2-to-1 shot or a 3-to-1 shot, or what have you, that we will be able to get the additional revenue. But I will quote these odds to the Senator: If this reserve is set up, then the odds are 100 million to 1 our getting additional revenue to pay for increased salaries for teachers, policemen, and firemen. You will have obliterated any chance we have. From an odds-making point of view, the merits of the case are abundantly on our side.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Indications are clear that public assistance payments, welfare payments, are \$3 million over the budget estimate. If this situation continues, we will run out of funds for these payments in March or April. How would the Senator meet this situation? Would he await the enactment of the revenue bill?

Mr. EAGLETON. I understand there is an additional \$2.4 million set up in the revenue reserve which would cover the items to which the Senator has referred, which are untouched and unaffected by the \$8.7 million amendment which I introduced.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is my understanding that the amendment of the Senator from Missouri would only leave \$1.5 million. This is running at a deficit of \$3 million so that it would not be sufficient to fund for that purpose.

Mr. EAGLETON. I wish to read a portion of the report of the District of Columbia Appropriations Committee, page 3:

In order to create a portion of these unobligated reserves, program reductions totaling \$2.4 million and across the board reductions in 1970 base programs totaling \$8.7 million have been necessary.

I was referring to the \$2.4 million.

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator will yield I wish to go a little further.

The legislative committee proposed a bill to accomplish court reorganization, which the Senate passed, and the matter is before the House. If this bill becomes law in January or February, how would the Senator propose to finance it? Would he have to await enactment of the revenue bill?

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, in the first place, the bill has not been enacted; and, in the second place, if and when it is enacted, it would not be effective until 6 months after it had been signed by the President. It would not be effective, in all likelihood, during the next fiscal year.

I have a copy of the bill dealing with court reorganization here before me. I direct the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin to page 315, section 602 of the bill wherein he will note that it does not become effective until 180 days, that is 6 months, after it is signed by the President.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is our understanding that substantial money would be needed in that area. In addition, there may well be need for medical services and overtime for police. How should that be met? Wait for a new revenue bill?

Mr. EAGLETON. I do not know about police overtime problems or how much

that would involve. I do know that we have already cut the budget \$29 million below the House, so I presume those cuts took into account the need for adequate money to take care of any overtime situations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is one of the reasons why we are providing for the reserve.

Mr. EAGLETON. May I respond to that by saying that it is my understanding the reason the Senator has provided for the reserve is to set aside \$8.7 million to pay for salary increases for police, firemen, teachers, and other non-professional teaching personnel.

Now, do I understand correctly that the reserve is not for them but now will be used for police overtime and unexpected increments on welfare cases and a whole assortment of other things that the Senator now has in mind as a different reserve from what we were talking about originally?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes. A big part of the reserve is the salary increases—\$10½ million in reserve which would allow for calling up within that reserve priorities desired by the District government.

Mr. EAGLETON. Of that \$10.5 million, \$8.7 million is directly attributable to police, firemen, and teachers, which is left untouched. The remainder of that \$10.5 million in reserve would be for such other unforeseen contingencies that in due time will develop.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Does the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) want me to yield to him?

Mr. BAYH. Yes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate the Senator from Wisconsin yielding to me. I am not a member of the committee or of the Appropriations Committee, so perhaps I should not get involved in this colloquy. But I believe that there is a need for us to do more than is being done to help the residents of the Nation's Capital. If we are going to be consistent, if we are going to set up this type of reserve as good business practice, then there are other areas in Government where we should also establish similar reserves. I have not been in the Senate as long as has the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), but we are continually passing special legislation and making appropriations, while the other committees of Congress are deliberating on measures to provide revenue for services. For us to establish this method of operating for the District of Columbia, where we are anticipating many possible extra expenses, even before the legislation is passed, is the first time this has ever been done, to my knowledge, since I came here.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a difference.

Mr. BAYH. One other observation. I deplore the somewhat slow pace of passing some of the appropriations bills and revenue bills.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is the trouble. We wait and wait for a revenue act. There is delay, delay, and more delay.

Mr. BAYH. Let me continue on a moment.

When Congress has been presented with a "crunch" when the disabled, the

unemployed, those on welfare, or indeed policemen, teachers, and firemen are out of money, or when the legislative branch itself needs funding, it has passed in a matter of hours such contingency funds as reasonably could be expected; and that is what would no doubt happen in this instance.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There is a difference. The difference is that this is one appropriation bill and the only appropriation bill on which there is a street limit. The limit is the amount of funds made available under two things: Federal payments, and the Revenue Act. We know what the limits are and what can be spent and no more can be spent than that. This is a different appropriation from those of other departments and agencies. They do not have a strict limit on them, but we have it here.

When the Mayor and the City Council recommends a salary increase, which the Senator has said everyone in the Senate virtually agrees must be provided, we should provide the funds, so that it is irresponsible for us not to provide the funds when we all are virtually certain—at least I am, although the Senator from Missouri disagrees—that there will not be a revenue bill enacted. My experience is that there will not be. We all know that it is virtually certain that there will not be, under these circumstances, a responsible way to handle it is to provide funds for the salary increase which they have requested in a reserve. Either we will not give them the salary increase or we will vote it the other way.

I wish we had a more generous bill. I was for an increase in the tax on cigarettes, as I am sure the Senator from Missouri was, and for increasing other taxes, but that was not done. That was a decision made by Congress. Under these circumstances, we have to act, and unfortunately the needs of the budget are strictly limited. Thus, it seems to me that this is the way to do it.

Mr. BAYH. I have great respect for the judgment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, but I respectfully suggest that Congress will pass a revenue bill and will make the necessary appropriations when its feet are put to the fire, as in other supplemental matters. I see no reason to regard this appropriation any differently than we have treated others.

Mr. PROXMIRE. It took until October of 1969 for Congress to come up with a revenue bill. We waited and waited and waited. I thought the Senate District Committee did an outstanding job on responding so quickly when the revenue bill cleared the House. The Senate Appropriations Subcommittee acted within 24 hours after the House subcommittee had acted. On this bill we set a new record for prompt action. Now we are being asked once more, really, to condition our action on the prospects, which I think are not hopeful, that the House District Committee will pass another revenue act.

Mr. EAGLETON. Let me make one brief observation and then I will have said all I care to say or, indeed, can say on this subject.

I wish to set the Record straight as to

where the District will get this additional revenue if Congress authorizes it. It is not requesting a Federal handout. It is not requesting a Federal subsidy. It is sometimes lost sight of that 83 percent of District's general fund expenditures are financed through local taxes. The local people pay it out of their pockets, whether through a property tax, or a tax that the Senate imposes on nonprescription drugs, or groceries, or all the other "lovely" taxes we have so eagerly imposed upon them recently. That 83 percent comes out of the pockets of the residents of the people of the District of Columbia.

Only 17 percent of the District general fund comes from the Federal Government.

Now, so far as the pay increases are concerned, it is requested by the District government that they be given some help only for the first partial year, and in the first full year of operation the full weight and burden of the additional salary increases would be borne by the residents of the District of Columbia through an increase in income taxes.

All they are asking us to do is to give them the authority to tax their citizens. That is a pretty "gutty" request they are making. They want authority to tax their own citizens. I do not see how we can deny them that. I think, in good conscience, that Congress will grant them that authority, in due course. For that reason, I believe the reserve proposed by the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXIMIRE) is unnecessary, unneeded, and unwarranted.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri for himself and other Senators. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY, I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MCCARTHY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN, I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 43, as follows:

[No. 220 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Baker	Griffin	Muskie
Bayh	Hart	Nelson
Bellmon	Hatfield	Packwood
Boggs	Hughes	Pell
Brooke	Inouye	Percy
Burdick	Jackson	Prouty
Cannon	Javits	Ribicoff
Case	Kennedy	Saxbe
Cook	Long	Schweiker
Cooper	Magnuson	Scott
Cotton	Mathias	Spong
Eagleton	McGee	Stevens
Fong	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Goodell	Metcalf	Young, Ohio
Gore	Mondale	
Gravel	Moss	

NAYS—43

Aiken	Fannin	Pearson
Allen	Fulbright	Proxmire
Allott	Gurney	Randolph
Bennett	Hansen	Russell
Bible	Holland	Smith, Maine
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Smith, Ill.
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Stennis
Church	Jordan, N.C.	Talmadge
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Dodd	Mansfield	Tower
Dole	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dominick	McIntyre	Yarborough
Eastland	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	Montoya	
Ervin	Murphy	

NOT VOTING—11

Anderson	Hartke	Sparkman
Cranston	McCarthy	Symington
Goldwater	Mundt	Tydings
Harris	Pastore	

So the amendment was agreed to.
Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 418

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, I call up Amendment No. 418, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BAYH, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be waived.

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

Mr. BAYH's amendment (No. 418) is as follows:

On page 2, line 4, strike out "\$100,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,500,000".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "\$39,201,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$39,701,000".

On page 4, line 2, immediately before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be available for municipal services at the local level, through Neighborhood Service Centers".

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, I shall be brief. My amendment would increase the appropriations by \$500,000, which is half of the amount originally requested in the budget, to provide—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Indiana that his amendment is not in order. It strikes out the same items that were just voted on. It is a duplicitous amendment.

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, I respectfully suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. PROXIMIRE, Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that, so that I can discuss another amendment with the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may temporarily withdraw my amendment, without prejudice.

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

AMENDMENTS NOS. 404, 405, AND 406

Mr. SPONG, Mr. President, I call up amendments Nos. 404, 405, and 406.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask for unanimous consent that the three amendments be considered en bloc?

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

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

The clerk will state the amendments.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) offers amendment No. 404, as follows:

On page 10, line 15, strike out "119,943,700" and insert in lieu thereof "\$119,608,200".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 405 is not in order since it amends figures already agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. SPONG, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 405 be withdrawn.

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

The clerk will state amendment No. 406.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) offers amendment No. 406, as follows:

On page 10, line 15, strike out "\$119,943,700," and insert in lieu thereof "\$122,795,800,".

On page 10, line 18, strike out "Provided," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That \$5,250,000 of this appropriation shall be available for capital outlay for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections: Provided further,".

Mr. SPONG, Mr. President, I call up these amendments on behalf of Senator TYDINGS, who is unavoidably absent today.

Amendment No. 406 would restore all of the money for the correctional facilities in the President's crime program for the District of Columbia. It restores funds for the planning of a new District of Columbia jail, the building of three additional security units at Lorton, and the modernization and securing of the women's detention center.

Amendment No. 404 relates to amendment 406 in that this strikes out \$335,500 which had been inserted in the House bill for the planning of a new District government administration building, it being the position of Mayor Washington, in which the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) and I concur, that the need for new penal facilities is more important and has higher priority than a District administration building.

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

Mr. SPONG. I yield.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Virginia.

I think the amendment is a very necessary part of the program in which every Member of Congress is interested in an effort to try to find some way to mitigate the terrible burden of crime and the cost of crime to every resident of the Washington metropolitan area.

The penal institutions and the penal programs constitute a part of the entire spectrum of law enforcement. And unless we have the ability to improve the penal program in the District of Columbia, we are not going to improve the total spectrum of law enforcement.

I very strongly urge that the Senate approve the amendments.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I would say that insofar as the jail project and the facilities at Lorton are concerned, they are all a part of the President's crime program and have within the last 2 days been specifically endorsed by President Nixon.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have had a chance to discuss this with the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS). They have made a very strong case for it.

They are all items in the area of public safety. They do affect the President's crime package.

I have discussed it before. They are capital outlay items in the amendment as amended.

Though the committee felt we ought to restrict ourselves on construction at the present time because of the fiscal situation and the desire of President Nixon to do so, under the necessity of putting more resources into the area of public safety, I am happy to accept the amendment. I have discussed it with the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the ranking minority member, and I understand that he is willing to accept the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to Amendments Nos. 404 and 406.

The amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 418

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a moment ago I called up amendment No. 418, which was ruled out of order because it dealt with a previous line.

My only alternative is to ask unanimous consent, which I intend to do in a moment, which would permit any Senator to object and exercise his right.

I have previously discussed the matter with the subcommittee. They agree to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

The amendment provides \$500,000 to implement recommendations made recently in San Diego by the National League of Cities.

This would establish in the District of Columbia an innovative creation known as Neighborhood Multi-Service Center.

I read from the policy adopted at the conference in San Diego. On section 203.1, it says that these centers will perform wherever possible the everyday functions

of the city government through the neighborhood centers and other centers in the community to help contribute to greater citizen involvement and confidence in the government.

As I see it, there are four good reasons for this type of government center.

It would strengthen the delivery of government services and do a better job providing services.

It would provide better coordination and less duplication. I am advised by those who know that there are as many as 10 different departments providing government services in the District of Columbia. Some duplication in overlapping exist, and indeed, because of the lack of knowledge, some citizens are omitted altogether.

It would make the services more acceptable to the public so that those who are ill or disabled, as well as those who are uninformed, would have a better chance to get the services.

Most important, in this day of increasing pensions in our cities, it creates a better sense of citizen involvement so that the local citizens feel they are a direct part of their government.

With that explanation, and with the hope that no one will object, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 418 be considered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have had a chance to discuss the amendment with the Senator from Indiana and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the ranking member on the committee.

We agree that it is a meritorious amendment. It involves \$500,000, which is a modest sum. We think it is a very good cause.

I would be happy to take the amendment to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is still not in order; it amends items already agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be considered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is impossible. It has to be corrected.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I misunderstood. I thought the amendment had been corrected.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I direct the attention of the chairman, the manager of the bill, to page 53 and page 54 of the Senate report, under "Summary of Capital Outlay, by Project." I direct his attention to "Public schools" under "Public building construction." I note that on these pages in the report, perhaps 30 or 35 schools in the District are named. After the naming of the final school, the West Elementary School addition, there is a total for public schools. The budget estimate is some \$55 million. The House bill provided some \$43 million, and some

\$28 million is recommended to the Senate.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 11 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 13270), the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily, and that the Senate continue consideration of the pending business.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1970

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14916) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, some \$28 million is recommended to the Senate, which is one-half of the estimated funds necessary for the building, renovation, and reconstruction of the District schools.

I have had the opportunity in the last year to visit six of these schools on my own, and to speak to some of the classes and some of the assemblies. I—as well as any members of the committee who have taken the time to visit the schools—realize the extraordinarily dilapidated conditions of schools attended by many of the young people who live in the District.

I wonder whether the chairman of the committee, the manager of the bill, could review this matter with us, at least to the extent possible. I have not had a chance to give him additional notice on this question. As I understand, the hearings just came to the floor a few minutes ago. I wonder whether the Senator could review the overall budget item and give us some general observations on this very dramatic reduction in the outlay, and then perhaps review, to some extent, why these significant cuts were made.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There were two principal reasons for the reduction.

One reason is that we felt that it was proper for the Nation's Capital, of all the cities in the country, to respond to the President's request for a delay, a stretchout, in construction projects by States and localities, especially when Federal money was involved.

As the Senator is aware, the President has made this request, and we felt that, to the extent that we could do it in the District, we should do it.

The second reason is that it was late in the year. It seemed to us unlikely, with only 6 months left, that the same amount of funding could be used appropriately if we funded in full funds that would be available for only 6 months.

Taking these two considerations into account, we then asked the District itself to make its own recommendations as to where the stretchouts and the postponements should be, where was the greatest need, and so forth. We followed the recommendations of the District government, the responsible officials, to the letter. These are their recommendations. These are not arbitrarily made.

We do feel, however, that it is proper for Congress to react constructively to the President's request that we postpone those construction projects that can be properly postponed.

Mr. KENNEDY. One fact exceedingly distressing to me, as I am sure it is to all of us, is that if we look at the results of the Armed Forces Qualification Tests, which are given to people in all parts of our country, we find, with respect to those who have graduated from the District schools or those who, perhaps, have not graduated but are still taking these tests, that in excess of 60 percent do not pass this examination.

I am sure that many different kinds of factors and considerations enter into those results, other than the facilities themselves. But I certainly think that when we are taking into consideration the President's request for austerity and for budgetary ceilings, and when we, in Congress, have attempted, under title I and the other education bills, to recognize the concept of compensatory education, we ought to be willing to be more understanding of the needs of schools in the District, rather than cutting back.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think the Senator makes a good point. I direct his attention to the fact that we have funded the teaching aspect of education very fully. As a matter of fact, we now provide an average of \$1,094 per pupil, which is 30 percent higher than other comparable cities, 23 percent higher than the next most generous city with respect to its teachers. We provide far more professionals including teachers per pupil than any other city in the country. I think we are devoting a substantial amount of resources to education in the District.

I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that it could be more. But I think it would not be proper for me, as the chairman of the committee, to say that the committee has not been extremely generous in this area over the years and in this year, also. In the area of construction, we are providing \$28 million. It is less than the House. It is less than we would like it to be. But in a period of inflation, it seems to me that this is a responsible position to take.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am aware of the estimates—

Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am aware of the per-pupil expenditures indicated on page 34, and the statement the chairman gives on page 33. But this really does not tell the story.

In many ways we have seen that when a child goes to school hungry in the morning, no matter how many teachers there are to teach him, he is going to have a good deal of difficulty in learning. No matter how many teachers there are per pupil, if the classroom is noisy, if it is

a classroom in which the pipes rattle, he is going to have even more difficulty in learning.

For instance, in the Anacostia school, the number of seats necessary in their common room to provide not just facilities for lunch, but for rotation of those students who bring their own sandwiches, we see the kinds of interruptions which work adversely to the learning process.

I think all the educators we have had a chance to listen to in the Subcommittee on Education pointed out very plainly the relationship between the facilities, the curriculum, the adequacy of books, and also the physical facilities. I think we delude Members of this body in suggesting that only with the per pupil expenditure and the professional staff per thousand pupils can we feel we are really meeting the demands which exist in the schools of the Nation's Capital. This is true particularly when we have seen that there really is a growing need in the Capital's schools, if we take any kind of testing, such as the armed services test. Of course, that it is not the most scientifically devised test or the most perfect test, but it does provide some kind of medium for testing the young people in the kinds of education they are receiving.

I think, as well, that educators themselves talk about the atmosphere and the climate within the home, the interest in studying, and study habits. When we come to Congress and to the Senate and talk about the needs of the District of Columbia, the fact which distresses me is the fact that we have not had much higher consideration given to this matter than we have to the matter of construction. I am deeply concerned about the kinds of recommendations made, even with the fiscal position in which we find ourselves.

I think it would be extremely unfortunate to apply those fiscal standards to the opportunity for young people in the District of Columbia to study and learn in an atmosphere and in classrooms which are now not really conducive to learning.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I think this colloquy has been extremely helpful. It highlights a great need in the District of Columbia. It is true. I am conscious of the fact that the committee did not fully fund the construction; we are substantially below the House. I do not think the Nation could make a better investment than education. We should make a better investment than we have in the past. If I am chairman of the committee next year, I intend to do all I can to respond to the very eloquent, moving, and proper observations of the Senator from Massachusetts in this area.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to go into one additional area—the District of Columbia Hospital. I think all of us are aware of the tremendous demands that exist upon the urban hospitals in our country.

At the present time the Hill-Burton Act is before the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and there is consideration within that committee, with respect to altering or changing the formula, because there is a recognition that we are really

not meeting our responsibilities in the urban hospital field.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. I wish to point out that the committee not only funded the original estimate, but we went beyond that and above the House and provided more funds than the House provided because we fully funded the final request.

This is an area in which the Senator is properly interested and the committee was also.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend the chairman for going higher. Directing the attention of the Senate and the manager of the bill to page 55, we see the estimate was \$3 million. Although there was nothing in the House bill for it, the Senate included \$1.118 million and that is higher than the House bill. But it is considered below the estimate.

I think all of us realize we have a number of teaching colleges, teaching universities, and medical schools in this area. We know there is some effort, although I am not satisfied there is a sufficient effort, to try to coordinate the kinds of medical services among the teaching schools in the District of Columbia and the District of Columbia General Hospital.

We know certain teaching opportunities are available in the District of Columbia General Hospital. But in providing the real kind of quality there, I do not believe there is the kind of coordination, communication, and interrelationship which should exist.

However, Mr. President, at this time I want to direct attention to the fact that although the Senate placed in the bill in excess of \$1 million of the \$3 million estimated, the \$3 million estimate was a very hard figure.

I have had an opportunity to visit the District of Columbia General Hospital myself, and to see the enormously crowded conditions which exist in the waiting room, and the new X-ray areas, and in many of the outpatient areas. It is an area of great need.

I would certainly hope that in a new budget the committee would be as sympathetic as possible in its consideration of this problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business before the Senate is the request of the Senator from Indiana for unanimous consent to be allowed to offer an amendment at this time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is my understanding. For that purpose, I ask that the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SPONG) be allowed to make a unanimous-consent request because that is the amendment to be modified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair directs its statement to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 404, previously agreed to, be reconsidered and disagreed to; that amendment No. 406 be reconsidered, modified, and agreed to as modified, and that the clerk report the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. President, as far as the proposal being agreed to, it would be desirable if the Senator from Indiana would let us know what we are voting on.

Mr. BAYH. I think we are dealing with two different lines.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will state the first portion of his request.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 404, previously agreed to, be reconsidered and disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, the amendment is reconsidered and rejected.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 406 be reconsidered, modified, and agreed to as modified.

I might say for the benefit of the Senate that this is done to combine the two amendments so that they are not in conflict with each other as far as the mathematics are concerned.

Mr. PROXMIRE. To make it possible to provide funds for the community centers which was the thrust of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana. Is that correct?

Mr. SPONG. No. That is not correct. The Senator from Indiana was correct in stating that what he seeks to do is not related to what I have done.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very good.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia requires unanimous consent that amendment 406 be reconsidered and that it be modified—and that it be reconsidered on that basis—be adopted as modified. Is there objection?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I wish we could get an explanation of what the modification is.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, yes, I do not object at this time, but I would like to know what the modification is, too.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 18, strike out "Provided," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Provided, That \$5,250,000 of this appropriation shall be available for capital outlay for the District of Columbia Department of Corrections: Provided further,".

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from Indiana yield? Does this mean he is satisfied that the community centers he has provided are—

Mr. BAYH. Let me make one motion on behalf of the Senator—if the Senator will permit me, I should like to move that—have unanimous consent that—amendment No. 418 be accepted, despite the fact that the line to which amendment No. 418 addresses itself has been amended previously. This is the request made by the Senator from West Virginia, only he used different verbiage. I think this one will deal with the problem of adding \$500,000, as the Senator discussed earlier, for municipal services at the local level through neighborhood services centers.

The two amendments are not related. Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. SPONG. Has the unanimous-consent request on amendments Nos. 404 and 406 been acted upon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Amendment No. 404 has been acted upon. Now the Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that amendment No. 406 be reconsidered—that it be modified and agreed to as modified.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am not objecting, but I certainly would like to know what the modification is.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I would be glad to tell the Senator from Florida what the modification is. It takes \$335,500 out of the total figure. What the two amendments sought to do was to put money in the appropriations bill to take care of the crime package insofar as a new District jail and improvements at Lorton were concerned, and take out of the appropriations bill the money for a new administration building in the District.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be reconsidered and as modified is agreed to.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that amendment No. 418 be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to know what the amendment does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. Let us read it all.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 4, strike out "\$108,706,000" and insert "\$109,206,000".

On page 3, line 4, strike out "\$39,971,000" and insert "\$40,471,000".

On page 4, line 2, immediately before the period, insert a colon and the following: "Provided further, That \$500,000 of this appropriation shall be available for municipal services at the local level, through Neighborhood Service Centers".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the offering of the amendment of the Senator from Indiana? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I should like to thank the chairman of the committee not only for his work on the whole bill but also for his clear explanation this morning of some of the possible economies which he sees as proper and necessary in the District of Columbia, and with which I agree.

He has pointed out some of the frills that could and should be eliminated over the whole structure of government where we can try to find places for economy. I want the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin to know that although I have been one who has urged him on on a number of occasions to approve larger amounts than he has, I am basically in

accord with his desire to get a dollar's worth of value for every dollar invested in the government of the District of Columbia.

The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) has raised the question of the District of Columbia General Hospital.

Again I want to thank the chairman of the committee for his support of the requests that were made by the Commissioner of the District for a total of \$3.2 million in additional funds for the District of Columbia General Hospital which will permit the addition of 254 people in new positions.

The committee report states on page 39 that no overall reduction is to be made in the 1970 base program for the District of Columbia General Hospital. The committee has been extremely fair with the District in this matter and, as the report notes, the figures which have been recommended here are those which I understand, to the penny, are those requested of the District.

What I should like to say at this point is that I hope the whole community of the District of Columbia not just the Commissioner or the city council, but the whole community, will raise its sights with respect to what is needed at the District of Columbia General Hospital.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD just one example, a letter from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated September 23 of this year, in which it withheld approval of eight of 13 of the laboratories in the District of Columbia General Hospital. Only five were approved as meeting minimal standards of the Public Health Service. This is the kind of situation that cannot be tolerated in any hospital, certainly not one in which the Congress has direct responsibility.

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

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Atlanta, Ga., September 23, 1969.

Dr. JOHN P. NASOU,
Medical Director, District of Columbia General Hospital, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. NASOU: Based upon our on-site examination of your laboratory on August 29, 1969 and a review of your application, we are recommending the Main Laboratory, Division of Pathology be approved for Interstate licensure only in the following categories:

Syphilis serology, urinalysis, histopathology, nonsyphilis serology, and immunohematology.

We cannot recommend approval in the following categories:

Bacteriology, parasitology, endocrinology, hematology, mycology, blood and cerebrospinal fluid chemistry, toxicology, and exfoliative cytology.

Please note that the items of noncompliance indicated on the enclosed "Suggestions for Laboratory Improvement" refer to specific Sections of the Regulations. You should read these Suggestions, and the Regulations, carefully to determine how you may make appropriate corrections.

Enclosed is your license covering the approved categories. We look forward to working with you in this program and will schedule your laboratory for reinspection on or about December 1, 1969.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID J. SENCER, M.D.,
Assistant Surgeon General, Director, National Communicable Disease Center.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I concur with some of the complaints which have been made about the situation at the District of Columbia General Hospital where we find that people with serious health problems and injuries are not treated promptly. In one case in particular, a man with a broken neck had to wait 45 minutes to be moved from one part of the hospital to the other. These are conditions which are so far below the adequate level that they must not and cannot be tolerated.

Thus, Mr. President, in expressing my appreciation to the committee for having gone as far as it went in meeting the requests of the District government, let me say a word beyond these walls to the residents of the National Capital, who must develop a sense of public awareness and conscience so that the area's requests to Congress can be brought up to a level commensurate with need.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Maryland. He has served so well on the District Committee and is an ex officio member of the subcommittee. His interest and his ability in this area have been most helpful.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk two technical amendments and ask that they be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 2, after line 21, insert:

"THE COMMISSION ON REVISION OF CRIMINAL LAWS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

"For expenses necessary to carry out Title X of the Act of December 27, 1967 (81 Stat. 742, 743), establishing The Commission on Revision of the Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia, \$150,000 to remain available until expended."

On page 5, line 3, strike out "\$620,000" and insert "623,000".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Are there further amendments? If not, 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 was read the third time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President—

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, before we vote on the bill, I would like to commend the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Kansas for their diligence with regard to the bill. I particularly would like to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I applaud the efforts he has made to inject a higher degree of efficiency in the operation of the District of Columbia government.

I might say to the Senator that on yesterday, when the hearing on the nomination of a new Deputy Mayor, Mr.

Watt, was being considered, both Mayor Washington and Mr. Watt pledged themselves to work toward a survey of the District government in its entirety, with a view toward seeking every way possible to make the District government more efficient and less expensive.

Again I commend the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator. Of course, we have had much talk in the past about the need for further financial aid for the District, but there is no question that there is a tremendous amount of waste in every sector of the operations of the District government. We must concentrate on more corrective action to remove that waste.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, recently, I have received several communications from responsible civic leaders from the Mount Pleasant, Columbia Heights, and Adams-Morgan areas in the District, expressing their concern that the District of Columbia government has thus far failed to effectively deal with the problems of language, unemployment, and other problems related to Washington's Spanish-speaking Americans.

I believe it is time the District of Columbia government does something about assisting the Spanish-speaking American community. They could do this by establishing within the office of the Mayor an investigating committee who will: first, prepare a report to the Congress on the extent of poverty, hunger, unemployment, and other problems confronting the Spanish-speaking American; and second, make recommendations to the Mayor and Congress as to how to alleviate these problems. I strongly recommend that the city government undertake such a venture immediately.

I find that apparently only the Metropolitan Police Department has recently taken steps to meet the problems of the District's Spanish-speaking citizens and their families. They have done this by assigning several policemen to a Spanish language course. Other than this isolated instance, apparently no other funds are being used by the District of Columbia government to aid Spanish-speaking citizens, and yet, as we look to Arlington County, we find that an office has been specifically established to deal with the problems confronting the Spanish-speaking community. No comparable office has been established for the Spanish-speaking citizens in the District despite the fact there is 10 times the number of Spanish-speaking people living in the District. The information I have is that the Spanish-speaking citizens in Arlington are living under better conditions.

The Spanish-speaking population in the District of Columbia has grown rapidly since the 1960 census. Although there are no accurate numbers on the size of the community, it is estimated there are upwards of 50,000 to 70,000. I am confident that when the facts related to the problems of the Spanish-speaking community are presented to the Mayor and to the Congress, the help that Spanish-speaking people are asking for will be undertaken.

For this reason, I am at this time call-

ing upon the District government, as we consider the District budget, to make the necessary funds available to establish within the office of the Mayor a committee to investigate immediately the problems confronting the Spanish-speaking citizens of this city. Once the problems have been investigated—and it is my hope they will be promptly—and recommendations are presented to the Mayor and the Congress, I would recommend to the District of Columbia government that they continue the special office on Spanish-speaking affairs in order to carry out the recommendations and insure that the various programs reach the Spanish-speaking residents of this city.

Mr. President, as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, I intend to continue following actions of the city government in this respect.

I am taking particular interest in this, Mr. President, not only because I wish to improve conditions for the Spanish speaking here in Washington, D.C., but because I think this will help us focus national attention on a problem which is in fact nationwide. The Spanish-speaking citizens of this Nation, as a group, are living in substandard conditions. They are at the bottom of the totem pole, as an ethnic group, in education, employment, housing, and all the other segments of American society. And, yet, we have been unable to bring the necessary national attention to bear on this situation. Perhaps by focusing national attention on conditions of the Spanish speaking in our Nation's Capital, we can have the necessary attention focused on the disgraceful conditions in other parts of the Nation.

I have sponsored legislation, S. 740, which hopefully will be enacted before we adjourn this year to establish a Cabinet Committee on Opportunities for the Spanish Speaking. This committee will be the spokesmen for the Spanish speaking to the administration and the Congress. However, unless we are able to make all Americans aware of the problems confronting the Spanish speaking of this country, little progress may be made in providing equal opportunities for them.

We have made progress in many areas of the country. In New Mexico, for example, we enjoy a very harmonious tricultural society, with Spanish Americans, American Indians, and other Americans living together as equals. There is still lack of opportunities for some, but they are isolated instances and not as a matter of policy. We must do away with all vestiges of discrimination and lack of opportunity wherever they exist and the place to begin is our Nation's Capital.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point copies of correspondence regarding problems confronting the Spanish speaking here in the District of Columbia, including my letter to Mayor Walter E. Washington of November 6, 1969, on which I am still awaiting a reply; my letter to Gilbert Hahn, Jr., Chairman of the District of Columbia City Council of December 9, 1969; and, correspondence with enclosures from

Mr. George Frain, Secretary of the Adams-Morgan Federations, Inc., Washington, D.C.

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

NOVEMBER 6, 1969.

HON. WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Mayor, District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MAYOR WASHINGTON: I have long wanted to discuss with you personally a matter which has been of great concern to me, and which I feel must be of equal concern to you as well. I speak of the plight of the estimated 50,000 to 70,000 Spanish-speaking residents of the District of Columbia.

As you so well know, the Spanish-speaking residents of the District have in recent years been congregating in the Mt. Pleasant, Columbia Heights, and Adams-Morgan areas. Because of the common problems and common cultural ties, this congregation has been inevitable. As a result, many of the problems have been compounded.

In June of this year, I testified before the Senate Subcommittee on the plight of the Spanish-speaking Americans throughout the country. I also testified in support of my legislation, S. 740, a bill to establish a Cabinet Level Committee on the Opportunities for Spanish-speaking people. I felt it was essential that we have a Federal office, of a cabinet level, to ensure that Federal programs were reaching the Spanish-speaking people.

While it would seem only natural that all Americans should have an opportunity to participate in our Federal programs—especially those designed to assist the underprivileged—it is a fact that the Spanish-speaking American has been left out of the mainstream. Until my testimony, the Congress appeared to be completely ignorant of the fact that the Spanish-speaking people of this country ranked at the bottom of the totem pole on education, employment, housing, poverty, and all the other segments of our society. From what I have seen and from what I have been told, conditions for the Spanish-speaking in Washington, D.C., are no exception.

I wish to enlist your own personal assistance and cooperation in improving the terrible conditions which exist here in the District for Spanish-speaking residents, with the hope that by improving conditions here in the Nation's capital, we can point to our accomplishments here with pride and use our experiences here in improving conditions throughout our Nation. I am hopeful that we may be able to meet on this matter some time in the near future to discuss it in more detail. In the meantime, I would appreciate being supplied with the following information in order that I may be better able to assess the problem here in the District. Your answers to the following questions would be most helpful and appreciated.

1. What is the size of the Spanish-speaking population in the District of Columbia?
2. Are most of these individuals concentrated within one specific area, and if so, where?
3. Are most of these individuals American citizens?
4. What is the educational attainment of the Spanish-speaking American in the District as opposed to the Negro and other Americans?
5. What is the rate of unemployment of the Spanish-American as opposed to the above groups?
6. What percentage of the Spanish-speaking residents in the District live in substandard housing; how does this compare with other groups in the city?
7. Do you have an office within the District Government, or any individuals, whose spe-

cific duties are to assist in the peculiar problems of the Spanish-speaking?

Your response to the above questions would be most helpful to me. Assuring you of my desire to cooperate with and assist you on this and all other problems confronting the District, I am

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senator.

DECEMBER 9, 1969.

Mr. GILBERT HAHN, Jr.,
Chairman, District of Columbia City Council,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN HAHN: I am enclosing a copy of the November 6 letter which I addressed to Mayor Walter Washington expressing my concern for the well being of Spanish-speaking residents in the District of Columbia, and raising a number of questions. I am presently awaiting a response from the Mayor.

I have noted present accounts quoting you as announcing "hearings next March on the problems of the city's Spanish-speaking community. I commend you for this action and anticipate that the hearings will be extremely valuable in pinpointing the problems of this particular group of citizens. I am concerned, however, that the hearings will not be held until next March. I anticipate that one reason I have not received a reply from Mayor Washington to my November 6 letter is because the information I have requested is simply not available. To wait until March for this information would certainly not be acceptable.

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee of the District of Columbia, I wish to assure you of my every interest on behalf, and cooperation in, seeking to improve conditions for the Spanish-speaking citizens of the District. I wish to be of all possible aid to you and to the Mayor in attacking the problems of these citizens.

In order to provide me and the other members of Congress the necessary data that we need, and as promptly as possible, I urge that you reschedule your proposed March hearings for January. This will assist in providing those of us in Congress interested in this matter the additional data that we will need in order to assist wherever we can, and will also permit the City Government to move expeditiously with your present resources and authority to attack the particular problems which your hearings will reveal.

Urging your every cooperation, I am

Sincerely,

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senator.

ADAMS-MORGAN FEDERATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., December 8, 1969.

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONTOYA: Growing concern is being expressed over the problems of the 50,000 Spanish-speaking residents of the District of Columbia, as shown by the attachments which include:

1. An "Open Letter" to Mayor Walter E. Washington, and the D.C. City Council, presented by the Rev. Antonio R. Welty, head of the Good Shepherd United Presbyterian Church in the Adams-Morgan area at 15th and Irving Streets, N.W.

As you will note, Mrs. Geneva K. Valentine, president of our Adams-Morgan Federation, points out the "Open Letter" was unanimously adopted at the conclusion of the luncheon meeting which was attended by two City Councilmen, Vice Chairman Sterling Tucker, and Dr. Henry S. Robinson, Jr.

2. A proposal to teach Spanish to the Police.
3. Hearings by the D.C. City Council on the problems of the Spanish-speaking community.

Rev. Welty, & Carlos Rosario—chairman of "The Committee for the Aid and Development of Latin Americans in the Nation's Capital" ("CADOLANCA"), feel these hearings should be held early in January, as shown by the "Open Letter" attached. We agree, and we urge you to support holding the hearings in January. We feel this is an entirely reasonable request by the Spanish-speaking community. We urge you to write at once.

May we hear from you at your earliest convenience, and please send us copies of any correspondence on the above points.

Respectfully yours,

GEORGE FRAIN,
Secretary.

ADAMS-MORGAN FEDERATION, INC.,
Washington, D.C., December 6, 1969.

Hon. Walter E. Washington, Mayor, and Hon. Gilbert Hahn, Jr., Chairman, and all Members, D.C. City Council:

We note in the *Washington Post* (Dec. 3, page C5) that the City Council will hold hearings "next March on the problems of the city's Spanish-speaking community."

We understand that this March date was decided on because, in the meantime, the City Council would be deeply involved in the development of the District Budget. But it is vitally important to provide funds in the D.C. Budget to help solve the Spanish problems. It is clear that it is absolutely essential to provide funds in the D.C. Budget to aid and help the D.C. Government establish—(1) a permanent office to serve the Spanish-speaking community, and (2) a high-level Spanish-speaking advisory committee in the Office of Mayor Walter E. Washington, to consider and advise the District Government on all problems related to the Spanish-speaking citizens and their families. Arlington County has such an office and it is directed by the Spanish-speaking community, yet the number of Spanish-speaking citizens in the District is 10 times the number in Arlington County; and they are relatively better off, and better provided for, in Arlington.

It is astounding that only the Metropolitan Police Department is taking steps to meet the problems of the District's Spanish-speaking citizens, and only this week the leaders of the Spanish-speaking community met with Dr. Robert Shellow, director of the Pilot Police Project in the Third Police District to start a crash program. This was reported in both the *Washington Post* and *Evening Star* on December 5, attached herewith.

We, the undersigned, urge hearings be held on the Spanish-speaking problems early in January by one or more members of the D.C. City Council so that funds can be included immediately in the D.C. City Budget to help meet these problems by the steps cited above. May we have an immediate answer to this reasonable request, since these problems can not, and must not, be put off year after year? The Spanish-speaking District citizens must no longer be ignored by Congress, the District Government, or the White House.

Sincerely,

Rev. Antonio R. Welty, Good Shepherd United Presbyterian Church; Mrs. Margaret Wilde, reporter, Spanish Panel, Adams-Morgan Federation Conference; Carlos Rosario, Chairman, "Calolanca," 1614 Hobart Street N.W.; Garry Garber, member, Spanish-speaking community; Luis H. Vidana, member, Spanish-speaking community; John J. Schuller, editor, News and Views; Prof. Juan Casasco, City and Regional Planning Department, Catholic University of America; Rev. B. Frank Foster, Assistant Pastor, National Baptist Memorial Church, Inner City Ministry; William K. Scheirer, president, Kalorama Citizens Association; George Frain, administrator-secretary, 18th and Columbia Road Business Association.

DECEMBER 8, 1969.

The above "telegram" to Mayor Walter E. Washington, Chairman Gilbert Hahn, Jr., and all members of the D.C. City Council, was presented to the Adams-Morgan Federation—MEDCO-BLACK ECONOMIC UNION—Conference on December 6 by the Rev. Antonio R. Welty, Pastor, Good Shepherd United Presbyterian Church, at the end of the conference luncheon. City Council Vice Chairman Sterling Tucker, and Councilman Dr. Henry S. Robinson, Jr. were present. After spirited discussion, it was unanimously adopted by a show of hands. We urge immediate scheduling of the Council hearings on the Spanish-speaking problems early in January, 1970, instead of in March 1970 for the reasons stated in this vitally important message to the D.C. City Council.

Mrs. GENEVA K. VALENTINE,

President, Adams-Morgan Federation.

P.S.—There were over 200 people present at the luncheon when the above message (or letter) was adopted. They were drawn from all walks of life and all groups in the Adams-Morgan area. This letter represents a real consensus that immediate steps must be taken to solve the problems of the 50,000 Spanish-speaking citizens of the District of Columbia, most of whom live in the Adams-Morgan-18th & Col. Rd. area, served by the Adams-Morgan Federation. The Rev. Welty's Church has one of the largest Spanish-language congregations in the District of Columbia.

Mrs. GENEVA K. VALENTINE,

President, Adams-Morgan Federation.

COMMITTEE FOR THE AID AND DEVELOPMENT OF LATIN AMERICANS IN THE NATION'S CAPITAL ("CADOLANCA")

Washington, D.C., October 20, 1969.

HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONTOYA: We are writing with regard to two matters (1) we want to express strong support for your bill, S. 740, to establish a Cabinet Committee for Spanish-Speaking People, which we understand has passed the Senate but is log-jammed in the House; and (2) to request you to urge Senators Tydings, Mathias, and Spong to take whatever steps are necessary—including the early establishment of a permanent Spanish-speaking office or Agency in the District Government—to meet the needs of the 50,000 Spanish-speaking District residents—as the needs of Spanish-speaking residents are being met in other major cities from coast-to-coast. We urge you to meet personally with the leaders of the Spanish-speaking community resident in the Nation's Capital which includes six churches, the American Legion Puerto Rican Post 69, Curculo de Puerto Rico, the Coordinating Council for the Metropolitan Area, and CADOLANCA. We would have a delegation of 12 (approx.) to meet with you on this issue—and to meet also with Senators Tydings, Mathias and Spong.

Maryland and Virginia governments, at all levels, State, county, and municipal, are helping their Spanish-speaking residents, but the 50,000 Spanish-speaking citizens of D.C.—whose numbers compare with that of many cities—are largely ignored and by-passed while others unqualified and unfamiliar with their culture and needs speak for them. That there are some 50,000 Spanish-speaking citizens in the District was noted by the *Washington Post* (Dec. 28, 1968) in an article titled "50,000 Latin Good Neighbors Settle Here." The *Sunday Star* (Jan. 5, 1969) published an article titled "The Silent Minority". These 50,000 residents live in the Mt. Pleasant, Columbia Heights, and Adams-Morgan areas—where they are largely concentrated, and in many other areas of the District of Columbia. Spanish-language res-

taurants: Omega, El Caribe have been written up as fine restaurants in the newspapers. They are located on Columbia Road, and a large number of stores, a barber shop are located on Columbia Road, and on 18th Street.

The White House, in a letter dated May 12, 1969, said that: "The condition of Spanish-speaking residents of the District of Columbia is of course a concern to the President. I am sure he would be the first to assert that our efforts in housing, education, and other areas of need have not been adequate. Steps to meet these problems for Spanish-speaking residents of Washington and for others, not only here but across the country, are being pursued and that effort will continue." The 50,000 Spanish-speaking residents of the District are encountering major problems in education, housing, recreation, health, crime—they are often the subject of criminal attack and assault. The requirements of Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 as to bilingual education have never been implemented in the District of Columbia. We invite you and Senators Tydings, Mathias, and Spong to tour the Mt. Pleasant, Columbia Heights, and Adams-Morgan areas and see our problems for yourself at first-hand. We also urge you to meet with us, and to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate D.C. Committee. May we hear from you?

Respectfully yours,

CARLOS ROSARIO,

Chairman.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 3, 1969]
SPANISH HEARINGS

Washington City Council Chairman Gilbert Hahn Jr. said the Council will hold hearings next March on the problems of the city's Spanish-speaking community.

Representatives of that community asked city officials two weeks ago to establish a liaison office through which they could work for the community's betterment.

Hahn said the March hearings will attempt to identify the problems of Washington's Spanish-speaking community and try to find out which of its needs that could be cared for at the municipal level were not being met.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 5, 1969]

GROUP URGES PILOT PROJECT TO TEACH SPANISH TO POLICE

(By Martin Weil)

Representatives of Washington's Spanish-speaking community called yesterday on the police pilot district project to start a crash program of Spanish language training for 10 to 15 policemen.

The representatives said that the city has 50,000 Spanish-speaking people, most of them within the pilot (third) district, who face a "sound barrier" that makes them a "silent majority," often unable to communicate with police.

Dr. Robert Shellow, director of the pilot project, expressed enthusiasm for the community proposal, which asks also that residents be used as teachers. Dr. Shellow said he will work to see that instruction begins as soon as possible.

Carlos Rosario, speaking for 12 Spanish-speaking organizations, called also for hiring bilingual persons at the third district station house. Yesterday's meeting was held at the Spanish Catholic Center, 3055 Mt. Pleasant St. N.W.

Community representatives asked that police be trained in Spanish culture and behavior. While asserting their belief that few Spanish-speaking people violate the law, they cited examples of how misunderstandings can occur when such citizens do meet police.

The Rev. Antonio R. Welty, of the Good Shepherd United Presbyterian Church, told of watching recently as an officer dealt unsympathetically with both a Spanish-speaking man charged with running a red light, and with a Spanish-speaking witness in the man's favor.

In talking with each other, Mr. Welty said, the suspect and his witness used "their hands, their heads, their eyes."

The officer decided they were both drunk, Mr. Welty said. Asked why, Mr. Welty said the officer cited "the way they moved their hands, their heads, their eyes."

"We Spanish-speaking people are different in so many ways" Mr. Welty said. "We are a little more emotional . . . There is a desperate need to train police in the way of living of Spanish-Americans . . ."

Interviewed later, Shellow said he believes that no more than two or three of the 300 officers in the pilot district speak Spanish. To insure 24-hour availability of a Spanish-speaking officer, he said, 10 would be desirable, 15 even better.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Dec. 5, 1969]

TRAIN POLICE IN SPANISH, EDUCATIONAL GROUP ASKS

(By John Flalka)

Members of the District's Spanish-speaking community have asked the city for more involvement in the Pilot Police District Project.

Carlos Rosario, president of the Educational Organization for Latin Americans, a coalition of 12 organizations, said the project should train 10 policemen in Spanish and give more training in the customs of the Spanish community.

The project, a \$1.4 million experiment in improving police services in an inner-city area, is located in the Third Police District, an area in Northwest Washington bounded by L Street, 4th Street, Harvard Street and Connecticut Avenue.

The area also is the home of many of the 50,000 persons of Latin origin living in Washington, Rosario pointed out.

He said that the Spanish community supports the city's attempts to plan an election in the Third District to choose a citizens' board to help determine police policy.

At a press conference held yesterday at the Spanish Catholic Center, 3055 Mount Pleasant St. NW, Rosario and 10 other community leaders said their main concern was the rise in crime.

"President Nixon talks about the silent majority. The Spanish-speaking people are in the silent majority in this town. People are afraid to move here," said Luis Vidana, one of the leaders.

Another, the Rev. Antonio R. Welty of Good Shepherd United Presbyterian Church, said that the problem is compounded when people are unable to express themselves to the police.

"This morning I had a man who had a run-in with a policeman. He was charged with crossing against a red light. This man had a witness, but the police did not recognize him. The policeman thought they both were drunk because they were talking with their hands, and moving their heads and eyes. That's the way we talk," said Welty.

Dr. Robert Shellow, director of the project, said he would take up the question of language and cultural training with the mayor and the chief of police.

"I think what you're asking for here makes a good deal of sense," he said.

Shellow said the department is now paying for Spanish courses for 20 officers at the Washington Technical Institute.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this ques-

tion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. McCARTHY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 221 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Alken	Gore	Moss
Allen	Gravel	Murphy
Allott	Griffin	Muskie
Baker	Gurney	Nelson
Bayh	Hansen	Packwood
Bellmon	Harris	Pearson
Bennett	Hart	Pell
Bible	Hartke	Percy
Boggs	Hatfield	Prouty
Brooke	Holland	Proxmire
Burdick	Hollings	Randolph
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Ribicoff
Byrd, W. Va.	Hughes	Russell
Cannon	Inouye	Saxbe
Case	Jackson	Schweiker
Church	Javits	Scott
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Smith, Ill.
Cotton	Kennedy	Sparkman
Cranston	Long	Spong
Curtis	Magnuson	Stennis
Dodd	Mansfield	Stevens
Dole	Mathias	Talmadge
Dominick	McClellan	Thurmond
Eagleton	McGee	Tower
Eastland	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McIntyre	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Metcalf	Yarborough
Fong	Miller	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Goodell	Montoya	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—8

Anderson	McCarthy	Symington
Ellender	Mundt	Tydings
Goldwater	Pastore	

So the bill (H.R. 14916) was passed.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the

Presiding Officer appointed Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. MONTAYA, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PEARSON, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota conferees on the part of the Senate.

DANGERS OF POLITICAL PARTISANSHIP IN THE FIGHT AGAINST HUNGER

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I take this time today, and I shall be brief, to call the Senate's attention to the issue of hunger, in which we have a burning interest. I address the Senate as a member of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs—of which the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) is the chairman. This issue is very pertinent because the other body is now in committee considering what to do about the food stamp program and is going through the administration bill section by section. We understand that the House Agriculture Committee has already rejected the Senate-passed bill sponsored by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) and me.

We have had in the select committee a very fine spirit of bipartisanship. Only in that way can we achieve our objectives. The select committee is being continued until the end of January.

Mr. President, over 7 months ago, early in his new administration, President Nixon called for substantial improvements in our Federal food programs and for an "end to hunger in America—for all time."

The administration followed up by breaking the redtape barriers that inhibited its predecessor administrations from acting decisively to meet the challenge of hunger in our society. Its record is certainly better than that of the predecessor administrations and it has been responsible for specific highly commendable initiatives, including free food stamps in two South Carolina counties; a supplemental food program for pregnant women and infants in the District of Columbia; a reduction in the number of counties without food assistance programs from nearly 500 at the first of the year to 307 today; the establishment of new food-stamp allotments based on uniform national standards which will enable all participating families to purchase the Department of Agriculture's "economy diet"; a reduction, to the extent permissible under present law, of the amount that a family must pay for its stamp allotment; and new "outreach" efforts.

A number of these steps were taken in response to initiatives of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, on which I have served as the ranking Republican for the past year. The impact and success of these steps thus far is in large part attributable to the select committee's search for bipartisan commitment in the fight against hunger.

Last week, the President convened the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health. The high purpose of the Conference, an end to hunger in the Nation, was a tribute to the President and to Dr. Jean Mayer, his special consultant on nutrition. Most importantly, President Nixon, by being the first President to convene such a conference, be-

came the first to give explicit recognition to the fact that hunger does exist in America. The controversy over the concrete accomplishments of the Conference in no way detracts from its historic significance. It signaled the support of the President and the wide breadth of public support in the Nation—at all levels—for ending hunger in America.

Now, as a result of the Conference recommendations and proposals, I believe the President is in a position to declare that the existence of hunger in the United States constitutes a national emergency and to order the prompt distribution of commodities and free food stamps under existing emergency authority.

We must now move forward from the White House Conference, and in that regard, the select committee has an important role to play. However, the achievement of that objective hinges on a continued spirit of bipartisanship. There must be continued cooperation between the Senate committee and the administration. The committee has cooperated with the administration—particularly with Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin—in pursuing the administration's initiatives.

The administration has also introduced a food stamp bill—which seeks very material reform, although it does not go as far as the Senator from South Dakota and I would like to go or as far as the Senate would like to go.

But now there is a clear and present danger that this spirit and this cooperation could be eroding. We could be headed for a partisan struggle over what to do about hunger in America. And the ending of bipartisanship could signal also a material reduction of our chances of ending hunger and malnutrition—and this would be a tragedy for the hungry poor of our Nation.

I would consider the end of bipartisanship in the select committee a grave mistake.

In this regard, I am concerned about one matter. I have conferred with the chairman of the select committee, the Senator from South Dakota, about this. He knows what I am going to say and is prepared to make his own statement on the subject. Senator McGOVERN, on the television interview show, "Face the Nation," broadcast on Sunday, November 30, said: "I call on the administration to stop this doubletalk and get behind a serious effort to push that bill through the House of Representatives, where it is now blocked."

Senator McGOVERN was referring to the Senate-passed food stamp bill in which some two months ago the Senate adopted a major reform and expansion of the food stamp program. That bill, which could not have been passed without Republican support and is now pending in the House of Representatives, would give the administration the tools that are needed to wage the battle against hunger.

The administration advises me it is not lobbying against or speaking against the Senate-passed bill, and that it does not propose to do so. No good can come from partisan efforts to describe its position in any other way; nor does the

administration deserve such condemnation.

Reference was there made to a memorandum which had fallen into his hands. This was an internal memorandum from an official from the Department of Agriculture, passed on, ostensibly, to the Secretary. I am advised that this particular memorandum was not circulated and that it has no official standing in terms of the administration. It was an internal memorandum and it expressed a particular point of view. It began with a particular official and that is where it ended. The memorandum expressed concern over the costs of the Senate-passed bill. It is understandable in a cost-conscious administration for an official to make that kind of analysis.

No good can come, in my opinion, from part of the efforts to discredit the administration upon this issue, nor do I believe it deserves it.

One of the counter bills on hunger is the school lunch bill. On the school lunch bills pending in the Senate and already passed by the House, to which Senator McGOVERN also referred in the interview, I am advised that the administration has generally expressed a favorable position except for the "special milk" provisions and that it is up to the Senate Agriculture Committee—of which the chairman of the select committee is a member—to take action. Even in that regard, the administration was unfavorable because this is a general program, that does not zero in on the hungry poor. I think that is creditable.

In the televised interview, Senator McGOVERN, referring to the House and Senate Agriculture Committees, also said:

And I do regard them as the principal bottlenecks at the present time to adequate food assistance reform—that, plus the lack of real leadership in the Executive Branch.

Now, I definitely agree that the Agriculture Committees could certainly move more expeditiously in their consideration of these vital antihunger measures, but this is ours—not the executive branch's—problem. Yet, the statements I have quoted regarding the executive branch could, if persisted in, unwittingly undermine the bipartisan effort to combat hunger.

The select committee has brought the attention of the Nation and the power of Congress to bear on appalling conditions of hunger and deprivation. As the ranking Republican member of the committee, I would consider it a grave mistake to draw the lines with the administration on hunger on a partisan basis. I hope the administration will conclude that it should show its support of the Senate-passed reform of the food stamp program. I hope also that the chairman of the select committee will moderate his criticism of the administration in the interest of a framework of balance and objectivity within which there is the best chance for ending hunger in America.

Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from South Dakota. But, first, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from South Da-

kota (Mr. McGOVERN) and 1 minute to the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cook).

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, let me first commend the senior Senator from New York for his statement. I think it once again demonstrates his deep concern about this issue and his sincere desire to see every hungry American receive an adequate diet.

I especially appreciate his comments about the need to maintain a completely bipartisan stance in the effort to end hunger in America. I am sure that Senator JAVITS knows that I am aware of the tremendous contribution that he, as the ranking member of the select committee, and Senator Cook and Senator PERCY and other Republicans on the committee and in the Senate as a whole have made to the great progress we have made this year.

We all know that the passage of the historic food stamp reform bill in the Senate this year would not have been possible without Republican leadership and support.

I also want the Senator from New York to know that I fully appreciate the efforts that have been made by the President and the administration. They have gone further than any previous administration in recognizing the problem and recommending measures to deal with it.

Any statements I have made that might appear critical of the administration's commitment to end hunger have stemmed from my sincere conviction that when we are dealing with this most basic human problem—hunger—it is simply not good enough to do better than we have before. When dealing with hunger, we simply must go all the way—as the bipartisan bill of the select committee did go. I have spoken out of a sense of urgency and commitment, not with an eye to partisan advantage. It is my conviction that there has been a struggle within the administration as to how big a commitment should be made for food assistance. My public comments including my criticism has been designed to strengthen the hand of Secretary Finch, Secretary Hardin, Dr. Mayer and others in the administration who have been pushing as the Senator from New York has for a more adequate food program.

But the position of the administration has been somewhat confusing. For this reason, I am particularly pleased with Senator JAVITS' remarks today.

I am particularly gratified to learn that the President is now "in a position to declare that the existence of hunger in the United States constitutes a national emergency and to order the prompt distribution of commodities and free food stamps under existing emergency authority." Perhaps the Senator from New York and I should join in a call for the declaration of a national emergency. The request that hunger be declared a national emergency was at the top of the list of action recommendations adopted by the President's White House Conference on Nutrition. To meet this request would be a statesman-like response of the highest order. It would surely put to rest the understandable doubts about the administration's response to the White House conference which have been expressed by many of its participants who

have so often been disappointed in the past.

I also join with the senior Senator from New York in calling upon the administration to support the Senate-passed food stamp reform bill. While I am pleased that the administration has now at least adopted a position of neutrality with respect to the Senate food stamp bill and Senator TALMADGE's school lunch bill, I believe, as I know the Senator from New York believes, that the need for food stamp and school lunch reform and for adequate funding of those programs requires the active leadership of the executive branch and action by the Congress.

If the White House Conference on Nutrition demonstrated nothing else, it demonstrated that the day has passed when America's poor families will be satisfied with more promises and more rhetoric. The White House conference by acclamation adopted at its closing session last week an action statement proposed by seven voluntary action task forces. The 3,000 conference participants—including representatives of the food industry, the health professions, religious groups, students, labor, women's organizations as well as the poor and their representatives—called on the President to implement a five-point action priority program.

The first call to action was that the President immediately declare a national hunger emergency and invoke the Disaster Relief Act of 1969, revise food stamp price schedules, implement a food program in every county using section 32 funds, support immediate passage of the Senate food stamp bill, the Talmadge school lunch bill, and instruct schools to provide all children on public assistance with free school meals.

The action statement also called for a guaranteed adequate income, immediate reform of food stamp and school lunch programs, the institution of a national free lunch and breakfast program and transfer of program administration to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I hope that these recommendations will be implemented by the administration and the Congress.

Because questions have been raised about the administration's previous position on school lunch and food stamp legislation, I believe the record should speak for itself. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the following materials be printed in the RECORD.

The first item is a memorandum from the Department of Agriculture dated October 23, 1969, together with a paper entitled "Fact Sheet—S. 2547." As the memorandum states, it was distributed within the administration at the sub-cabinet level. The memorandum states:

The food stamp legislation passed by the Senate is not acceptable to the Administration.

This memorandum will speak for itself.

I ask also that an analysis of this Department of Agriculture memorandum which has been prepared by the staff of the Select Committee on Nutrition be printed in the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that two documents be

printed in the RECORD at this point. The first is a letter to the chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee in response to the chairman's letter of July 8, 1969, requesting an Agriculture Department report on S. 2548, Senator TALMADGE's bill to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts. As this letter states, the department then opposed several of the key reform provisions of S. 2548.

Finally, I ask that an editorial from the Des Moines Register of December 6, 1969, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., October 23, 1969.

From: Phillip C. Olsson, Assistant to Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Consumer Services.

Subject: Food Stamp Legislation.

The draft memorandum on Food Stamp Legislation which was distributed at this morning's Subcabinet Working Committee meeting contains a critical error on page 2.

The projected cost estimate for the Senate Food Stamp bill with a \$4,000 cutoff and our best estimate of participation should read \$5.6 billion.

A corrected draft is enclosed. Would you please destroy any copies which you picked up this morning.

FOOD STAMP LEGISLATION

The food stamp legislation passed by the Senate is not acceptable to the Administration. Its cost is excessive. It would make it hard to limit eligibility to the poor. It is incompatible with the current trend toward more cash assistance. It contains a number of inflexible provisions that would be difficult to administer. These are described in more detail on the attached fact sheet.

The Administration believes that it is urgent and important that the House act on the Administration food stamp proposals. These proposals are contained in H.R. 12222, a bill introduced by Congresswoman Catherine May and 38 of her colleagues.

The changes in food stamp legislation requested by the President will:

1. Provide a participating family with enough stamps to purchase food for a nutritionally adequate diet.
2. Assure that no family pays more than 30% of its income for its food stamp allotment.
3. Provide food stamps at no cost to the very poorest families.
4. Allow simultaneous operation of commodity distribution and food stamp programs.
5. Establish uniform national eligibility standards for recipients.
6. Establish a fair hearing procedure for aggrieved participants.
7. Permissive variable purchase of food stamps is not now included in the bill but an amendment will be requested by the Administration for this purpose.

FACT SHEET—S. 2547

Large Overall Cost: The following table shows projected costs under the Senate and Administration bills:

Cost with best estimate of participation	
Senate with \$4,000 cutoff (billion)-----	\$5.6
Participants (million)-----	21.6
Administration with \$4,000 cutoff (billion)-----	2.4
Participants (million)-----	13.7

The \$2.5 billion authorized by the Senate Bill for fiscal '72 would be inadequate to support the program.

Under each proposal participation is con-

centrated at the lowest income brackets. At higher income levels participants pay larger amounts for their stamps and receive proportionately smaller bonuses. Therefore, participation tends to fall off at higher income levels of any food stamp plan.

Incompatible with Move to Cash Assistance:

Senate Bill Provides: Large allotments of stamps will only be good for a limited range of purchases (chiefly food).

Comment: Families with income below \$150 per month will have more stamps than cash and this will create pressure to use stamps for ineligible purchases in violation of Federal law.

Senate Bill provides: Senate Bill allows purchase of non-food hygiene items and of complete meals by the elderly.

Comment: These special needs could be better met with cash assistance.

Eligibility Not Limited to the Poor: \$4,000 eligibility cutoff contained in Bill inconsistent with \$1,500 allotment at not more than 25% of income.

Comment: If all those people for whom \$1,500 is more than 25% of income are included, families will be eligible up to \$6,000. This embraces 63.5 million possible participants.

Inflexibility: Stamps to be issued by participating retail food stores.

Comment: Difficult to monitor stores that both issue and redeem stamps.

Inflexibility: Households "shall be certified for eligibility solely by execution of an affidavit . . ."

Comment: USDA should be allowed to continue working with HEW toward common procedures of simplified certification.

Inflexibility: Provides that "a household may . . . purchase any amount of coupons less than the full coupon allotment."

Comment: Secretary should have discretion to set levels for variable purchases that will be administrable by local issuing offices.

Inflexibility: Senate bill sets out precise levels for food stamp allotments and free stamp eligibility.

Comment: Preferable to give Secretary discretion to determine these levels within guidelines set by Congress.

ANALYSIS OF DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE MEMORANDUM OPPOSING SENATE FOOD STAMP BILL (S. 2547)¹

Department of Agriculture Memorandum: The food stamp legislation passed by the Senate is not acceptable to the Administration.

Comment: White House Press Secretary, Ron Zeigler, said on September 25 that the President "is very pleased that the Food Stamp Bill has passed [the Senate]." The Press Secretary said that he knew of "no discussion within the White House which indicates that there is going to be a move to forcefully push for another position when it [the Senate bill] goes to the House."

Department of Agriculture Memorandum: Its cost is excessive.

Comment: The cost of the Senate bill is fixed at 1.5 billion dollars for F.Y. 70, 2.0 billion dollars for F.Y. 71 and 2.5 billion dollars for F.Y. 72. The cost is in line with estimates of the likely expense of operating an adequate food stamp program in conjunction with an expanded welfare system and continued economic growth.

Department of Agriculture Memorandum: It would make it hard to limit eligibility to the poor.

Comment: Under the Senate bill the Secretary of Agriculture is specifically authorized to establish an eligibility level of \$4,000 per year. This is only \$400 above the \$3600

poverty line established by OEO December 1, 1969. Since the \$3,600 poverty line is arbitrary and widely regarded as too low, the inclusion of a limited number of near poor Americans in the Food Stamp Program should be seen as an advantage of the Senate bill over other food stamp proposals.

Department of Agriculture Memorandum: "It is incompatible with the current trend toward more cash assistance."

Comment: The food stamp program passed by the Senate is compatible with the trend toward more cash assistance. Like all food stamp programs, it considers welfare payments as income and therefore would be automatically phased out as cash assistance rises to a level which is adequate to provide a family with a nutritious diet.

Department of Agriculture Memorandum: "It contains a number of inflexible provisions that would be difficult to administer."

Comment: While the Senate bill does establish national guidelines for the food stamp program, the Secretary retains the flexibility to vary standards within the guidelines set by the Senate. The purpose of S. 2547, the Senate bill, is to insure minimal adequacy of program benefits without establishing rigid administrative requirements.

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 1. "Provide a participating family with enough stamps to purchase food for a nutritionally adequate diet."

Comment: According to USDA itself the amount of stamps provided under the President's bill is not enough to provide a nutritionally adequate diet. In written testimony prepared for the Nutrition Committee USDA estimates that "less than ten percent" of the families spending \$100 per month for food actually achieve a nutritious diet. Speaking of the \$100 per month "economy" diet the Agricultural Research Service of the USDA says, " * * * Many welfare agencies base their food cost standards on the USDA Low-Cost Food plan (\$125 per month plan written into the Senate bill) which costs about 25 percent more than the Economy Plan."

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 2. "Assure that no family pays more than 30% of its income for its food stamp allotment."

Comment: The Senate bill asks a payment of 25% of family income. The average American family spends only 17 percent of its total income on food.

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 3. "Provide food stamps at no cost to the very poorest families."

Comment: The "very poorest families" under the Administration bill means families earning less than \$360 per year. This figure is 1/10th of the poverty level and 1/4th of the cost of food alone.

Under the Senate bill free stamps would be available to families earning up to \$750 per year. This figure is still only half the cost of buying food alone. Even the \$750 figure leaves many very poor families paying for food stamps. To require families earning less than \$750 per year to pay for their stamps is simply to write them out of the food stamp program.

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 4. "Allow simultaneous operation of commodity distribution and food stamp programs."

Comment: The Administration bill permits simultaneous distribution of commodities and stamps during the transition from the commodity program to the stamp program. The Senate bill requires simultaneous distribution during such transition until participation in the new stamp program equals previous participation in the commodity program. This provision of the Senate bill is designed to prevent participation drops during transition. The Select Committee found earlier this year that participation has declined by an average of 40% and a total

¹ Prepared by the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

of over 1.1 million persons in counties which have switched from commodities to stamps.

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 5. "Establish uniform national eligibility standards for recipients."

Comment: The Administration stamp bill does establish the principle of national standards, but it fails to set guidelines for such standards. It does little to prevent the continued tailoring of program regulations to the availability of appropriations rather than to the need of the hungry.

Claims for the President's food stamp proposal (H.R. 12222): 6. "Permissive variable purchase of food stamps is not now included in the bill but an amendment will be requested by the Administration for this purpose."

Comment: A variable purchase provision is already written into the Senate bill to insure that lump sum purchase requirements will no longer be permitted to keep the poor out of the stamp program.

Department of Agriculture Fact Sheet: "The \$2.5 billion authorized by the Senate bill for fiscal '72 would be inadequate to support the program. The Senate program will cost '5.6 billion' and will have '21.6 million participants' and '63.5 million possible participants.'"

Comment: According to the Agriculture Department fact sheet, the Senate food stamp bill would reach 21.6 million participants at an annual cost which would reach 5.6 billion dollars by 1972. This figure does not appear to take into account either the large new family assistance program which the Administration itself has said will be operating by 1972 or the fact that the Senate bill permits partial purchase of food stamps by recipients. Both of these factors would substantially reduce the 5.6 billion dollar figure cited by the Administration. While it has frequently been testified that it is impossible to calculate the precise cost of a program whose expense varies according to such unpredictable factors as unemployment, it appears that the 2.5 billion dollars authorized by the Senate bill for F.Y. '72 should be sufficient to finance the food stamp program in that year so long as unemployment remains at a low level and the Family Assistance System proposed by the President is fully implemented. If the 2.5 billion dollar figure is not enough to end hunger, it would seem appropriate to raise that figure to an adequate level rather than to propose a less adequate program to fit a low cost figure.

Department of Agriculture Fact Sheet: The Administration plan will cost 2.4 billion and will reach 13.4 million people.

Comment: Neither the 2.4 billion cost or the 13.4 million participation figures for the Administration program have been actually requested by the Administration. If their program will cost 2.4 billion dollars, they should request that amount.

Department of Agriculture Fact Sheet: Incompatible with move to cash assistance.

Comment: The Agriculture Department fact sheet claims that the Senate food stamp bill is incompatible with the move to cash assistance for a number of reasons. It says first that "large allotments of stamps will only be good for a limited range of purchases." It contends that because of this limitation families with incomes below \$150 per month will have more stamps than cash and will therefore, be tempted "to use stamps for ineligible purchases in violation of Federal law." It then reverses itself and criticizes the Senate bill for allowing food stamp users to purchase items necessary for personal cleanliness and hygiene on grounds that these needs "could be better met with cash assistance."

The comment of the Agriculture Department fact sheet with respect to the alleged pressure to use stamps illegally is neither backed by experience with existing food stamp programs nor does it take into account

the fact that the new food stamp program will be operating in conjunction with an expanded family assistance system. The Administration has said that it intends to be operating a liberalized family assistance system by 1972. If this promise is carried out, then there will no longer be a single family in the category which the Agriculture Department claims will be tempted to use food stamps illegally.

Department of Agriculture Fact Sheet: Eligibility not limited to the poor.

While it may be true that the need for items necessary to personal cleanliness could be met with cash assistance, it is not consistent to claim on the one hand that limiting the use of food stamps to the purchase of food creates pressure for illegal use of food stamps and to claim on the other hand that broadening the use of food stamps to include items necessary for personal cleanliness dilutes the program and is an inadequate substitute for cash assistance. The fact is that a clean home and sanitary cooking conditions are prerequisites to proper nutrition and cannot be provided with present or projected welfare level budgets. Unless the food stamp program is expanded to meet these needs they will not be met.

Comment: Contrary to the Agriculture Department fact sheet, the Senate food stamp bill specifically provides the Secretary with the authority to establish a \$4,000 national eligibility limit for the food stamp program. The Secretary is given the flexibility to raise the standard if he feels it is necessary, but the implication that the Senate food stamp bill would require distribution of stamps to "63.5 million participants" is totally false and misleading.

The question as to whether or not a 25% purchase requirement is compatible with a \$4,000 per year eligibility limit can only be answered through actual experience with the program.

If it were to pose a major problem, the Secretary of Agriculture would be free under the Senate bill to raise the eligibility limit to whatever level he felt necessary to eliminate that problem. If it were not a problem the eligibility limit would remain at the \$4,000 level specified in the Senate bill.

Department of Agriculture Fact Sheet: Inflexibility.

Comment: The Agriculture Department memorandum charges that the Senate food stamp program would require issuance of food stamps by participating retail stores. It claims that this sort of issuance would be difficult to monitor. In fact, the Senate food stamp bill simply permits the issuance of food stamps in this manner. It also permits the issuance of food stamps in a number of other specified ways and states that stamps should be issued in whatever manner best insures the participation of needy households.

The Agriculture Department memorandum also criticizes the Senate food stamp bill for permitting certification "solely by execution of an affidavit." It says that "USDA should be allowed to continue working with HEW toward coordinated procedures of simplified certification." Since certification by execution of an affidavit is precisely the same method of certification suggested by the President in his new family assistance system, it is hard to understand why USDA should object to use of this procedure in the food stamp program.

According to the USDA fact sheet, another inflexibility in the Senate bill is its setting of "precise levels for food stamps, allotments and free food stamp eligibility." "It is preferable," says USDA, "to give the Secretary discretion to determine these levels within guidelines set by Congress." It is simply not true that the Senate bill ties the Secretary to precise levels of any kind. Actually, the Senate bill merely establishes minimum requirements. The Secretary is free

to establish whatever levels and allotments he deems appropriate so long as he respects minimum guidelines established by the bill.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDEE,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of July 8, 1969, requested a report on S. 2548 to amend the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts in a number of respects.

The Department does not favor enactment of this bill in its present form. Although this Department believes steps should be taken to improve the child nutrition programs, and we favor many of the concepts in this bill, a number of the provisions of S. 2548 would present serious administrative and operational problems.

1. The first section of the bill provides that appropriations for the child food service programs may be made a year in advance and that the data upon which State apportionments are calculated shall be the program year completed two years immediately prior to the fiscal year for which the appropriation is requested. This section also provides that funds appropriated shall remain available until expended.

The Department does not object to the provisions of this section.

2. Section 2 provides for funding of section 5 or the nonfood assistance phase of the National School Lunch Act in the amounts of \$38 million for fiscal year 1970; \$33 million for fiscal year 1971; \$15 million for fiscal year 1972 and \$10 million for each succeeding fiscal year. The funds are to be apportioned to the States in amounts "which bear the same ratio to the total amount to be apportioned among all the States as the number of schools programed for new or replacement food preparation facilities in all the States."

The Department does not favor enactment of this provision.

Section 5 of the National School Lunch Act has not been funded since the first year after enactment and the appropriation bills for the Department of Agriculture have for many years carried an explicit prohibition against the use of section 5 purposes of any of the funds appropriated for the National School Lunch Program. On the other hand, section 5 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 authorizes assistance in the acquisition of food service equipment by low-income area schools and carries permanent authorization authority. It also provides that States shall finance at least one-fourth of the cost of any equipment financed.

The Department believes this provision of the Child Nutrition Act is preferable to that contained in S. 2548, particularly since the latter in no way differentiates between those schools that can well afford to finance equipment and those that cannot. The use of the number of schools in the apportionment of funds rather than enrollment would also result in serious inequities in the disbursement of funds. Generally, we feel that the factor of enrollment or average daily attendance in schools without a food service combined with a need factor would better reflect the relative magnitude of need in each state.

3. Section 3(a) would authorize the Secretary to provide foods acquired by direct purchase under section 6 of this Act for use in school breakfast programs and to service institutions such as day-care centers, settlement houses and summer recreational projects.

This section also provides for a program of nutritional training and education for workers, cooperators and participants in the broadest sense.

The Department favors this provision. Section 3(b) states that the Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, use this

authority to purchase "highly nutritious foods, especially those foods with a high content of vitamin A or vitamin C."

Both vitamins A and C are essential nutrients. However, as a practical matter, the greatest need lies in assisting schools in meeting the protein requirement. Meat and meat alternates are the most expensive elements of the meal and the most difficult for the schools to finance day-in and day-out. Foods with a good vitamin A content are, for the most part, more palatable to children when served raw rather than cooked. This means that procurement locally is more practical in many instances than a nation-wide purchase program. As for vitamin C, the recommended daily allowances for school-age children were substantially reduced by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Research Council in 1968.

The Department does not believe that it is either necessary or advisable to designate in legislation specific nutrients for special attention. However, we will continue to place emphasis in the section 6 procurement program on foods rich in vitamins A and C as well as those including other important nutrients.

4. Section 4(a) provides for amending State matching requirements by gradually substituting a one-to-one State-Federal matching for the present three-to-one basis. Section 4(b) provides that State tax funds must be used to meet a portion of the matching requirement.

The Department favors utilizing State revenues in financing the National School Lunch Program. At present the States are more than achieving the existing matching requirement by relying on children's payments and local contributions. The Department believes that State revenues should bear at least a portion of what has always been designated the "State share" of National School Lunch costs. If the "State share" is properly borne by State revenues, children's payments and local contributions there will be no need to alter the present three-to-one matching requirement.

5. Section 5 is a technical and clarifying amendment with reference to assistance to State agencies for administrative expenses where more than one State agency is providing direct services to child food service programs.

The Department has no objection to this section.

6. Section 6(a) would place a ceiling of 20 cents on any reduced price meal offered under the School Lunch Program.

The Department does not favor this provision because it imposes a restriction that many schools may not be able to meet until the time comes that fully adequate funding from Federal, State and local sources is assured. This concept could more effectively be fulfilled through program regulations that can be adopted to changing situations.

Section 6(b) provides that in the child food service programs there shall be no overt identification of those children who receive free and reduced price meals.

The Department favors this approach but believes it should be strengthened by requiring that each school's policy and procedures with respect to eligibility for free and reduced price meals should be a publicly announced policy setting forth the specific criteria for eligibility. Only in this way can there be assurance that everyone in the community knows and understands the rules.

Section 6(c) provides a legislative base for strengthening regulations related to the donation of price support and Section 32 foods to schools that do not participate in the National School Lunch Program. The provisions of section 6(c) would enable the Secretary to establish standards for these schools similar to the policies with respect to free meals and nutritional requirements as now apply to

schools in the National School Lunch Program.

The Department favors this provision.

7. Section 7 proposes substantial changes in the administration of section 11 of the National School Lunch Act with respect to special financial assistance to particularly needy schools.

Section 7(a) authorizes \$200 million for section 11 in fiscal year 1970; \$250 million for fiscal year 1971 and \$300 million for fiscal year 1972.

Section 7(b) would, in effect, permit section 11 money to follow the child rather than restricting assistance to reach only eligible schools. Section 7(b) would also authorize reimbursement for up to 80 percent of the cost of operating a lunch program in situations of severe need.

The Department is sympathetic to the intent of these proposals. However, we believe it would be preferable to have an appropriation authority but to eliminate specific authorizations and to amend section 11 to eliminate the criteria involving school eligibility and substitute a simple, direct authority for the Secretary to provide additional assistance for any needy child in any participating school.

8. Section 8 authorizes the issuance of standards relating to the operation of separate food services in a school that are in direct competition with the nonprofit programs assisted under the National School Lunch and Child Nutrition Acts.

The Department favors this provision.

9. Section 9 provides for assistance in a variety of ways to strengthen State and local administration and training in child food service programs.

At the present time, funds are available to assist in strengthening State administration of the food service programs directed primarily to needy children. The Department does not favor the extension of this type of assistance to the local level. Basically, this would involve the Department in financing a part of local administrative costs in thousands of individual school districts throughout the country.

Section 9 would also establish a National Advisory Council on child food programs. Although the Department does not object to the formation of such a Council, it is felt that the proposal should not specify in detail, as it does, the membership of such a Council. As the provision now stands, Council membership would draw from a very limited group of experts.

10. Section 10 extends school food service participation to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This is consistent with the authority in P.L. 90-302 to assist food service operations in the Trust Territories for children in pre-school and summer recreation programs.

There was not sufficient time prior to the hearing of this bill to obtain the advice of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely,

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., September 29, 1969.

HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Your letter of July 23, 1969, requested a report on H.R. 11651, a bill to amend the National School Lunch Act, as amended, to provide funds and authorities to the Department of Agriculture for the purpose of providing free and reduced price meals to needy children not being reached.

This Department is in agreement with the objectives of H.R. 11651. The level of funding proposed in the revised budget for 1970 which has been approved by both Houses of Congress, will fulfill the intent of H.R. 11651 by providing free or reduced price meals for the estimated 6.6 million needy children who

require this level of assistance during the 1969-70 school year.

The total budget request for child feeding for fiscal 1970 is \$638 million. This includes \$133.8 million for cash grants to States for free and reduced price lunches for needy children, for school breakfasts and for assistance in providing equipment to initiate or expand food service in low-income area schools and for State administrative expenses. And \$10,750,000 (of which \$750,000 would be for State administration) would be available to assist in providing food service to children in non-profit day-care centers, settlement houses and summer recreational projects.

In addition to the funds directed specifically to low-income area schools and needy children, \$168 million is proposed for cash grants under the regular school lunch program and \$301.6 million in donated foods for child feeding programs.

The budget request also included \$20 million to continue the special milk program on a limited basis and to shift the bulk of these resources to providing complete meals to children that include milk. The House has passed an appropriation bill that includes \$120 million for the milk program this fiscal year and the Senate has passed an appropriation bill that includes \$104 million. Until this difference and others are resolved in conference, the Department of Agriculture is temporarily operating its programs under a joint resolution of the Congress. Under the terms of the resolution, the special milk program will be continued at last year's rate.

Given these circumstances, the Department recommends that the bill not be passed.

There was not sufficient time prior to the hearing of this bill to obtain the advice of the Bureau of the Budget.

Sincerely,

J. PHIL CAMPBELL,
Under Secretary.

TASK FORCE ACTION STATEMENT

INTRODUCTION

In opening the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, President Nixon said: "This meeting sets the seal of urgency on the national commitment to put an end to hunger and malnutrition due to poverty in America." We who have come here are already firmly dedicated to that goal. The President said: "Our job is to get resources to people in need, and then to let them run their own lives." He did not provide any new or meaningful program by which this can be accomplished. Obviously, he wanted us to do this, and intended that we should do so. To paraphrase the President, we "not only accept the responsibility, (we) claim the responsibility." Therefore, the combined task forces on Voluntary Action by Women, Consumers, Religious Organizations, Community Organizations, Health Organizations, Faculty and Students, and Organized Labor,¹ present the following action priority program:

I. *A national emergency:* There is a hunger and malnutrition emergency in this country today. Therefore the President must immediately declare that a national hunger emergency exists, and under existing authority must now free funds and implement programs to feed all hungry Americans this winter.

II. *Guaranteed adequate income:* The overriding remedy for hunger and malnutrition is a minimum guaranteed adequate cash income with a floor of \$5500 annually (for a family of four). The government must also

¹ The AFL-CIO endorsed the policy statement in principle with no opposition on certain specifics. The Alliance for Labor Action (ALA), including the United Auto Workers, the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, and the International Chemical Workers Union, endorses this statement as written.

guarantee a meaningful job with a living wage to those who can work, elevation of wages and benefits to those presently underemployed, the "adequate income" to those unable to work or find employment, and maximization of the purchasing power of the food dollar for all.

III. Interim food programs: As interim measures only, present food programs must be reformed and expanded immediately in order to assure truly adequate benefits and participation by all who need them in all parts of the country.

IV. Universal school food programs: A national free lunch and breakfast program must be made immediately available to all children, through secondary school and regardless of income, that will provide at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the minimal requirements of the Recommended Dietary Allowance, while respecting cultural food preferences.

V. Running the programs: All administrative responsibilities for all hunger relief and nutrition programs must be shifted from the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture to the U.S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare, with corresponding shifts in Congressional committee responsibilities. The recipients of these programs must have responsibility for local administration of the programs under standards determined at the Federal level.

To put these priorities into action requires the following:

This nation today faces a national hunger and malnutrition emergency. This emergency situation requires emergency action.

While we initiate long-term programs to eliminate hunger in America, action must be taken immediately to deliver food now to the millions of Americans whose chronic malnutrition the nation can no longer tolerate. Only within the context of adequate food now can a program of nutrition education for all Americans have meaning.

We therefore call on the President to adopt immediately the following emergency program to feed hungry people this winter:

(a) Invoke Section 11 of the Disaster Relief Act of 1969 and like statutes in order to supply free food stamps to meet the needs of hungry people.

(b) Instruct the Secretary of Agriculture to immediately revise food stamp price schedules of less than \$100 per month (based on a family of four) and at a maximum cost of 20% of income.

(c) Instruct the United States Department of Agriculture to implement directly a food program in every county and town in the United States within the next three months using all available funds, including the customs receipt funds (Section 32 funds).

(d) Actively support immediate passage and funding of the following essential legislation.

1. The Senate-passed Food Stamp Reform Bill (S. 2547).

2. A School Lunch Program Reform which consists of the Talmadge school lunch bill, the McGovern amendments and the Javits proposals.

3. The Economic Opportunity Act, particularly its section on emergency hunger relief (Section 401, Title X), and without the Green-Gule type state control amendments which will in effect destroy OEO.

(e) Instruct the Department of Agriculture to immediately require that all schools receiving Federal financial and commodity assistance for their lunch and breakfast programs provide free meals to all children whose families are receiving any type of public assistance.

Because each of these actions is either already authorized or embodied in pending legislation, action to meet this emergency can be taken within the next month.

II. GUARANTEED ADEQUATE INCOME

To implement this number one remedy to hunger and malnutrition, the following program is imperative:

(a) The adequate cash income presently at \$5500 annually for a family of four sets a floor. It should automatically follow the cost of living as defined by the Low Standard Budget of the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(b) Establishment of government careers in nutrition and allied health professions, in connection with other private and public efforts to solve simultaneously social problems and unemployment problems. These suggestions alone should provide two million new jobs.

(c) Grants to encourage and support broadly based organizations of low income citizens in local ownership and operation of such services as food production and distribution.

(d) Establishment of housing factories on the order of the automotive industry to serve the dual function of provision of low-cost housing and the provision of jobs at desirable wages. This involves creation of 750,000 to 1 million new jobs to produce 3-4 million housing units.

(e) Extension to all working people of the right to bargain collectively for wages, hours, and working conditions, including the right to strike or boycott when necessary.

(f) Extension of unemployment insurance coverage to working groups presently excluded, such coverage to be on the same terms and conditions as provided for other workers now covered.

(g) Improvement of the scope of Social Security laws with a 50% raise this year, so that the program provides a reasonable return on investment.

(k) Reform of certain pricing, packaging, promotion and other food industry policies and practices which add unnecessarily to the cost of food. This cost inflation is unfair to every consumer and particularly disastrous to the poor. We need:

1. Price reduction through mandatory limitation of promotional and advertising expenditure and other means suggested in the Food Marketing Commission Report.

2. Mandatory price marking and posting which facilitates and simplifies price comparison.

3. Effective inspection and regulation to insure availability of safe nutritious food at fair prices and conditions of sale.

4. Mandatory processing, packaging, and labeling requirements to identify and preserve nutrient content and assure accurate and honest promotion.

5. Encouragement of retail distribution systems which take special account of the needs of the poor.

(I) Establishment of a national prepaid health insurance program and new methods for the delivery of health care and extension of existing health programs to all states. The Medicaid Bill should be fully implemented by 1971.

The task forces feel that it is especially important to note that many of the above programs can be self-supporting and/or income-producing, and none will require appropriations higher than a fraction of the cost of the space program. Together they should create substantial new tax revenue (4 million jobs should produce an average increase of \$5 billion a year in taxes), substantial increase in income through increased buying power, and a saving of \$7 billion of funds misspent under the present public assistance programs.

III. INTERIM FAMILY FOOD PROGRAMS

None of the existing family food programs—food stamps, commodity distribution, emergency food and medical services—provides an adequate diet or permits the participation of all who have need. Major reforms and expansions are necessary to make sure that all people in need have access to an adequate diet until an adequate income becomes a reality.

As an interim measure only, the food stamp program must be altered so that it can become the primary vehicle for providing an

adequate diet to those in need in all parts of the United States and its territories, and on Indian reservations. Free food stamps to those whose income is less than \$100 a month (for a family of four), modification of the price schedule so that no recipient must pay more than 20% of his income for food stamps, national eligibility standards, self-certification, a coupon issuance to all recipients equal to the Low Cost Food Plan of the Department of Agriculture, a several-fold expansion of the program—all are necessary to make the food stamp programs adequate. The commodity distribution program should no longer serve as a means of surplus disposal but should provide direct food aid adequate to a nutritious diet wherever necessary, fully respecting the ethnic and cultural preference of the recipients. Hunger programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity should also be expanded to supplement the above.

We must do the following:

(a) The President should support, and the House quickly approve, the Senate-passed food stamp bill. The program should be fully funded and fully implemented in all parts of the United States and its territories, including Indian reservations, before the end of this fiscal year.

(b) The Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969, particularly the new section on emergency hunger relief (Title 4, Section 401—Title X), should be quickly approved and fully funded by the Congress, without crippling amendments subjecting part or all of the programs to state and local government control.

(c) The Federal Government should immediately initiate food programs in the 321 counties still without them.

IV. UNIVERSAL SCHOOL FOOD PROGRAM

There must be established a national child feeding program which will make available at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the Recommended Dietary Allowance. This is to be accomplished by implementing a free lunch and breakfast program for all pre-school elementary and secondary school children.

To assure maximum participation in the program, the following steps should be taken:

(a) Nutritious food selected shall be consistent with the cultural preferences of the children to be fed.

(b) Funds shall be provided to enable schools, child care centers, and other participating groups lacking adequate facilities for food preparation, to obtain such facilities or to devise ways to provide meals by other means.

(c) Community groups shall be eligible to operate child feeding programs.

(d) Local poor residents must be trained for careers in nutritional planning and food preparation for employment in the program.

(e) Food provided at the schools shall be available at the choice of the children and their parents.

V. RUNNING THE PROGRAMS

There is a conflict of interest established in the U.S. Department of Agriculture in its dual role—primarily the advocate for the producers of food, and secondarily the distributor of food to the needy. Therefore, all programs relating to the provision of food, services, food stamps, commodity distribution and nutrition services should be removed from the administrative jurisdiction of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and be established in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, whose primary concerns are the needs and well-being of the people these programs were created to assist. Within that department, the provisions of food services of all kinds should be tied as closely as possible to the provision of overall comprehensive health care. We call on the President to use his Executive authority to initiate these changes.

To provide maximum coordination, Con-

gressional responsibilities for both funding and programming should be reassigned to coincide with the above administrative changes.

The provisions of food services has too often been thwarted by lack of responsiveness at the state and local governmental levels. The poor should run their own programs. Maximum dignified participation by recipients is insured by transferring organizational and operational responsibilities to duly constituted, broad based, local community organizations of the recipients themselves. Certification, review and auditing must be done entirely at the Federal level to circumvent parochial political implications and to insure the protection of individual rights of those presently living in hunger and despair.

From all corners of this nation we have come together out of a deep concern to end hunger in America now. We feel a heavy sense of obligation to follow through on our commitment and on the commitments of this Conference. We brought with us the diversity that is the American people and we believe there is need for on-going active participation of all people in implementing the recommendations of this Conference.

Therefore, we call upon the organizers of this Conference to provide an effective continuing mechanism by which all of us who have this concern can contribute vigorous continuing leadership to ensure that this Conference produces action. Today is a beginning, not an end, of our commitment to end hunger in America.

And the appropriate beginning is conference-wide adoption of the 5 points.

1. A National Emergency.
2. Guaranteed Adequate Income.
3. Interim Food Programs.
4. Universal School Food Program.
5. Running the Programs.

[From the Des Moines Register, Dec. 6, 1969]

FOOD ACTION, NOT WORDS

Of all the suggestions which emerged from the stormy White House hunger conference this week, the soundest came from the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. It was simply that the House get moving and pass the food stamp bill which cleared the Senate over two months ago.

Representative W. R. Poage (Dem., Tex.), chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, feels food stamps promote laziness. He is keeping the Senate bill on the back shelf, while he holds hearings on watered-down versions of the food stamp bill.

The Senate-passed bill was drafted by Senator George McGovern (Dem., S.D.), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, with the help of three Republican members of the committee. On Sept. 24, in a vote which ranks as a major victory for McGovern's war on hunger, the Senate voted 54-40 to consider his bill instead of the food stamp bill voted out by its own Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee. The McGovern bill was then passed, 78-14.

The McGovern bill goes far beyond provisions of the original Senate committee bill, which generally followed President Nixon's proposal. Food stamp appropriations for fiscal 1969 amounted to \$225 million. Under the McGovern bill, the 1970 appropriation would be \$1.25 billion; the 1971 appropriation, \$2 billion; and the 1972 appropriation, \$2.5 billion.

The bill offers free food stamps in some cases, as for a family of four earning less than \$60 a month or for a family already spending 25 percent of its income on stamps. It provides that where local officials will not run a food stamp program, the secretary of agriculture can take on the job.

The plight of the hungry in this country was relatively ignored until 1967, when the then surgeon general of the United States,

Dr. William H. Stewart, told the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, "we just don't know" the extent of hunger in the nation. "It hasn't been anybody's job," he said. Later, after various investigations began to give some hints as to the extent of the misery, it became the job of Senator McGovern's committee.

Some grim facts spotlighted by the committee—among them, that there are children not getting enough to eat to keep their tape-worms healthy—helped the problem of hunger in America achieve a place in the national conscience. The issue has been showered with some noble phrases, such as Nixon's May 6 special message to Congress, in which he called for "an end to hunger in America itself for all time."

But there have been disturbingly ignoble words, as well—such as Nixon's well-publicized remark to Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin: "You can say that this Administration will have the first far-reaching attack on the problem of hunger in history. Use all the rhetoric, so long as it doesn't cost any money." This remark was quoted (from minutes of an Urban Affairs Council meeting) by Nick Kotz, of The Register's Washington bureau, in an article in Look magazine.

It was natural to suspect that the White House hunger conference was another attempt to delay action by substituting another avalanche of rhetoric. But buried within the avalanche were the words of Abernathy, calling not for another study or formation of another committee or another declaration of policy, but rather for immediate action on a food stamp bill which is a vital weapon in the war on hunger. Its passage would demonstrate more clearly our commitment to the problem than have all the words.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the ranking Republican on the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

He has forthrightly set the record straight in regard to the administration's intentions in the area of food and food distribution programs.

The distinguished Senator from New York pointed out that President Nixon only recently reiterated his call for an "end to hunger in America—for all time."

This is the administration which has first moved to recognize the seriousness of the hunger problem in America. I am delighted that the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) has as much as said that this administration has done more.

Just as the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) has said, I regret very much the partisan tone which has been much in evidence in recent days. I have worked closely with the majority members of the Nutrition Committee and would like to be able to continue to do so.

However, the spirit of bipartisanship must work both ways. This requires a recognition by the Democrats on this committee of the strides the Nixon administration has made in this whole area.

Once again, let me congratulate the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) for his remarks. I might say, in regard to the memorandum under discussion, that it is really unfortunate that it was ever written because I think the Senator from South Dakota would agree with me that

although turned over to the House Agricultural Committee, it was never necessary to write it in the first place, because the bill that was passed by this body and sent to the House would never have moved out of that committee under its present membership.

I can only say that the Senator from New York has been an outstanding advocate for our party on this committee and I certainly hope to be able to continue to work with him, and with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), to make whatever contribution I can towards the elimination of this disgraceful state of affairs in regard to hunger and malnutrition in the United States of America.

Mr. JAVITS. I am very grateful to my colleague for his kind words.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from New York for his very fine statement today and for the work of the select committee.

I have said before, and I say it again, that if the committee is to be used to undercut the administration, whichever administration it may be, it will serve no useful purpose. In fact, it will have a negative impact.

Certainly, there is no place for politics in hunger. There is no reason to pick out the "good guys" or the "bad guys" in this body, or the other body.

I commend Secretary Finch, and Secretary Hardin and Dr. Jean Mayer, and others in this administration, and in past administrations, who have tried to meet this problem head on.

I repeat, I commend the select committee for having prodded the American people into action, but if this is going to be used as a political springboard to undercut the administration, then of course, it should not be allowed to continue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, to complete this discussion, I recall that the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), the former Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Clark, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy of New York, and others on the subcommittee, were the ones who unearthed this enormous problem in Mississippi. I remember the tremendous struggle that took place with Secretary Freeman trying to get something done. He said that the bureaucracy blocked action.

I must pay tribute to the present Secretary of Agriculture that he did not let the bureaucracy block action. We will find that the President is in the same mood.

I welcome very much the fine expressions of cooperation and understanding just made by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN). It indicates a resumption of the bipartisan cooperation which we have enjoyed on that committee and which is so essential to the achievement to the goals we all seek.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The bill (H.R. 13270), the Tax Reform Act of 1969.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk a motion and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) moves that the bill (H.R. 13270) be re-committed to the Committee on Finance with instructions to report back forthwith an amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the bill as passed by the House, containing the provisions of the committee amendment, as reported on November 21, 1969, as amended by all amendments adopted by the Senate prior to the offering of this motion with the following exceptions and modifications:

First. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) relating to a tax credit for expenses of a higher education shall not be included;

Second. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) relating to an exemption from the termination of the investment credit for up to \$20,000 of qualifying investment each year shall not be included;

Third. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) relating to an exemption from the termination of the investment credit for certain investments in depressed areas shall not be included;

Fourth. Section 515 of the committee amendment—relating to total distributions from qualified pension, and so forth, plans—which was stricken by the amendment proposed by the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) shall be restored;

Fifth. The amendment proposed by the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) relating to the medical deduction in the case of individuals who have attained the age of 65 shall not be included;

Sixth. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) relating to a deduction for commuting expenses of disabled persons shall not be included;

Seventh. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) relating to increases in personal exemptions, and making other changes in the provisions of sections 801, 802, and 803 of the committee amendment, shall not be included; and

Eighth. The various amendments proposed with respect to social security benefits—proposed as a new title X of the bill—shall not be included.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the motion strikes provisions from the committee bill. It is not a delaying tactic. If the motion should be approved the bill would be reported back forthwith.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, would the Senator desire the yeas and nays?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, while there are enough Senators present, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, would the Senator be willing to agree to a time limitation on his motion?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would rather wait until the Senator from Tennessee is present to make sure he is protected. I told him I would not get any unanimous-consent agreement while he was not present.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, is the motion amendable?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion consists of instructions to the committee. Therefore, it would be amendable.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, could we agree to consider the amendments en bloc? I would just as soon vote the motion up or down one way or the other.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am going to ask for that later. I did want to wait until the Senator from Tennessee was present to make sure that if he wished to object he would be protected.

I was going to point out that the motion is subject to amendment. Each of these sections would be subject to amendment; however, if we start all over again, we will be back where we were before.

Later I shall ask the Senate for unanimous consent that these sections be considered en bloc in order that we may have a vote on the merits of the issue.

I respect the right of any Senator to vote for his amendment; however, it would only result in moving this matter back into debate.

The effect of the motion very simply would be to strike from the bill the Senate amendments which would result in a loss of revenue in 1970 totaling \$10.65 billion.

There will be a total annual revenue loss of \$12.35 billion when we include the effect of the Ribicoff amendment, which will result in a revenue loss of \$1.7 billion. That provision would become effective in 1972.

The breakdown of the proposals that this motion would delete is as follows:

The Ribicoff amendment, the No. 1 item, would lose \$1.7 billion annually in revenue; however, that would not be lost until 2 years hence.

The Hartke amendment, which reinstated a portion of the 7-percent investment tax credit, would cost \$720 million a year.

Under the Stevens amendment for the depressed areas, which would restore the investment tax credit for depressed areas, we would lose \$70 million a year.

Under the Inouye amendment, which would restore the capital-gains treatment which comes from distribution under pension funds, \$10 million a year would be lost.

Under the Murphy amendment for unlimited deductions for medical expenses after age 65 we would lose \$210 million per year.

Under the Fannin amendment, which deals with the deductions for commuting expenses for disabled persons, and so forth, we would lose \$90 million per year.

The Gore amendment would result in a \$2.3 billion additional loss of revenue in 1970. The additional loss of revenue in 1971 would be \$3.8 billion.

When we add the Ribicoff amendment to it, we have a loss of revenue as the result of Senate action totalling over \$12 billion annually.

The social security amendments that would be deleted involve some \$7.5 billion. That refers to the social security 15 percent increase across-the-board amendment at a cost of \$4.5 billion; this is the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) to raise the minimum to \$100. That would cost another \$2 billion immediately while the second Byrd amendment would cost \$600 million for each of the next 2 years.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Delaware, does not the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader and me pay its own way?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It does after 1972 when the new tax would become effective. It does not do so for the next 3 years.

I am talking now about the loss in fiscal 1970. The Senator is partially correct in his statement, as I was going to point out.

The second Byrd amendment, which reduces the retirement age to 60, while actuarially sound over a long period, results in \$600 million loss in revenue next year.

The Harris amendment would result in a \$150 million annual loss in revenue.

Taking the social security amendments together, we have an annual loss of \$7.25 billion.

The Senate action on social security would drain over \$20 billion from that trust fund during the next 3 years and there is no method provided for financing these extra costs.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, the Senator referred to the second Byrd amendment. While it would have an initial impact on the trust fund in the first year, is it not true that in the long run it would level out so that there would be no overall impact? And does the Senator not also agree that it would not likely go into effect next year because of the triggering mechanism which was added?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct—5 or 10 years hence. However, I am speaking of the triggering effect for the fiscal year 1970 if all of the amendments are agreed to by the Senate and by the conferees. It would result next year in an additional loss of revenue over and beyond what it would be if we had enacted the bill, as reported by the Senate Finance Committee of \$10.650 billion.

Our Government just cannot afford

such a loss in revenue, to do so would be fiscally irresponsible.

That total of \$10.5 billion does not include the Ribicoff amendment which goes into effect a couple of years later. Including that revenue loss in the year 1973 would be \$12.150 billion. The total loss of revenue for the next 2 years, the 2 calendar years of 1970 and 1971, if the Senate bill were enacted into law as it stands now, would be \$22.800 billion. How can we reduce taxes or increase expenditures by such an amount when we are already operating at a deficit.

That is the loss of revenue over and beyond what would have been lost by the bill if the bill approved by the Finance Committee had been approved by the Senate without amendment the day it was reported.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, if the motion is agreed to, would that prohibit a vote in this session on an increase in social security benefits?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It would not. I was getting ready to mention that point. That is why these social security amendments were included. It was the thought of some of us that social security should not be a part of the tax bill.

I have conferred with the chairman of the committee and with all the members on our side of the committee, and we are in complete agreement that the social security bill would be stopped at the desk if this motion were to be agreed to.

We make this as a pledge. The House is acting on a social security measure this week. There is no question about that. I suppose that it will be a 15-percent increase across the board. However, it will be subject to whatever amendments may be offered in the House or the Senate.

We agree, and the chairman of the committee will concur on this, that if this motion is agreed to we will stop the bill at the desk when it comes over so that it can go direct to the Senate Calendar.

The question of whether the Senate wants to vote for or against a 15-percent increase in social security and whether it wants to vote for or against the other social security amendments will all be germane to the social security bill and can be acted upon at that time.

This will assure the Senate that if the motion is carried, the Members of the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on the question of whether they should or should not raise social security benefits before we go home this year.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, if the social security bill from the House comes over and is stopped at the desk, would that bill then be amendable in the Senate?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. It would be the same position as any other bill. The advantage of stopping it at the desk is that it would eliminate the necessity of the bill going to the committee and the committee having to meet, with or without hearings, and order the bill reported. And the members of the Finance Committee will no doubt be tied

up for a day or two in the conference on this bill no matter what we do on the motion.

So, being realistic, I doubt that the Senate Finance Committee would have a chance to hold hearings and report a social security bill. The chairman of the committee and the minority committee members have agreed that we would stop it at the desk, if this amendment is adopted, and then it could be brought before the Senate at the convenience of the leadership.

Mr. BROOKE. That would enable the Senate to vote on an increase in social security benefits in this session, prior to our recess?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct. And the motion is being offered with that understanding.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. SCOTT. That is a very reassuring statement, because I am sure that Senators will want to know about that if they vote to support the Senator's motion to recommit—and I intend to support it, because the President has made it quite clear that the bill in its present form is entirely unacceptable. What I want is a bill. What I want is tax reform. Therefore, I also want to know, as the Senator has given this assurance to the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), that the Senate will have a reasonable expectation of treating the 15-percent increase in social security proposal, now in the other body, in the current session of Congress. It can be so handled only, in my judgment, by stopping it at the door. The other body has that measure before it and reportedly may act on it today.

If we have this reasonable assurance that we can get the social security increase this year, I believe that the Senator's motion offers the Senate an opportunity to go on record with regard to the features of this bill which we may severally and effectively regard as bad. For example, I do not regard as seriously or as ominously bad certain of the amendments which the Senator from Delaware includes in his motion to recommit. But I hope that he will ask that they be voted on en bloc, as he says, in order that we do not have to again go through this lengthy exercise of trying new amendments to the bill by handling his motion other than as a single motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator. I will make that request at the appropriate time, when Members are advised.

I say to the Members that the position I am taking today, to try to hold what I personally consider is a fiscally responsible position, is not taken because we have a Republican President in the White House. I am not offering this as an administration proposal, although I know the President is very much concerned about the revenues loss entailed in this bill.

I remind Senators that a little over a year ago I stood in this same place and took the same position when President Johnson was in the White House. At that time I cosponsored, with the Senator from Florida, a bill which we felt was essential to the country, the 10-percent

surcharge; and I pleaded with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it because I thought our country needed that revenue in order to maintain the solvency of the dollar. I thought that in order to check the threat of inflation that action had to be taken.

I am making the same plea today. I am going to ask at the appropriate time that we can have a vote on this motion en bloc. I would like to think that I am entitled to such a vote, because I feel very strongly that we cannot afford this loss of \$10 billion in revenue next year.

So far as the particular amendments are concerned I cosponsored three similar amendments on prior occasions, but today we just do not have the revenue.

I cosponsored on one occasion the amendment sponsored by the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). I think there is a great deal of merit to the proposal that we allow some form of tax credit for college tuitions, and I am looking forward to the day when we can afford it. But I do not think we can do it today and remain fiscally responsible and make progress toward checking inflation.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I wish to comment on item No. 1, referred to in the Senator's memorandum as the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF). Of course, he and I were cosponsors and the principal sponsors of it. Is it not a fact that this amendment would not become effective until 1972 and that it would not be reflected in revenues until 1973?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I have so stated in my opening remarks. The Senator is correct.

Nevertheless, if we have the revenue to do it in 1972 it could then be done. I shall not be in the Senate, but I look forward to the day when this amendment can be made part of the law. I think it is something Congress should consider whenever the money is available, but we do not have it now.

What I was confronted with was not singling out those amendments which I felt were not meritorious. They all have merit. I took them across the board, on both sides of the aisle.

On a few occasions I have offered in the committee the same amendment that was offered by the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY), and I tried to get it adopted. I think there is merit to it. I think there is great merit to the amendment of the Senator from Arizona. I will not quarrel with the merit of the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee. I know that there is a great deal of sentiment in this country for these exemptions.

The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Colorado would not become effective until 1972. On the other hand, the Gore amendment represents an additional loss in revenue in 1970 of \$2.3 billion beyond the committee bill, and in 1971, \$3.8 billion. But the long-range effect of the Gore amendment is that it would not lose any more revenue than would the committee bill. I think in fairness that it should be stated.

So I am not attacking any of these amendments on their merits; not one of them. I am not discussing their merits. I am discussing only the fiscal impact on our budget for the years 1970 and 1971.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I will yield for a question. I promised the Senator from New York that I would yield to him.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, who has gone a little further with his speech than he thought he would have to, if he would yield to me. We are tying up a number of Senators on another matter. I think we could finish all our business within 15 minutes. I will try to make it 10 minutes. We have the hunger problem before us now. I ask him to yield to me, without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield for 10 minutes to the Senator from New York, without losing my right to the floor.

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

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question on this colloquy?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. If the Senator from Delaware should try to get unanimous consent to consider these items en bloc, would that then prohibit an amendment to strike out one item or another?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No; I have checked with the parliamentarian.

I would hope that such amendments would not be offered, and I am appealing to my colleagues not to do that for this reason: If anyone offers an amendment to protect his amendment, naturally each Member will feel obligated to have his amendment restored, and we shall be back on the merry-go-round.

All I am asking for is a vote on this as a package because I believe we have debated the merits of it. There is no question in my mind that the Senate is on record for these amendments. For example, the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Colorado was adopted by a substantial margin. I do not question the sentiments of the Senate. I would merely like to have one vote. That is all I am asking for.

I was interested in good tax reform measures as early as any other Member of this body. I have been advocating tax reform for years, as Senators know. I regret that this bill has been converted into such a revenue-losing measure. I would like to support it, but I cannot do so unless some adjustment is made.

Since Labor Day our committee has been in session almost daily and occasionally on Saturdays. For months I have neglected other matters in my office for the one purpose of expediting this bill in order to get before the Senate a measure the Senate could support.

But the bill now before us, as amended by the Senate, is not one I can support. I am trying to make one last effort to bring it in line. All I ask is the right to vote on that question.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I would like to make the record clear at this point, because of the debate which has taken place and the discussion between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Colorado that the Senator from Delaware points out the merits of the Ribicoff-Dominick approach in the tax credit and expresses the hope that in some time in the future this legislation is adopted.

The only way to get this philosophy impressed upon the country is to pass it as law.

The Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), and I were well aware of the problems involved insofar as fiscal responsibility and shortfall are concerned. In our discussions we determined why we believed in the principle. We were deeply concerned that there would not be a revenue loss for the coming year. Consequently our amendment affected 1972, which would first show up in 1973 when the tax returns for 1972 were filed.

So the Senator from Colorado, the Senator from New York, and I do believe that we were being very fiscally responsible on a measure that had great popular appeal not only in the Senate but in the country.

I am at a loss to understand why item 1 is included when we were being so careful to make sure there would not be a revenue impact until 1973.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I stated in my remarks that the revenue loss would not take effect until 1973. I shall outline why I still think it should be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I have discussed the possibility of a limitation of debate, hoping we can vote on final passage of the bill today. For that reason, I believe we have an understanding. I will put the request, and see if we can agree to it. I am going to ask that we limit debate on the motion, and on that I am going to ask for time to be controlled by the author of the motion and the Senator from Tennessee.

Then I am going to ask that we have 2 hours on the bill, to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Delaware.

I want to make it clear that if amendments are offered to the motion, the Senator from Louisiana would plan to offer, in the event time on the motion had expired, at such time as seems appropriate, time on the bill to any Senator who wants to offer an amendment to the motion, in order to explain his amendment. No Senator would be foreclosed from making a statement, although we would have a 2-hour limitation on the bill and a 1-hour limitation on the motion, if agreement is reached on the request.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, as I stated earlier, it is my hope that we can

get a straight up-and-down vote on this motion, but I have talked with Senators whose amendments are affected and have assured them that they would be protected. I said that if we agreed to any consent agreement we would have 20 minutes, 10 minutes on each side, on any amendment they wanted to offer.

I hope no amendment will be offered, but I am committed to protecting their rights if Senators want to amend the motion.

Therefore, I would suggest that we have 1 hour on the motion itself to be controlled, as I understand, by the Senator from Tennessee, and myself, equally; and if there should be any amendments offered to the motion that they be limited to 20 minutes, to be divided between the maker of the motion and myself, 10 minutes each; and then on the bill we could have 2 hours.

I think that would protect every Senator's rights. Some Senators who are not presently on the floor could be assured they have this protection.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think it would be better to have more time on the bill, which could be yielded. The reason why I say this is that if a Senator wanted to engage in dilatory tactics—and no Senator has indicated any desire to do so—the kind of consent agreement the Senator is suggesting is even more subject to dilatory tactics than would be the ordinary Senate rules.

My thought would be that if a Senator really needed time, I would be happy to yield him time on the bill. I am sure the Senator from Delaware would be happy to yield some time also, if he had time remaining, to any Senator who needed it.

I would suggest that we have 4 hours on the bill, so that any Senator who wants to offer an amendment can do so. Then we will know that eventually we can vote on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I assure the Senator we can vote on the bill at an early hour. This is not going to be a dilatory tactic. In fact, I talked with the majority leader and told him my plans. If it should develop into such a delaying procedure I would withdraw my motion. I do not anticipate any problem at all in that direction. I only want a vote.

I have promised Senators that there would be no unanimous-consent agreement if they were off the floor unless they were protected in their rights.

I am hoping there will not be any amendments offered, but I would suggest, in case there are that we have 1 hour on the motion itself, equally divided, and 20 minutes on any amendment if there should be one, equally divided between whichever Senator makes the motion and myself. I think we can dispose of this matter in very short order.

Mr. LONG. Could we have an agreement on how many amendments can be offered? For example, if we are going to allocate time for amendments to the amendment, since the Senator's motion would strike, as I understand, about 10 amendments from the bill, I would suggest we have no more than 10 minutes on a side for each amendment, with time allocated for those amendments. That is

200 minutes, if we actually take 20 minutes on each one.

I cannot for the life of me see any reason why any Senator, other than Senators interested in the amendments referred to, would want to offer an amendment to the Senator's motion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I do not think they are going to offer amendments. The only reason I offered that suggestion is that we make haste better if a Senator does not think his rights have been ignored. I told certain other Senators that their rights would be protected whether they were on or off the floor, just as I promised the Senator from Tennessee. He is present and can speak for himself.

I would suggest that we proceed in this way. I am confident it will not delay a vote.

Mr. LONG. I am not going to ask for 20 minutes on amendments. That could go on forever.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Perhaps I can offer a suggestion. I have examined the motion of the distinguished Senator from Delaware to recommit. His instructions would direct the committee to strike out eight amendments. I find that on all amendments, except the amendment relating to the social security benefits and the amendment relating to an increase in personal exemption, items 7 and 8, I voted the same as the Senator from Delaware. In other words, on his first six items, his position and mine have been exactly the same. Therefore, if we could eliminate 7 and 8, I would be wholeheartedly in favor of his amendment. But if I removed from the instructions, or attempted to remove from the instructions, what I do not like, I daresay other Senators would do the same, and that would open up the bill again.

I am willing to have a vote up or down on the motion to recommit, but I realize that if other Senators start offering amendments, I will feel a necessity to do so—which comes to the suggestion I arose to make: If we could agree to a time limitation on the motion to recommit, plus 20 minutes for any amendment to strike out any one of the eight items of instructions, that would limit it to 160 minutes at a maximum.

Mr. LONG. Item 8 is three amendments.

Mr. GORE. I understand it is, but it would all be together by a motion to strike out item 8 in the Senator's instructions.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, suppose I put it this way: I ask unanimous consent that further debate on the motion of the Senator from Delaware be limited to 1 hour, to be divided between the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from Tennessee—the manager or a Senator to be designated by him—and that the time on amendments to the amendments that would be stricken—they are listed as eight, but item 8 is three amendments, one by the Senator from Louisiana and two by the Senator from West Virginia—be limited to 20 minutes, to be divided between the spon-

sor of the amendment and the Senator from Delaware—not to exceed 20 minutes, to be equally divided—and that there be 2 hours of debate on the bill itself, to be controlled by the manager of the bill and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is agreeable.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, does that mean there would not be an opportunity for anyone else, other than the sponsors of the affected amendments, to offer amendments?

Mr. LONG. No; it does not. That is the purpose of asking for 2 hours. If someone else wants to offer something, the manager of the bill and the Senator from Delaware then have 2 hours in which they can yield to Senators who might wish to discuss some thought of theirs, or might wish to bring up some additional item of debate on something that may come up later.

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

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me so that I may propound a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that it is of the utmost importance that Senators understand what will be the situation in the event that this motion of the Senator from Delaware—or, if it be modified, any modification of it—be agreed to, and if the Finance Committee, acting instantaneously, reports back a bill shorn of the amendments, heretofore voted, mentioned by the Senator from Delaware in his motion, or any portions thereof.

Therefore, I make this parliamentary inquiry: In the event of the adoption of the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit, and the immediate action, as directed by that motion, of the committee in reporting back the bill shorn of the various amendments heretofore voted which are recited in the motion, or which may be recited in the motion as modified, the question is, Would the bill still then be in the position it now is; that is, of having passed third reading and being subject to being voted up or down on the question of passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the bill having been read the third time, the question would be on the adoption of what the committee reported back forthwith.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Presiding Officer.

As I understand the ruling of the Presiding Officer—and I think it is correct—it is that, as reported back, the bill would not then be subject to amendment, but the question would be on passage, up or down, in the condition reported back by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As reported back; the Senator is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. Pres-

ident, I might add that having consulted with the Parliamentarian before I made the motion, I concur completely with the ruling. It was for that reason that I waited until after third reading of the bill to make my motion, so that we would not be opening it up for another donnybrook of amendments.

I state again that I advised those whose amendments are proposed to be deleted by my proposal. Senators knew what action I was planning to take here. I have tried to protect their interests so that they will have an opportunity to defend their proposals.

I have checked with the Parliamentarian and am advised that I can ask unanimous consent that the various items in my motion be considered en bloc and that, at the same time, obtaining unanimous consent for that would not preclude any Senator who might wish to offer an amendment to my motion from doing so. Their rights would be protected.

With that understanding I ask unanimous consent that the eight points in my motion be considered en bloc.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I realize that an excellent argument can be made for any one of these amendments, and I realize also that the sponsors of the individual amendments feel very strongly about the merits of their particular amendments and could make a good argument that I should exempt this or that proposal.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG. I have been furnished with a tabulation showing the revenue impact of the various items in the Senator's motion, and I find that the biggest revenue item on the Senator's list includes the amendment I offered, which embodied the provisions of the House bill for an increase in social security benefits.

The Senator need not apologize for moving to strike my amendment. If his motion is agreed to, that is perfectly all right with me. When the House bill comes over, we can pass it. There is no problem about that, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I have discussed the matter with the chairman of the committee, and we agreed that when the House bill comes to the Senate, we would stop it at the desk so that Senators would be assured they would have a chance to vote on that social security measure, as the Senator has stated.

We are trying to protect the rights of all Senators, but I say again, the position I am taking, as the Senator from Louisiana knows, is the same as I took very strongly last year, when President Johnson was in office. I thought then that our fiscal situation was such that we could not afford to do without the revenue in the 10-percent surtax proposal. I feel equally strongly now that we cannot afford to lose this revenue, and I am asking my fellow Senators to give me a straight up or down vote on my motion. I certainly hope amendments to my motion will not be offered, although I un-

derstand we could be confronted with an almost indefinite donnybrook here. I do not want that, and I do not think we are going to get it; but at the same time, I did tell the Senators they would be protected in their rights.

The chairman of the committee has been very generous, and I say that, having worked with him for weeks and months in the committee on this bill. He has done a tremendous job as chairman in trying to get out of the committee and before the Senate a bill balanced as to revenue and one that would provide some tax reform and at the same time give some tax relief in other areas.

What the committee was trying to do was report a bill which would not be a tax increase or a tax reduction bill, but one that would be more or less an equalization of the tax load. We were adding taxes in some areas and distributing the benefits of the tax reduction in other areas to people we thought were now paying more than their proportionate share. This was to be more or less an adjustment bill. For those in the higher brackets we were raising their taxes by raising the capital gains tax or by eliminating some of their benefits under pension plans. While we were eliminating benefits in many areas, at the same time we sought to offset the increases for those in the higher brackets where possible by reducing their rates to 65 percent.

For those we felt had been overburdened with taxes we eliminated over 5 million taxpayers from the tax rolls entirely. We passed on to them the benefits of the revenue gained from the repeal of the investment credit, which is really a tax on corporations of about \$3 billion. We distributed revenue to the low-income groups. The committee bill was a fair bill.

We tried to be fair. I recognize that there are those who may differ with the bill, but we tried to come up with an answer that would not upset the budget in the long run. But since the bill came to the floor of the Senate it has, in the opinion of some of us, gotten out of hand, and I do not think we can afford the impact of its additional \$10 billion loss in revenue. As I stated earlier, one of the biggest items I have in mind, especially for fiscal 1970 and 1971, is the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). This one amendment in 1970 and 1971 would cost the Federal Treasury over \$6 billion. That would be highly inflationary.

However, as I stated earlier, the long-range effect of the Gore amendment a few years hence would not lose any additional revenue from the committee bill. In fact, if I recall correctly, it picks up \$100 million over a period of time and would be less costly when it gets fully implemented.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am very grateful for the forthright statement of the senior Senator from Delaware. There have been a great many loose statements made to the effect that the amendment which I sponsored to increase the personal exemption was fiscal irresponsibility.

The fact is that my amendment replaced other tax relief provisions in the bill and, as the distinguished Senator has just said, the responsible estimates by our technical staff are that, when fully implemented, the amendment which I sponsored would cost an estimated \$100 million less than the tax relief in the bill which my amendment replaced.

I hope that Senators and the American people who read the RECORD will now realize that this is the case. I read editorials and I hear comments to the effect that the Gore amendment is going to bust the budget. As a matter of fact, the Gore amendment, as the able senior Senator from Delaware just said, will, when fully implemented, cost \$100 million less than the provisions in the bill which it replaces.

If we look at it in the short run, the amendment which I offered will just about be even with the revenue gains in the bill in the calendar year 1970.

There is a shortfall in the calendar years 1971 and 1972. However, it would not be enough seriously to affect the budget.

So, I rise to express my gratitude to the able Senator not only for his statement, but also for his responsibility and willingness to refrain completely from misinterpretations of the facts with respect to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I tried to point out in presenting this matter earlier when the Senator was not present, both the short- and long-range effect of this bill. The Senator is correct. At the same time, I outlined the financial effect of the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Colorado, the Ribicoff amendment has no impact whatever in the years 1970 and 1971 but becomes effective after 1972.

I tried to outline statistically exactly what the effect would be of each of these amendments.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. GORE. Mr. President, there is one other distinction that we need to be reminded of. That relates to the difference between the calendar year and the fiscal year.

The Government budget is made on a fiscal-year basis. However, taxes are generally levied and collected with respect to calendar years. So, one can take his choice as to which is the most appropriate period to use. As a matter of fact, the able senior Senator from Delaware has referred to both calendar year and fiscal year.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct, and changes made in the bill will only have half of the effect for fiscal year 1970, whereas in calendar year 1970 it would be fully effective.

I have tried to keep in context the provisions of the various amendments and the impact they would have in the respective years. Likewise, the provisions of the social security amendments will result in a \$7.25 billion drain on the trust fund in 1970, and there would be about the same drain in 1971 and 1972. But in 1973, as the Senator from West Virginia pointed out, there would, under his

amendment, be a tax to offset the cost of his amendment. However, in the next three years under the Byrd amendment and the Long amendment we would have a \$21.75 billion drain from the social security trust fund over and above the revenue being provided.

I recognize that Congress will pass some kind of social security increase measure in this session of the Congress, but surely it will be properly financed.

I am confident that before Congress goes home it will pass some kind of social security measure, but let the increased taxes for that measure be a part of the same bill. However, my tabulation concerns the next 2 years' loss of revenue in this bill, and as I stated, I hope that we can get a vote up or down on this pending motion, which would save this revenue loss.

Last year I introduced President Johnson's tax bill and coupled it with what I thought was an important additional measure providing for expenditure controls and reducing the expenditures by \$6 billion.

A lot of people ask why the surtax was not more successful. It may not be a part of this debate, but I think that it should be mentioned. One reason that the surtax was not successful in controlling inflation was that Congress was a year late in getting it enacted. And after that there was a gradual whittling away by Congress and the administration of the expenditure controls. Expenditure controls were eroded by a series of exemptions, and during the latter half of last year the Federal Reserve Board pumped money into the economy at a faster rate than normal. Both steps contributed to the inflation in my opinion.

Again, if Congress had acted on the administration's recommendations for a repeal of the investment tax credit and extension of the surtax a little earlier, it would have helped. I think Congress could have acted earlier. We delayed and have not acted yet on investment credit. The taxpayers do not know whether they are going to get the tax credit or whether it will be repealed. That has created a problem.

Let us eliminate this uncertainty and take action on the bill, either pass it or do not pass it, and either accept or do not accept my motion. However, we should act so that the taxpayers will know where we stand.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has compiled two tabulations, I believe with the help of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, which show the increases and decreases in revenues from the committee bill which result from the various actions taken here on the floor. One table shows this information on a fiscal year basis and the other is on a calendar year basis. I ask unanimous consent that the tables, which I understand have been laid on Senators desks, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DECREASES (-) AND INCREASES (+) IN TAX LIABILITY AND SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS RESULTING FROM SENATE APPROVED AMENDMENTS AS COMPARED TO SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE BILL, CALENDAR YEARS 1969-1974 AND LONG RUN

[In millions]

	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	Long run
Tax relief for individuals.....		-\$2,251	-\$3,739	+\$85	+\$85	+\$85	-\$85
Investment credit:							
Small business exemption.....	-\$520	-720	-720	-720	-720	-720	-720
Depressed area exemption.....	-10	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70
Medical expenses for aged.....		-225	-225	-225	-225	-225	-225
Transportation deduction for disabled.....		-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90
Exemption for foster children.....	-(1)	-(1)	-(1)	-(1)	-(1)	-(1)	-(1)
Credit for higher education expenses.....				-1,800	-1,800	-1,800	-1,800
Capitalization of certain citrus grove costs.....		+5	+10	+10	+10	+10	+10
Total distributions from pension plans, and so forth.....		-(1)	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
Reduction of audit fee tax on foundations.....		-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
Liberalization of children's support test.....		-75	-75	-75	-75	-75	-75
Alternative capital gains rate provision.....		-50	-65	-80	-80	-80	-80
Accumulation trusts.....		-5	-15	-15	-15	-15	-15
Tax on preference income.....		-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
Real estate.....		(1)	-10	-20	-30	-45	-90
Percentage depletion (molybdenum).....		-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
Total.....	-530	-3,526	-5,049	-3,040	-3,055	-3,080	-3,160
Social security:							
Benefits.....		-5,700	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400
Tax.....					+6,700	+6,700	+6,700
Total including social security.....	-530	-9,226	-11,449	-9,440	-2,755	-2,780	-2,860

† Less than \$2,500,000.

DECREASES (-) AND INCREASES (+) IN TAX RECEIPTS AND SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT PAYMENTS RESULTING FROM SENATE APPROVED AMENDMENTS AS COMPARED TO SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE BILL FISCAL YEARS 1970-74

[In millions]

	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Tax relief for individuals.....	-\$970	-\$3,040	-\$2,095	+\$85	+\$85
Investment credit.....	-585	-780	-790	-790	-790
Medical expenses for aged.....	-25	-225	-225	-225	-225
Transportation deduction for disabled.....	-10	-90	-90	-90	-90
Credit for higher education expenses.....			-180	-1,800	-1,800
Capitalization of certain citrus grove costs.....	(1)	+5	+10	+10	+10
Total distributions from pension plans, and so forth.....	(1)	(1)	-5	-10	-15
Reduction of audit fee tax on foundations.....	-5	-20	-20	-20	-20
Liberalization of children's support test.....	-30	-75	-75	-75	-75
Alternative capital gains rate provision.....	-5	-30	-65	-80	-80
Accumulation trusts.....	(1)	-5	-15	-15	-15
Tax on preference income.....		-20	-20	-20	-20
Real estate.....	(1)	(1)	-10	-25	-30
Percentage depletion (molybdenum).....	(1)	-5	-5	-5	-5
Total.....	-1,630	-4,305	-3,585	-3,045	-3,055
Social Security:					
Benefits.....	-2,600	-6,300	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400
Tax.....				+700	+6,700
Total including social security.....	-4,230	-10,605	-9,985	-8,745	-2,755

† Less than \$2.5 million.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think it is correct to say that the calendar year table shows that the bill as presently tailored, would produce a revenue decrease as compared with the committee's bill of \$530 million this year—1969; in 1970, the decrease would be \$9,226 million; in 1971, it would be \$11,449 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. For 1970 it is \$9,226 million.

Mr. LONG. For 1971, \$11,449 million; for 1972, \$9,440 million; and for 1973, \$2,755 million. It would stay at about that level thereafter. In the long run, the bill as it now stands would result in an additional revenue loss of \$2,860 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The evaluation contained in the Senator's table is a precedent that is desirable. Just as we today are evaluating the revenue impact of this bill, we also at the end of each year, ought to take a look at what we have done, to see where we stand in terms of appropriations, and to determine what is needed in terms of revenue. We should seek to arrive at a balance that would be responsible, so that we would not con-

tinue indefinitely to have the fantastic national debt that at present overhangs the economy and the Nation.

We should think about the economic condition of the country, and all other relevant factors being equal, we should try to raise at least as much money as we spend.

The Senator from Delaware is seeking to provide that, at least so far as this bill is concerned—and that is, after all, what the members of the Committee on Finance have to think about—the Government will not be placed in a very bad fiscal situation.

I think I would vote for the Senator's amendment. If we do not do so, we will have something of this sort in conference. In other words, the House of Representatives, having sent us a tax reform and tax reduction bill that it regarded as being fiscally responsible, will undoubtedly be extremely concerned about the fiscal impact of the bill as it now stands. They will say they sent us a bill that was fiscally responsible, taking into account the inflationary pressures, the budgetary problems, and the various other factors that confront this Nation, its tax system and its economy at this

point, but that we, on the floor of the Senate, played politics and voted for many things with political appeal and many things that are desirable if we can afford them, without providing the funds to pay for all this.

The Senator knows how concerned House conferees can be when they feel the Senate has put many amendments on a basically good bill which do nothing but create mischief. I find it somewhat embarrassing to go into a room with those men, who have been responsible on their side, and tell them that we have overburdened the bill to the tune of approximately \$11 billion.

There is no doubt in my mind that if the Senator's motion is not agreed to, we still will have to take a good amount of the revenue loss out of this bill—in fact, much of what the Senator is seeking to strike from it, including my amendment. So far as I am concerned, I would be content to look at the social security bill when the House sends it to us this week or next week, as the case may be, and consider those items individually and also the administration's objections to putting the program into effect as of January 1. I know they prefer that the effective date be March 1, with the first increased checks being received in April. Also, we could then consider the amendments that have been added to this bill. There is no doubt in my mind that if we consider the social security bill by itself, it will pick up other amendments which may be meritorious and worthy, but I should think we could vote on the social security bill within a week.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think we can. I appreciate the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana.

It should be pointed out that the figures he read from the chart being placed in the RECORD are the differences as compared with the bill reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

The reason I want to make this motion is that if we go to conference with the bill as it is I am afraid that we shall not be able to complete the work in time to get the bill back and signed by the President. Furthermore, it will be

sheer hypocrisy on the part of the Senate to pass this bill in its present form and then expect the conferees to eliminate those same provisions for which they are now voting. Let us each be man enough to take a firm stand. Congress has already waited too long to act on some of these measures.

For example, the investment tax credit: Either this bill becomes law at the end of this year, or there will be no repeal effective for 1969. We cannot repeal the investment tax credit next year and make it retroactive in the calendar year 1969. We have never done that in our committee. This bill would be retroactive to April 18. Soon the taxpayers will be filing their returns. They get their tax returns in the mail the first of the year, and they have a perfect right to compute their tax liability based on the law as it was at the close of the year, and the present law still provides for a 7-percent investment tax credit. We must complete action on this bill within the next few days, or it will be too late. That is why my motion is so important.

The same is true with the excise taxes, which expire December 31, 1969. The surcharge expires at the end of this year. There is no good reason why the Senate has delayed action on these proposals until this late hour.

With my motion I am trying to get a decision as to what the Senate expects the conferees to do if we go to conference. Members may disagree with what I am proposing to do in this motion, but let us vote. I understand their right for disagreement.

I do not know of a single amendment I propose eliminating that I could not give a good argument for and cosponsor if we only had the revenue. I am not attacking any of them on their merits; none at all. I am trying to present the case of each of them as fairly as I can, because I do not think we get anywhere by trying to misrepresent; but the sum total of these amendments which I propose to delete from the bill would result in a revenue loss next year of over \$10 billion.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The Senator has presented this table to us. While it is true that in the long run the revenue impact of what we have done on the floor is not unusual—\$2.8 billion in 1974 and thereafter—it is rather startling to note that as compared to the committee's bill we have an adverse impact on the budget of \$9 billion in 1970 and \$11.4 billion in 1971.

The Senator is well aware that in the Finance Committee—actually, it was on the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware—we proceeded with our bill step by step through our tax raising sections, our reform sections, to see how much money we would raise; and, having tabulated how much we would raise, we then proceeded to see how much tax relief we could provide.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is going about this in an organized fashion, having laid

the whole business before us, to see how much we raise and how much we lose by our actions on the floor. The Senator now is offering a motion to bring the bill back into the balance it had when the committee reported it for next year and the year after.

With all deference to what some of these amendments would do in the long run, as a practical matter we had better be thinking about what we do for 1970 and 1971. The impact on the economy of a revenue shortfall as great as we now have in the bill for these years could be exceedingly inflationary.

The Senator has indicated his desire to retire. I hope he will change his mind, and I believe that hope is shared by every Member of this body.

The good Lord could call us home between now and then. But, there will be other Congresses and other sessions when people can think about what happens to the Government in later years. We had better concern ourselves now about what happens in the immediate future. What the Senator seeks to do at this point is to save the Government approximately \$20 billion in the next 2 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

I call attention to the fact that 17 months ago, on June 30, 1968, the national debt was \$350.7 billion. On November 20 of this year, 17 months later, our national debt was \$369.5 billion, or an average increase of over \$1 billion per month.

We cannot keep going down this road of deficit spending and finance it with the debt. It should be pointed out that a part of this large increase in debt is because the revenues the first 5 months of a fiscal year are always lower than in the second half. So it would not be quite fair to say that we are running behind at the rate of \$1 billion per month, even though the debt has increased that much, because it will average out later. But we are running a deficit of an average of approximately \$700 million per month at this time. We just cannot afford to continue down this road, toward fiscal insolvency. We can have a bond-buyers' strike in this country unless this inflation is brought under control.

I promised to yield to the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL). He has been very patient.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his yielding to me. It has been a pleasure to listen to the Senator from Delaware, and I commend him for his motion. I intend to support it.

I wish to congratulate him for the tremendous contribution he has made to this legislation in committee and in debate on the floor of the Senate. He has made a tremendous contribution over the years in connection with tax legislation.

In the past weeks the Senate has virtually washed tax reform away in a deluge of indiscriminate tax cuts.

We have before us now a bill which is nothing more than an overstuffed Christmas stocking. In its present form, it is not so much a tax reform as a tax relief measure. Its overall impact will not strengthen the Federal tax structure

while eliminating inequities. Its wholesale tax cuts will feed inflation and take away revenues desperately needed to meet the social problems facing this Nation. This is particularly true in the next 2 fiscal years.

Amendments to the tax reform bill adopted on the Senate floor will cost about \$10 billion a year in each of the next 3 years. Much of this additional cost is attributable to two amendments which I would have favored under circumstances of fiscal responsibility with the provision of adequate revenue to pay for them, but had to oppose under present circumstances because of their inflationary effect. These are the increase in the personal exemption from \$600 to \$800 and the increase in social security minimum benefits to \$100.

Surely, even in the Christmas season we cannot afford to be so prodigal.

A revenue loss of the magnitude contemplated by the Senate bill will gravely aggravate the inflation this Nation is now facing—thus further eroding the savings of millions of Americans and diminishing the purchasing power of their earnings.

Perhaps still more serious, such a loss will make it impossible for the Federal Government to provide effective programs for alleviating poverty, hunger, and urban decay.

Frankly, I find it difficult to comprehend how some of my colleagues, who have been highly vocal in calling for massive new programs at the Federal level for dealing with our social problems, could support enormous cuts in tax revenues needed to fund these programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG in the chair). All time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 additional minutes on the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, it is difficult enough under present budgetary limitations to provide sufficient funds for welfare reform, revenue sharing, and adequate health, urban rehabilitation, education and job training programs. It is stating the obvious that a reduction of billions of dollars in Federal revenues will make it literally impossible to finance these efforts at adequate levels.

Our budgetary problems have been aggravated by excessive military spending that many of my colleagues and I have opposed. Such military spending, however, remains a reality. The bitter experience of many years suggests that if revenues are cut, it will be domestic programs, not military expenditures, that will suffer most.

I have long been an advocate of tax reform to make the tax structure more equitable and to eliminate the favoritism that now exists in the tax laws for special interest groups.

There are tax reform provisions of this bill that are improvements over present law—such as the imposition of a minimum tax on many wealthy individuals who are now escaping taxation through various deductions; a low income allowance for the poor; a limitation on hobby farm losses for the rich; and various other loophole-closing measures. Several

of these reform measures should, however, have been made much tougher.

In a number of respects, this bill is an improvement over the House bill. It has, for example, eliminated provisions of the House bill that would have made it difficult or impossible for States and localities to obtain financing for needed capital improvements. It adopted more sensible rules for the treatment of capital gains and charitable contributions. And it mitigated the highly punitive provisions of the House bill regarding private foundations.

I very much hope these improvements will prevail in conference.

In other respects, the Senate bill has been unduly solicitous of private interest groups, at the expense of real reform. A glaring example is the oil depletion allowance—which was reduced in the House to 20 percent but only decreased to 23 percent in the Senate.

The Senate bill should be judged, however, not on its individual provisions, but on its total impact.

It has become a wholesale tax cutting bill more than a tax reform bill.

Its tax cuts are so deep as to cripple our economy and hamstring our efforts to solve the Nation's pressing social programs, particularly in the next 2 years.

Its total impact, in short, is negative. I shall vote against the bill in its present form.

Mr. President, I shall support the motion of the Senator from Delaware to recommit the bill. If the Senator's motion is not agreed to, I shall vote against the bill on the final vote.

I might say to the Senator from Delaware that I was a cosponsor of one of the amendments to which the Senator refers, namely, the tax credit for expenses of higher education. I regret that he has included that proposal, because the Senate at my request amended it so as to have deferred its fiscal impact until taxable year 1973. As much as I have favored this educational tax credit for the 10 years I have been in the House and the Senate, I did not feel we could responsibly put it into effect before 1973.

However, since the Senator from Delaware has included the educational tax credit in his proposal, I want him to know I do not intend to offer an amendment to delete it from his motion to recommit. I believe the Senator from Delaware should have an opportunity to have a vote up or down on his entire motion.

I believe the overall impact of the motion to recommit is so meritorious that even though I do not agree with all its provisions, I will support it.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall yield in just a moment.

The Senator mentioned the fact we do not have as much reform in this measure now before us as some of us would like to have. I certainly concur in that point, but at the same time I think I should add this comment.

I have explained the financial impact of some of the amendments which I am trying to delete, including the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) and the Senator from

Tennessee (Mr. GORE). I have tried to outline fairly the impact in my remarks. But I should add that throughout the work on this bill in the Committee on Finance and by our efforts on the floor of the Senate we have been together 90 percent of the time in our efforts to get needed tax reform. I compliment both of those Senators on the efforts they have made. I differ with them on this particular motion. I realize that. But at the same time as one who worked to get needed reform, as the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Connecticut know, we have joined together on many of the items.

When it came to trying to get real reform in our Revenue Code I compliment both of those gentlemen for the efforts they made. I wish we had been more successful. At the same time I am now trying to delete a couple of their amendments from the bill which would cost over \$4 billion and which I do not think we can afford. I thought the RECORD should show that.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time in opposition be assigned to the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE).

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, as I listen to the distinguished Senator, I know from my 7 years on the Committee of Finance there is no Senator in this body more interested in reform than the Senator from Delaware. But on listening to the Senator's remarks, I cannot help commenting that if it were not for the reforms the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Tennessee, and myself consistently voted for in committee, and in this Chamber, we would not have this problem because those reforms not only would have closed the loopholes and brought real reform but would have also brought in a considerable amount of revenue.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield at that point?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The record should also show, somewhat in contradiction of the statement of the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), that the reform provisions remaining in the bill, despite the barrage of amendments, will still produce additional revenue over present law of \$5.590 billion. That is to be compared with additional revenue that would have been provided by the reform provisions of the bill as reported by the Finance Committee of \$6.650 billion.

Thus, despite all the talk about the barrage of amendments, and all the votes, the amendments have lessened revenues from reform measures only by one-sixth of added revenue from reforms in the bill when fully implemented.

So those who condemn the bill as being without tax reform are beside the point. They have become victims of the noise.

Unfortunately, amendments were adopted that, in my view, should not have been adopted. I think, by and large, that the Senator from Delaware and I voted together about 90 percent of the time on these amendments.

But, Mr. President, the thing I rose to nail down is that the bill still contains a large measure of tax reform.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct. I made that point earlier. This is the reason for making this motion. We need a bill to go to conference which could become the law.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield for a question?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not true that if we retain those portions in the bill that pick up revenue, including the repeal of the investment credit, extension of the surtax, the other miscellaneous items, and eliminated the tax reduction, a reasonable amount of restrained appropriations and a balanced budget could be a reality?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. It could. I do not know that it could at the end of this fiscal year, but—

Mr. CURTIS. No. This would take a while.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. But I think that should be the No. 1 objective. I do not think we shall get control of inflation until we can convince the American people that we are going to stop pyramiding the national debt and balance this Federal budget.

Mr. CURTIS. That is why the vote coming up on recommitment is one of the most far-reaching votes that will be cast in this Congress, or perhaps the next. It is the one chance to obtain a balanced budget. If we miss this, we may miss it for a long, long time.

Also, if we miss it, does not the Senator from Delaware agree that we will have rendered a disservice to the American people, both now and future years?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is my opinion. While tax reductions are very attractive and everyone would like to reduce taxes, I do not believe we should lose sight of the fact that for each 1-percent increase in the cost of living it adds \$5 billion to the cost of consumer goods. Thus, we would be taking that money away by fanning the fires of inflation.

Inflation, which I recall was around 6 percent last year, has got to be checked. We have got to bring it under control.

Say a wage earner gets a salary increase. It looks nice. He will get more money. But before he can get home the increase in the cost of living, in groceries, in clothes, and so forth, will have so advanced in price that his salary increase has been gobbled up.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the Senator believe that the voters of any State in the Union will not demand reductions if we have to borrow the money to do it?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Personally, I do not think so. It is not sound practice to cut taxes with borrowed money.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it not also true that if we increase the national debt by \$1 billion, at the present cost of borrowing money we would add to the burden of carrying the interest at least \$60 million a year, and that \$60 million a year will have to be paid year after year after year, until a Congress is elected which will

have the courage to start paying off on the debt; is that not correct?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Government the other day paid 7½ percent for an 8-year bond. So it will cost \$77 million.

Mr. CURTIS. I understand that, but I am figuring it over the long run.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished former Governor of Alabama, the Honorable George Wallace, appeared today on a national television program which originated in Washington.

Governor Wallace endorsed an increase in the personal exemption as a method of tax relief.

From this, I have taken encouragement in two respects:

First, the influence of Governor Wallace may prove helpful in the conference between the House and the Senate in securing adoption of the Gore amendment. I appreciate his endorsement and welcome his assistance. All assistance is needed. Indeed, every ounce of support on behalf of the people will be needed in that conference, because there are great forces arrayed against the amendment. They are arrayed against the amendment because this benefit for the mass of the people of this country will replace the benefit proposed for the few by the Nixon-Agnew administration. The few are powerful and they have friends in very high places. All of the strength of the White House, the President, the Vice President, the Department of the Treasury, and their political affiliates are moving heaven and earth to defeat the amendment.

The distinguished former Governor of Alabama is a man who has been demonstrated to command the loyalty, respect, and support of millions of Americans.

As a candidate for President, he ran second in the State of Tennessee, and a close second. The people who supported him in my State were, largely, working people, largely people who have been friends and supporters of mine because in my career my efforts have been devoted earnestly to an improvement of the economic status of the people who toil.

So I take encouragement from the endorsement by Governor Wallace of this method of tax relief as one more piece of evidence that I represent the wish and the will of the mass of men and women, young and old, in Tennessee for economic justice which, I think, is demonstrated by the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD excerpts from the remarks of Governor Wallace on the television interview this morning.

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

Well, I advocated during the presidential campaign a \$1200 tax exemption, the same as Senator Allen has introduced. The \$800 is a

start but it is not enough. It should go more than \$800; it should be at least \$1000 or \$1200. I don't consider it inflationary. I consider the high government spending that brings no return to the American people as inflationary. And I say this Administration ought to remove the inequities in the tax structure that let the filthy, multi-million-dollar rich—such as the foundations—get by scot free while every working man and little businessman and little farmer has his nose to the grindstone. And this Administration must give tax relief to this mass of people in our country or they are going to find that it is one of the prime issues of 1972.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, much has been said and written about fiscal responsibility with respect to this bill. I have a tabulation of measures rejected by the Senate that would have increased revenues to the Government in the sum of \$4.170 billion. These amendments were supported by the senior Senator from Tennessee. I do not criticize any of my colleagues in any way when I say that in voting on these amendments there was a composite vote by the members of the minority party of 350 against these revenue-raising measures, and only 71 in favor. The senior Senator from Tennessee supported all these amendments.

So, Mr. President, let us examine the question of fiscal responsibility. The amendment which I offered, and which was adopted by a vote of 58 to 37, does not lose revenue for the Government. Indeed, it represents an increase in revenue of \$100 million, when fully effective, as against the provisions in the committee bill which the amendment replaced, it being a substitute amendment.

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

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Is it not true that the list of the amendments the Senator refers to that would have raised substantial sums of money represents attempted corrections of some of the most glaring and consistent loopholes in our entire Internal Revenue Code?

Mr. GORE. Indeed so, and I am sorry that the Senate did not see fit to adopt them.

Second, I would like to refer to amendments that were adopted by the Senate that lost revenue for the Government. These amendments produced a revenue loss of more than \$3 billion. The senior Senator from Tennessee opposed each of them, but my distinguished colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in large majority, supported them.

So if the performance of Members of this body need be measured by fiscal responsibility, then I submit that the two Members of this body, by the record, whose votes were most closely parallel during this whole fight are the senior Senator from Delaware and the senior Senator from Tennessee.

I am not sure that he claims that as a mark of prideful distinction or association. I do, and I say now on the floor of the Senate that I hope the senior Senator from Delaware will reconsider his decision and offer to serve another term in this body. I know of no one who can adequately fill his shoes.

Mr. President, this has been a very long and arduous task. I suppose the senior Senator from Tennessee has been the most persistent voice for tax reform in the Senate for the last decade. I am glad to say that we are accomplishing tax reform. I do not like to see the bill blackened and discredited because the Senate has, in my view, committed some errors. There is a great deal of tax reform left in the bill—as I have said, reforms that bring in additional revenues of \$5.5 billion. This is a sizable sum, but this is not the end of tax reform. We will try again, and I will try again, to raise the personal exemption to \$1,000, where it should be.

Of course, when we consider that my amendment has a low income allowance of \$1,000, then the \$800 exemption can be realistically interpreted as being equal to \$1,000 in personal exemptions for a family of four.

No, tax reform will not end with this, but despite its shortcomings, this is still a good bill, not in all respects, but, as amended, I would rather have it than not have it.

Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS).

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the pending motion of the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

May I say first, Mr. President, as has already been said, that I think the distinguished Senator from Delaware and the distinguished Senator from Tennessee have been as consistent supporters of real tax reform during this and prior sessions of the Senate as any Member of this body.

None of us can overlook the appearance of serious disease in the economy of this country. The consumer price index on meat, fish, and poultry, for example, rose almost as much during the first 8 months of this year as it did in all the previous 8 years combined.

There have been major increases in prices in the basic industries of steel and copper, for example, whence price increases roll ocean waves throughout the rest of our economy. The President of the United States, very early in his administration, indicated quite clearly that he intended to pursue a hands-off policy in regard to price and wage decisions, even in the basic industries. That has been the policy which he has pursued, and I think very unfortunately and with very seriously detrimental consequences for the economy generally.

I was glad that, at long last, he did alter that hands-off policy to some degree recently; but even then, Mr. President, he only sent out a letter to labor and management representatives, simply urging their support in holding the line on wages and prices. It seemed to me that that was a rather halfhearted effort, which came much too late in the day.

I do not think that the President of the United States ought to try to twist arms out of sockets, but I think most of the economists, the experts on the economy of this country, would say with President Theodore Roosevelt that the Presidency of the United States is "a

bully pulpit." It is the focal point for the moral power and influence of this great people. The Presidency is, today, an office which must be occupied by an activist, and in no field is that more true than in the field of the economy. I think we have seen the consequences of a passive Presidency in regard to wage and price decisions.

Second, Mr. President, I think that the worst thing that has happened in this economy, and the worst thing that could happen in this economy, is the fact that interest rates have been permitted to rise to their highest level in 100 years of this Nation's history. I do not think that this kind of tight money policy serves either the cause of the people of the United States—the plain people of this country—or the cause of curbing inflation. Rather, Mr. President, I think it can be clearly demonstrated that the outrageously high, scandalously high interest rates now in effect in this country fuel the fires of inflation and will, unless curbed, unless acted upon, cause this Nation, I am afraid, to fall upon even more difficult economic times.

The stock market does not, in my judgment, serve as a very good barometer to predict the shortrun future of the economy of the country. However, I think there is merit in the belief of many economists that it does serve as some kind of barometer as to what may happen in the economy for the longer run. We have only to look at what is happening in the stock market, Mr. President, and judge by that standard to find that, unless something happens to right this economy and to cure its serious ills, we may be headed for very serious troubles in the months ahead.

This, incidentally, is the first time in history—or it certainly is the first time in history so far as I know anything about it—that this country has had a conscious policy of raising interest rates at a time when we are trying to publicly finance a major war. That is exactly what we have done during the time of the policies which are now in effect.

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

Mr. HARRIS. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GORE. For those who say that there is no way to control interest rates, I should like to recall a little history. Former Presidents Roosevelt and Truman took this country through World War II and the Korean war maintaining an interest rate on Government obligations of 2.5 percent.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator is quite correct; and, if he will recall, we had before the Senate not long ago a bill which sought to provide more mortgage credit, and at the same time—and as I understood it over the objections of the administration—provide some kind of voluntary credit restraints and credit rationing similar to that system which was in effect during the Korean war. That bill was passed, but that provision was adopted, as I understand it, over the objections of the administration.

Furthermore, as I understand it, there is a bill to provide for a system similar to the kind of system which was in effect during the Korean war presently pending in the House Banking and Currency Committee; and I only hope that finally,

at long last, this administration and its Secretary of the Treasury will reverse themselves, and see that it is not in the public interest, that it is not in the interest of the plain people of this country, to continue this outrageously high interest rate policy which is sapping the strength of our economy, which is killing the housing industry, and which is distorting the economy generally.

The President of the United States has, I think, tremendous powers of suasion—and, more than suasion, of actually holding down interest rates—if he desires to use them. So far as I know—and I have watched it rather closely—to this good moment, the President has yet to say that it is against the national interest, as he sees it, to continue these high interest rates.

Furthermore, the President has lately appointed a man, Dr. Arthur Burns, to the Federal Reserve Board chairmanship; and I would think that, with that appointment of his own man, the President could finally, if he wanted to do so, see that the Federal Reserve Board reversed this high interest rate policy which is causing such tremendous economic troubles in this country—and is going to lead us down the road to a recession, in the eyes of so many economic experts whose opinions I trust—unless it is curbed, unless it is reversed, and unless that is done right away.

I think we have to be fiscally responsible, as well. But I wanted to point out these other items to indicate that we have run the wrong course monetarily, in my judgment, with this tight money policy. We have to be fiscally responsible, as well. That is why so many Senators, in recent months, have stood here and attempted to hold down nonessential expenditures, particularly nonessential military expenditures, to which we have to look first if we are really serious about trying to hold the line on the budget and provide a budget surplus. I hope that we will have greater help from the administration in that regard.

I saw a report on some action in the House Committee on Appropriations the other day to cut substantially from the administration budget request for military expenditures. As I understand it, the administration's position is that it is opposed to such deep cuts.

I think we must be fiscally responsible, and that means responsible not only so far as the amounts of revenue raised are concerned, but responsible also with respect to the amounts spent.

That brings us to this bill. I have tried to be responsible in my votes on the bill. In this time of continuing inflation and rising prices, Congress must be responsible in its fiscal policies, so as not to increase the inflationary pressures.

I voted for the Metcalf amendment, which would have raised an additional \$200 million; for the Tydings amendment, which would have raised an additional \$2.5 billion; and for the Kennedy amendment, which would have raised an additional \$480 million. The total increase in revenue that would have been raised had those amendments been adopted by the Senate was \$3.18 billion above the revenues that are raised by the bill.

I voted against the Ribicoff amend-

ment, which was agreed to and will cost \$1.8 billion in lost revenue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

I voted against the Murphy amendment, which was adopted and will cost \$225 million in lost revenue; against the Tower amendment, which was adopted and will cost \$100 million in lost revenue; against the Hartke amendment, which was adopted and will cost \$1.02 billion in lost revenue; and against the Inouye amendment, which was adopted and will cost \$55 million in lost revenue. The total revenue that will be lost in those amendments, among others which I opposed but which were adopted by the Senate, is \$3.2 billion.

Mr. President, I wish this bill were in better balance. I believe it will be—and it must be—as it comes back from conference.

I could support the motion of the distinguished Senator from Delaware in all particulars except in regard to items 7 and 8. I say, first, in regard to item No. 7, which would strike the increase in personal exemptions, which was adopted by the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), that the attempt to make a distinction in the bill between tax relief and tax reform, to some degree, is, in my judgment, valid.

However, basically and fundamentally, I believe that tax relief is tax reform. Tax relief is a part of tax reform, especially since at the present time and without the pending bill, the lower and middle income tax payers in America are paying more than their fair share of the taxes.

I believe that the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee with regard to personal exemptions provides the kind of tax relief which a great majority of Americans can understand and, in my judgment, a great majority of Americans support.

It is in line with the kind and amount of tax relief which had been granted in the House bill.

I supported an increase in social security benefits to the extent of 15 percent because it seems to me that if any segment of our society is to have some relief from the growing inflation in this country and these alarmingly rising prices in our country, it ought to be this group of Americans.

I support the statements which were made in support of that increase, which is not inflationary and can be paid out of existing rates.

I believe that when the bill comes back from conference, decisions will have to be made weighing revenue and reform which will strike a balance to the degree that the Senate can agree to it.

There is not any question that changes have to be made in the measure along the lines I indicated I had voted. However, since the changes eventually have to be weighed and decided upon in the conference with the House of Representatives, I believe it would be well not to agree to the motion of the Senator from Delaware now, but, instead, to send the bill to the conference committee so that the conferees may begin immediately to work their will upon the measure

and both Houses will have an opportunity to take another look at it.

I believe that we can then hurry along with what I believe is absolutely essential—not next year, but this year—substantial tax relief and tax reform which is long overdue.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee only has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield him 2 minutes in addition on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, there seems to be a great penchant here to equate tax reform with increased revenue to the Federal Government. I would like to get the matter back in perspective, at least as far as my State is concerned.

The investment tax credit has been in effect for the past few years. Just as my State is coming into a period of development, Congress wants to take it away.

We tried to limit the relief provided by my amendment to depressed areas. And Alaska is a depressed area. If my amendment is agreed to it will mean that when new jobs are created in my State, there will be a \$1,050 tax benefit for each new job created by people investing in my State.

The real problem concerning the approach to the bill as far as I am concerned is that no attention has been paid to the impact of what will happen as a result of both the House and Senate bills concerning the decrease in depletion allowance.

I have predicted that the price of gasoline all over the country will go up at least 1.5 cents a gallon. How inflationary is that as compared to continuing the depletion allowance that was built into the fabric of our economy for so many years?

In terms of the total impact of the bill, what will be the effect of the exemption we have voted for the individual taxpayer if the taxpayer gets a \$200 increased exemption over the period of time provided in the bill in individual exemptions? We talk, and the Senator from Oklahoma has just talked, about the concept of the rising interest rates. Instead of complaining about making more money available to individual taxpayers, if we find ways to encourage our people to save, the money made available by increased exemptions would go into the private stream of investments and would decrease interest costs for everyone, including the Federal Government, because more private capital would be available.

When I look at the decrease in tax liability and social security benefits resulting from the Senate approved amendment—and this table predicting the effect of our amendments has been placed on the desk of every Senator—it reminds me of the numbers game in accounting. One can do almost anything with figures. I do not believe that the impact of the Senate action on the bill can be interpreted simply by a look at the Federal Treasury today—we must realize that increased employment means in-

creased tax revenues—increased savings means lower interest costs.

The investment credit is in effect today. By preserving it for small businesses and depressed areas, how in the world have we affected the budget?

I oppose the Senator's motion to recommit because I feel it does not show confidence in the conference committee.

I did not offer the amendment on depressed areas with respect to investment credit until the Hartke amendment was agreed to. I assume that the conference committee will be composed of people who serve on the Finance Committee who were opposed to these amendments to begin with. We have little chance to succeed in the conference committee. Yet, we are asked to make a decision now.

I note that we are not asked to take out all of the amendments agreed to on the floor, but just a selected few. I would like to have my amendment receive the same consideration in the conference committee as the amendments of the Senator from Tennessee or the Senator from Indiana. I am prepared to abide by the decision of the conference committee, but not by a selective recommitment motion which says that we should take out some measures but that the rest of them are OK. Some of the amendments that are not listed in the motion to recommit have a great deal more effect on the budget than my amendment would have.

This table presented to us today states my amendment would cost \$70 million with relation to investment tax credit for depressed areas in the fiscal year 1970. If the Treasury lost \$70 million in 1970 as a result of my amendment, there would be 70,000 people who are currently unemployed and probably on welfare rolls who would be put to work and would be paying taxes.

Anyone who states that we would lose \$70 million from my amendment is completely unrealistic in my opinion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, we have heard much about fiscal responsibility recently, but we have been hearing it from the wrong people.

Some Senators have been moaning and groaning about the revenue loss of the much-needed tax relief now provided for in this bill. They claim it is fiscally irresponsible. Yet when opportunities are presented to them to vote for amendments which would make up for this revenue loss, they are suddenly very quiet about fiscal responsibility.

Where were all the noisy advocates of fiscal responsibility when the Tydings capital gain amendment, the Kennedy minimum income tax amendment, and the Metcalf hobby farmer amendment were being voted on? Not only were these three amendments desirable on equitable grounds, but, in addition, together they would have added at least \$3.2 billion to tax revenues. This sum could easily enough "pay" for the extra \$2.3 billion

that raising the personal exemption would cost.

Those Senators who are attempting to discredit the tax relief voted by the Senate are also including the 15-percent increase in social security as a further revenue loss. But this increase is not a revenue loss to the General Treasury. Social security is paid for out of a self-supporting trust fund which, without this 15-percent increase, would have an unnecessary surplus.

Although done for legislative convenience, it was perhaps a tactical mistake to add the social security to the tax bill. It really has nothing to do with tax relief, but the confusion has given the traditional opponents of social security a chance to distort it as fiscally irresponsible.

Mr. President, "fiscal responsibility," like "law and order," has become an abused term in the American political language. Behind the rhetoric of fiscal responsibility is the clear but unspoken message of the status quo—keep the loopholes open but oppose tax relief for everybody else.

But we should not let the enemies of meaningful tax reform get away with it. In my opinion, those who vote against tax reform are being fiscally irresponsible, not those who vote for tax relief.

Nor should President Nixon be allowed to get away with the rhetoric of fiscal responsibility. If the President had fought for tax reform with the same determination that he exhibited in the ABM and Haynsworth battles, we could have closed these loopholes and had more than enough increased revenue to cover the revenue loss of the barely adequate tax relief voted by the Senate.

Instead, the Nixon administration not only opposed some of the reforms in the House bill, but also wanted to cut the meager relief in the House bill by \$1.7 billion and turn \$1.6 of it over to the corporations in the form of a 2-percent reduction in corporate tax rates.

Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to recommit. The Senate has exercised its responsibility in writing this bill, and I think we must send it on now to the President and let him exercise his function as he sees fit.

I yield the floor.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. GORE. I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I am not going to delay the Senate, but it seems a little difficult—to me, at least—to understand why we should go through 2 weeks of rather heated debate on many of these amendments, take vote after vote on the floor, and decide, as the Senate, what we are going to do, and then be asked to take all this and put it back in committee and vote it out as though we had never considered these items before.

I do not happen to be in agreement with the Senator from Tennessee on his exemption, but the Senate has decided this. I happen to be in favor of the tuition tax credit. It is my recollection that the Senator from Tennessee was not in favor of that. But the Senate has voted on both amendments, and it would seem to me only proper, having had those

votes at this time, that we should send it to conference and see what can be worked out between the differing bills. Heaven knows, we have enough points which differ in both bills to take a rather extensive amount of time in conference if they are going to be gone over with care. So I find great difficulty in seeing why we should do it this way.

Obviously, I could support a motion which provides for taking out the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, and he could support a motion which provides for my amendment for tuition tax credit to be taken out. What we are doing is saying that we should take out all the major things that have been put into the bill after extensive debate by the Senate, and I cannot see the point in going through this type of exercise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SAXBE in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator.

Mr. DOMINICK. Insofar as the tuition tax credit is concerned, on which I have been working for 15 years, that was passed by the Senate once. It was taken out in conference last time on the ground that the revenue loss was too high. This time it was passed by the Senate and its effectiveness was postponed until 1973. It seems to me that there is room in this budget, as we go on, to take another look at this matter. If it looks bad at that time, we can change it around or reduce the amount, but at least we will have established a tax reform principle by which one is allowed to use his own gross earnings to further the national policy of making available the opportunity for more people to have an adequate education. This is the basic principle. It is a total reform concept. It seems to me that, in view of the postponement of the effective date so that there would be no real effect on the budget until 1973—not 1972, as shown in the schedule—we should retain this amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield such time as he desires to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have been informed that the revenue gain from reforms in the bill reported by the committee and as presented to the Senate amounted to \$6.6 billion and that as of now, with all the amendments put in by the Senate, the amount comes to \$5.6 billion. That is still a great deal of reform in my judgment—reform that in the end will distribute the tax burden in our society more equitably.

I would point out, Mr. President, that, to achieve this, the Senate has sweated for a number of days, for long hours, voted time and time again on amendments—20 of them yesterday—and that now the Senate is faced with a proposal to undo in a matter of minutes all the work we have done over the past 2 weeks.

What would be the effect of the loss of the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) and the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) insofar as helping out the overwrought and overpressed parents who are saddled with the high tuition and expense costs of education.

What would happen to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), which would give some small degree of relief to small businessmen—and really small businessmen?

What would happen to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Alaska, who is trying to look after the interests of his State and to compensate, at least in part, for the damages caused by floods, tidal waves, earthquakes, and other disasters?

What would happen to the sound proposal of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), which will provide some consideration for retirees under qualified pension plans?

What would happen to the amendment offered by the distinguished senior Senator from California, which only asks that older Americans be given a full deduction for their medical costs?

What about the amendment proposed by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), relating to a deduction for the commuting expenses of disabled persons?

What about the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, who is trying to raise the income exemption from a piddling \$600 to a mere \$800—and even that through stages? I think the \$600 exemption has been long outmoded, out of date, ridiculous, and in reality without any meaning. Frankly, I do not think the distinguished Senator from Tennessee went far enough. I joined the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) in seeking to raise the exemption rate to \$1,200, and even then I do not think you approach the level in a fashion that gives justice to the people who are being hit the hardest—not the rich, but the poor and the middle income groups. These are the citizens who contribute most of the funds which this Government so willingly takes and which the Senate spends, along with our colleagues in the other body.

Next we find that the pending motion would knock out the social security benefits—15 percent. The administration recommended a 10-percent increase. But that would only cover the increase in the cost of living since the last raise in social security. This motion would knock out as well the proposal of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia and the Senator from Montana, which would raise the social security minimum from \$55 a month to \$100 a month.

Who can live on \$55 a month?

It would also knock out the provision that would lower the eligibility age from 65 to 60 with actuarially reduced benefits and to 50 for women—the latter feature with little or no effect on the fund.

Well, Mr. President, all I can say is I have taken my stand on the bill. I voted for some amendments; I voted against others. I am willing to take my chances when I go back to my people and tell them how I voted, whether it was for a depletion allowance, for an increase of 15 percent in social security payments or for whatever. The record is there. We voted. We know where we stand.

I hope most sincerely the Senate will

reject the motion to recommit the pending bill. I hope most sincerely the Senate refuses to undo now what it has spent more than 2 weeks to achieve.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. MILLER. Maybe I did not hear the Senator from Montana correctly, but would the Senator mind repeating what he told the Senate about the state of the budget for calendar year 1970 under the bill as it has been amended, as against the bill reported by the Committee on Finance?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I did not refer to the state of the budget. I referred to the fact that the revenue gained from reforms by the committee bill was \$6.6 billion, but that as the bill stands now, with all the amendments, there is still a \$5.6 billion gain from reforms.

Mr. GORE. From the reform provisions in the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. From the reform provisions in the bill.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I would like to comment on that statement because, while I am sure these figures are accurate, I do not think they convey the true picture as far as the overall budget is concerned. That is what we have to look at.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We are not talking about the budget, but rather a bill which was reported by the Committee on Finance, a tax reform and tax relief bill. We have expressed our views on it. We had almost 100 votes, I believe. The situation is quite clear. Now is the time to vote it either up or down.

If you are not for the bill, which all of us voted for in part, with one exception, possibly, then I think the best way to do it is to face up to the matter as is; and the best way to do that is to vote down the motion of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I think it is terribly important to look at the budget, that is, the way the budget is under the bill of the Committee on Finance and the way it would be under the bill as now amended with all of these Christmas tree ornaments.

The Senator will find in the committee report that under the committee bill there would be a surplus of \$6.5 billion for calendar year 1970, but under the bill as now amended we would have a deficit of nearly \$3 billion.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Though I did not refer to the budget, I can suggest to the Senator some areas where we could cut that budget. For instance, I think we could cut it very easily in the Defense Department. Indeed, some of the cost overruns on some of its projects alone exceed many revenue items in the tax bill. There are other exotic items that have been funded in the past in the name of Defense that have been wrong decisions. It seems that all the people in the Defense Department have to do is ask and they receive. The fact is, the budget can be cut and redistributed in line with the needs and priorities of this Nation and we in the Congress have had that opportunity every year. With re-

spect to the redistribution of the tax burden, however, it is not often that we have had the opportunity to provide reforms with a view to greater equity; certainly not every year, not even every decade. I hope we take advantage of the opportunity today.

Mr. MILLER. That is not the proposition before the Senate. That proposition will be reached by the Appropriation Committees, by the Senate and the House Committees on Appropriations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator used the word "budget" and to me the defense aspect of the budget comprises the overwhelming part of the money spent.

Mr. MILLER. I thoroughly agree on that, but I must point out to the Senator we are not dealing with the budget here; we are dealing with the Finance Committee bill, and the budget will come along later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) controls the time on the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I agree with the figures which the Senator from Montana has presented here. They are correct. My point is that they do not go far enough in presenting the true picture. If we are so concerned about high interest rates in this country, we had better keep the Federal Government from competing in the money market with private industry and with individuals who want to buy homes. But we cannot do that if we continue to build up deficits.

The best part of the bill of the Committee on Finance was that it assured a surplus. But under the amendments that have been agreed to, which the Senator from Delaware is trying to get off the backs of the American people, we are not going to eliminate this competition from the Federal Government for money. That is the way high interest rates can go down.

Mr. President, I have one further comment. I think we should recognize this fact and I want to repeat it.

When we increase the personal exemption from \$600 to \$800, that means that people like most of my colleagues in the Senate, who are at least in the 50-percent tax bracket, get \$400 in tax benefits for every exemption they have and the little fellow in the 15-percent tax bracket gets a \$120 crumb.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. MILLER. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I think frankly that is a poor excuse when the amendment was offered as a substitute for rate changes which would have given \$10,000 or more in tax reductions for the wealthy. The Senator is talking about a difference between \$400 and \$10,000.

Mr. MILLER. If the Senator's amendment would give every taxpayer a similar tax break, that would be one thing, but to give every Member of Congress a \$400 tax break and the little fellow who is in the 15-percent bracket \$120 is not very much equity and is not tax reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The ques-

tion is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Delaware. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (after having voted in the negative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). If he were present and voting, he would vote yea; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote nay. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON). If he were present and voting, he would vote nay; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote yea. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) would vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent on official business.

The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 31, nays 60, as follows:

[No. 222 Leg.]

YEAS—31

Aiken	Goodell	Pearson
Allott	Griffin	Percy
Baker	Hansen	Russell
Bennett	Holland	Saxbe
Boggs	Hruska	Scott
Brooke	Javits	Smith, Maine
Cooper	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Cotton	Mathias	Tower
Curtis	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dole	Murphy	
Fannin	Packwood	

NAYS—60

Allen	Gurney	Montoya
Bayh	Harris	Moss
Bellmon	Hart	Muskie
Bible	Hartke	Nelson
Burdick	Hatfield	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Prouty
Cannon	Hughes	Proxmire
Case	Inouye	Randolph
Church	Jackson	Ribicoff
Cook	Jordan, N.C.	Schweiker
Cranston	Kennedy	Smith, Ill.
Dodd	Magnuson	Sparkman
Dominick	Mansfield	Spong
Eagleton	McCarthy	Stennis
Eastland	McClellan	Stevens
Ervin	McGee	Talmadge
Fong	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Fulbright	McIntyre	Yarborough
Gore	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Gravel	Mondale	Young, Ohio

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Byrd of West Virginia, against.
Long, for.

NOT VOTING—7

Anderson	Mundt	Tydings
Ellender	Pastore	
Goldwater	Symington	

So the motion to recommit the bill was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on passage of the bill.

Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

I regret very much that the Senate rejected this motion, which would have established some degree of fiscal responsibility as far as this bill is concerned.

I worked hard for the last 3 months trying to get a tax reform bill that would be properly balanced. The bill as it is now before us, which the Senate is about to vote for, as compared with the bill that was reported by the Finance Committee will lose \$10.656 billion next year in additional revenues. That does not count the \$1.7 billion amendment sponsored by the Senator from Connecticut and by the Senator from Colorado, which is in the bill but which does not become effective until 1972.

I do not think we can afford that. We are already confronted with a budget deficit of staggering proportions. I know they are projecting a \$3.4 billion surplus under this unified phoney budget, but that surplus is only based on the premise that they count as normal revenues the \$10.6 billion of accumulations in the trust funds. If those trust fund accumulations were eliminated—which never have been counted before, and they should not be counted—then there is a projected deficit of \$6.8 billion for next year, and that does not include the \$10 billion extra loss in revenue contained in the bill now before us.

In addition, even that deficit is based on the premise that Congress will increase postal rates retroactive to last July. It is also based on the assumption that social security increases will be effective April 1, 1970, instead of January 1, 1970. It does not include the extra \$600 million Congress provided for pollution control. It does not include the \$400 million extra for veterans benefits.

The appropriation for HEW has been increased over \$1 billion. It does not take into consideration any salary increases over and above what have already been provided for in the budget.

There is no question that we are headed into a serious deficit situation next year and that this bill will only further aggravate the problem.

I regret very much that the Senate has turned what was supposed to be a tax reform bill into a political Christmas package which promises everything to everybody when I do not think Members of the Senate ever expect those promises to be delivered.

Senators speaking against my amendment have said, "Let us pass the bill as it is." I have confidence in the conferees. They want to vote for these top reductions on the floor of the Senate, and then they can go home and tell their constituents how they voted for them, but the conferees took it away.

I will not be a party to any such political hypocrisy. I am sure we are going to pass the bill, but as one member of the committee who has worked long and hard on it and who believes in tax reform, I will not be a party to the irresponsible action the Senate is about to take. I am going to vote against the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. If the bill is not passed, is it not true that, from the standpoint of the administrative budget, the deficit will be less than if it is passed?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Benefits amounting to \$10.650 billion were added on the floor of the Senate to what was already provided in the bill as it was reported from the committee. There were some tax reductions already in the committee bill. The increased revenue to be derived from repealing the investment tax credit, extending the surcharge and the excise taxes all that has gone down the drain under this Senate bill.

This bill represents the most irresponsible piece of legislation that I have seen since I have been in the Senate.

Mr. CURTIS. If the Senator will yield further, I believe it is grossly unfair to ask the American people to accept repeal of the investment credit and extension of the surtax and the many increases that are in this bill for naught, because after all that is done, the deficit will be greater and the debt will be greater. A nay vote is a vote to improve the condition of the budget.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 more minutes.

There is no question about what the Senator from Nebraska has said. As I mentioned earlier in the debate, in the last session when we enacted the 10-percent surcharge, when President Johnson was in office—and I supported that because I thought we ought to have it—as of June 30, 1968, our national debt was \$350.7 billion. The national debt on November 20 of this year, just 17 months later, was \$369.4 billion, or an increase of over \$1 billion per month for that 17-month period.

Now the Senate proposes to increase that debt further by reducing revenues and increasing expenditures by another \$10 billion.

I think it is the most irresponsible action ever taken in my 22 years in the Senate. We have cast the impression to a lot of people that they are going to get something. This is a political hoax for the American people. The people have been told that when the bill is passed they will get an increase of 15 percent in their social security benefits. They are told they will get an increase in their minimum social security payments to \$100 a month. They are told they can retire at age 60. Under this bill they are being promised a big tax reduction next year. Parents with a child in college have been told they will get a generous tax credit for that student's expenses in college.

They have been promised all these things. How are we going to deliver when we do not have the money to pay for it?

Perhaps I am wrong, but if there are Senators who think that can be done I shall be looking forward to seeing how they do it.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I shall not delay the Senate, but I take only one moment to praise the Senator from Delaware. Future generations will appreciate him for the fight he has made

here, not only today, not only last week, but throughout his career. He has not won on every vote, but he has been true to his convictions. While opinions differ, and I respect the right to have differing opinions, in my opinion he has been eminently right, and I commend him.

I commend the distinguished chairman of the committee for the way he has handled the bill.

Once more I want to raise my voice in praise of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and the staff of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The task that was imposed upon them by browbeating the committee to bring about this monstrosity in so few short weeks resulted in night work, working weekends, and a very great burden. We must remember also that the end product of their work must stand testing, in court, by the best legal talent in the country. They have done an outstanding job, and they are deserving of the gratitude of the entire Senate.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. In a moment. I yield myself one-half minute.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska. I might say that I am not so conceited as to think that any future generations will remember what I have been doing, but I will say this: The generations to come will remember what the Senate is doing here today because they will be paying the cost of our votes today.

I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. I think 1 minute will be sufficient to indicate that I shall vote against this bill. Last night I placed in the RECORD my reasons for voting against the bill as amended by the Senate. I believe that a vote of "no" is really a vote of confidence in the work the Finance Committee originally did. Even though I think it is apparent that the bill will pass, a strong "no" vote will be an indication to the conferees to put the bill more in line with the House bill or the bill as originally reported by the Finance Committee, so as to provide a revenue loss of not more than \$3 billion or \$4 billion, rather than the \$21 billion revenue loss we will otherwise suffer during the next 2 years.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator from Louisiana yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. LONG. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I should like again to spend a moment talking about fiscal responsibility and this bill. A great deal has been said about social security. The fact is that there is a social security trust fund, in which there is now a surplus—a social security trust fund with respect to which the actuarial experts of the Social Security Board testified that there was sufficient surplus to provide for a 15-percent increase in social security benefits across the board; and the record was so impressive that the House Ways and Means Committee reported such a bill unanimously.

How does it happen that now it is fiscally irresponsible to provide the benefits in the social security program, for which the people have already paid and

have built up a surplus sufficient to provide for those benefits?

So much for social security. We now come to the tax provisions of the bill. I know we have had a great many votes and a great furor over amendments. I voted against most of the amendments that reduced revenues; but be that as it may, what is the result? As the Committee on Finance brought the bill to the Senate, its tax reform provision would bring in, according to experts in the Treasury Department, \$6,600,000,000 in additional revenue. After all of our furor, the tax reform provisions in the bill as it is now ready to be voted, up or down, will produce \$5,600,000,000 in additional revenue.

The committee chose to recommend that this additional revenue be used to provide tax relief for individuals. The principal choice before the committee has been who would get the tax relief. The administration recommended that it be done by a change in tax rates, lowering the top bracket on earned income from 70 percent to 50 percent. If Congress should approve that recommendation, it would mean that in one 5-year period, gradualism in our income taxes, above a reasonable level, would have been obliterated. It would mean that in one 5-year period, we would have cut the top rate from 91 percent to 50 percent on earned income. Striking that provision out was the first amendment the Finance Committee approved.

Then the bill came to the floor of the Senate, with the choice whether this additional revenue brought into the government by tax reform measures—more than five sixths of which are still in the bill—should be distributed in tax relief by way of rate changes running to 8 percentage points in the high brackets and only 1 percentage point in the low brackets, or whether that tax relief should be provided by way of increasing the personal exemption. After long debate the Senate chose the latter by a vote of 58 to 37.

So we have a bill that is not perfect, but one that is, on balance, good. It does not accomplish all the tax reform we desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GORE. I ask for 1 more minute.

Mr. LONG. I yield the Senator 1 additional minute.

Mr. GORE. But tax reform will not end with this measure, either. Many of us will be pressing harder and harder for more equitable tax reforms.

But this is a great start. Banish those who say it represents fiscal irresponsibility. This is a good bill, and I am prepared to vote for it.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I recorded myself as in favor of the Williams amendment, because I like the idea of being fiscally responsible with all revenue bills. But, as the Senator from Tennessee has so eloquently pointed out, there is a lot of good tax reform in this bill, and we are certainly justified in providing tax reduction to the extent that we provide tax reform. If the House of Representatives could do that, I see no reason why the Senate cannot do it. But the House position of a balanced bill for

1969, 1970, and 1971 will be in conference, and we can discuss that there.

After all the long, hard work that the Senate has done on the bill, I certainly would regret to see all this work done for naught. I very much hope that the bill will pass.

I believe that Senators will be happy with the final result of the bill. Between 500 and 700 amendments will be in conference. But it is my judgment that by the time we shape the bill into final form in conference, although it will not please everyone, the Senate will be better satisfied than it is at this moment. I believe that on balance it is a good bill, and that Senators will regret a vote against it.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 5 minutes to me?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Montana as much time as he may desire.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I am going to digress from the vehemence and the eloquence that have been spoken about the bill. I have asked for this time to ask a question of the Senator from Louisiana, who is managing the bill. I wish to ask him about a provision on page 349 of the bill, section 638, of the Internal Revenue Code, a provision which is discussed also in the committee report on page 189, section 7, regarding the Continental Shelf.

The Continental Shelf is the subject of great concern for several committees of the Senate. The distinguished and able Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) heads a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations; the able and distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) is in charge of a subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce; and I am chairman of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. The Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs is the committee that last had jurisdiction over Continental Shelf legislation.

This is a subject of concern in the United Nations, as it was also in the last Interparliamentary Conference, the U.S. delegation too, which was headed by the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN). It was a matter of much discussion.

We are concerned about whether we should have a 3-mile shelf or should have jurisdiction for 20 miles or, as some South American nations have asserted their jurisdiction, for 200 miles.

The Department of Defense, the Department of State, and other departments have yet to reach a conclusion as to what the recommendation should be made.

The bill provides that the United States shall have jurisdiction to tax provided such area is adjacent to our territorial waters and we have exclusive rights to such area under international law. I understand that the committee has written a provision in accordance with international law with respect to the exploration and exploitation of natural resources. But already we have demonstrated the ability to explore and exploit far beyond the 3-mile limit or the 20-mile limit.

I should like to make it clear today that this is only a tax bill and that we

are extending only our tax jurisdiction; that this provision does not establish any precedent or make any statement so far as U.S. jurisdiction over the outer Continental Shelf is concerned for defense purposes or for fishing or for the water column or air column overhead.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that section 507 of the tax reform bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

SEC. 507. CONTINENTAL SHELF AREAS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter I of chapter 1 (relating to natural resources) is amended by adding after part IV (added by section 505 of this Act) the following new part:

"PART V—CONTINENTAL SHELF AREAS "SEC. 638. CONTINENTAL SHELF AREAS.

"For purposes of applying the provisions of this chapter (including sections 861(a)(3) and 862(a)(3) in the case of the performance of personal services) with respect to mines, oil and gas wells, and other natural deposits—

"(1) the term 'United States' when used in a geographical sense includes the seabed and subsoil of those submarine areas which are adjacent to the territorial waters of the United States and over which the United States has exclusive rights, in accordance with international law, with respect to the exploration and exploitation of natural resources; and

"(2) the terms 'foreign country' and 'possession of the United States' when used in a geographical sense include the seabed and subsoil of those submarine areas which are adjacent to the territorial waters of the foreign country or such possession and over which the foreign country (or the United States in case of such possession) has exclusive rights, in accordance with international law, with respect to the exploration and exploitation of natural resources, but this paragraph shall apply in the case of a foreign country only if it exercises, directly or indirectly, taxing jurisdiction with respect to such exploration or exploitation.

No foreign country shall, by reason of the application of this section, be treated as a country contiguous to the United States."

(b) SOURCE OF INCOME FOR WITHHOLDING OF TAX.—Section 1441 (relating to withholding of tax on non-resident aliens) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) CONTINENTAL SHELF AREAS.—

"For sources of income derived from, or for services performed with respect to, the exploration or exploitation of natural resources on submarine areas adjacent to the territorial waters of the United States, see section 638."

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of parts for subchapter I is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Part V. Continental shelf areas."

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might require to answer the question.

Mr. President, the Senator can rest assured that the Finance Committee has no intention whatever of usurping the functions of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in this matter.

If the Senator will look at lines 12 through 16 on page 349 of the committee substitute, he will see that in modifying the term "United States" it says:

For purposes of applying the provisions of of this chapter (including sections 861(a)(3), and 862(a)(3) in the case of the performance of personal services) with respect to mines, oil and gas wells, and other natural deposits—

So the application of this provision is limited to chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code. It is also limited in that it has application only in the case of natural resources.

It is not intended to affect any other questions which may arise with regard to the Continental Shelf. We are not trying to regulate these activities or get involved in foreign affairs.

All we want to do is clarify the status of the Continental Shelf for income tax purposes in this context. And that is what we are seeking to do—to provide the proper tax treatment for income from natural resource activity on the Continental Shelf.

Mr. METCALF. I am in complete accord that they should be taxed.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from Louisiana if it would not be correct that the very wording here, where the bill says "submarine areas which are adjacent to the territorial waters of the United States and over which the United States has exclusive rights"—it does not say sovereignty, but it says "exclusive rights, in accordance with international law" underline the point that has just been made in the colloquy between the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Louisiana to the effect that this bill is not a step forward in extending the exercise of national sovereignty?

Mr. LONG. We do not get into the subject of national sovereignty. I have thought about the item. However, all we seek to do is collect the income tax due from U.S. firms who earn income on the Continental Shelf, just as we are collecting income taxes from people who make it within the 3-mile limit.

They owe income taxes to the Federal Government. We do not prejudice what any foreign government can do.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, what is meant by the phrase:

No foreign country shall, by reason of the application of this section, be treated as a country contiguous to the United States.

Does that mean that resources from the continental shelves of Mexico and Canada will not be included?

Mr. LONG. We just do not want islands in that area to be regarded as contiguous for purposes of income tax.

The matter was very carefully considered by the Treasury. That is what the Treasury thinks ought to be done for tax purposes.

There are certain provisions in the law that apply where a nation is contiguous to the United States. And we do not want to get involved in that.

That is why the language is there.

Mr. PELL. It is a self-denying ordinance.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the only point is that this definition only has application for tax purposes.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct. There is nothing more.

Mr. President, I yield such time as he may require to the majority leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at this time it would be appropriate to refer

to those whose devotion and dedication made possible a tax relief-tax reform bill this year. To the committee, to its members and staff, to the staff of the joint committee and most of all to the able and distinguished chairman, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), and the able and distinguished ranking member—the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS)—we owe our deepest gratitude. Their effort has produced the most singularly outstanding achievement of this session and perhaps of the entire 91st Congress. During the past 2 weeks or so, we in the Senate who are not members of the committee experienced only a little of what was necessary to pass a proposal of this magnitude. In all of my years, in fact, I have never witnessed any committee devote itself more diligently to a task, working from early in the morning until late in the evening, not just for a matter of days but for nearly 4 solid months.

Frankly, I do not know how to express in words my gratitude, the gratitude of the Senate and of the Nation for the service that has been so magnificently performed.

Perhaps no Member will agree that the measure in its present form provides the reform and relief that will achieve absolute equity in our tax structure. No proposal could. In my opinion, however, it goes a long way in that direction and certainly much further than ever before. I am confident as well that when the conferees return with their recommendations it will be an even better proposal.

But the remarkable story is how this measure was achieved.

Last July when the question of extending the surtax was before the Senate, Chairman LONG and the members of the Finance Committee agreed that they would report the tax reform bill in 3 months. I do not believe that even they realized at the time just how much work would be involved in meeting that timetable. But rather than extend the period to accommodate the workload, they intensified their efforts to meet the schedule. In setting such a timetable for his committee, Chairman LONG is to be particularly lauded for his efforts, for his commitment, for his cooperation and performance.

In like manner, the ranking minority member, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware—who has for years championed the cause of tax reform—as well as all members of the Finance Committee who hammered out a full and distinct set of proposals in a relatively short period, deserve the praise and respect of the entire Senate and of the country.

The expeditious attitude of the Finance Committee set the example for the entire Senate. The bill was scheduled for floor action at the beginning of Thanksgiving week. Voting began the very first day and I must say that from then on the cooperation and consideration exhibited by all Members on both sides of the aisle was of the highest order. Speaking for the joint leadership, we are most grateful. This experience has established beyond question that the Senate can be most efficient when it devotes its full energies to a task. It has taken less than 3 weeks—just 13 working days—to do the job. There are 11 days left to pass

at the least five appropriation bills and a foreign aid bill and a comparability pay bill.

Finally, I should say that the achievements of the 91st Congress shall be many, but none can surpass those which will flow from the enactment of the tax reform-tax relief act. It should be highlighted that this bill is one that originated solely within the Halls of Congress. The initiative as well as the follow-through was in the Congress. This act will highlight again that our actions in the Congress are far more significant than anyone's words.

To the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), to the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), to the members of the committee, and to the entire Senate I extend my deepest gratitude; and I express the hope that this bill will be reported back to us so that we can consider it once again before we adjourn sine die the first session of the 91st Congress.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. I thank every Member of this body and the members of the Finance Committee in particular for the very generous cooperation they gave to the chairman.

In some instances, the chairman decided that we would never conclude the hearings unless we strictly limited Senators in their questioning. It was very considerate of the members of the committee to go along with that mandate, without which we never could have concluded these 7,000 pages of hearings on the bill.

But, more than any Senator, I believe the staffs of the Finance Committee, headed by Tom Vail, and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation headed by Larry Woodworth deserve all the praise we can heap upon them.

They have been working 20-hour days—and I do not think too much praise can be accorded to them—to work out the technical sections of this 585-page bill. They have worked around the clock in many instances, on Sundays and holidays as well as the ordinary workdays. I do not think there are more overworked people anywhere in Government than these two staffs, and they deserve all the praise the Senate can accord them. I do not think there are many people in America who are as competent to work on the bill as those we had working for us.

I would also like to make special and fond mention of Harry Littell of the Legislative Council's office. Words cannot begin to adequately praise Harry for the superb craftsmanship of his efforts on this massive task and for his devotion to the job. Without the extremely long and difficult hours put in by Harry, we would not have this bill before us. Without his efforts and skill we would not have a bill that is in such excellent technical shape. We cannot begin to praise Harry enough.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what the distinguished Senator has said is not only well merited, but also very much deserved. The staff members have worked long. They have a good deal of work ahead of them. I think that out of the efforts of the committees and their very capable staffs, the tax reform-tax relief

bill this year will be one of the hallmarks, the benchmarks, the landmarks of this Congress.

Mr. LONG. The RECORD also should reflect that many dedicated employees of the Treasury Department volunteered to work with our staffs on this bill.

I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts such time as he requires.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in the exchange which has just taken place, the distinguished majority leader has paid a great and well-deserved tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance and to the members of the committee. I warmly associate myself with his remarks, because I feel that this praise and this acclamation is well due.

In addition, as we go into the final minutes before we vote, we ought to recognize the eminent role played by the distinguished majority leader in our efforts to achieve meaningful tax reform. Indeed, I believe that it was the Senator from Montana who articulated most clearly the relationship between the extension of the surcharge and the inequities which existed in our present tax system. It was he who emphasized to us that the surcharge was unfair, because it requires no contribution from those who escape their taxes. It was he who demanded that the surcharge should be coupled with tax reform. Only in this way, he realized, could we bring maximum pressure to bear on tax reform. Indeed, in main part, it is because of the majority leader's strong and dedicated commitment to tax reform, and his leadership in working with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance and the members of the committee that we find ourselves in the successful posture we are in today.

There were those who said we need not act hastily on the question of tax reform. There were those who said the matter ought to be studied. The administration told before the Ways and Means Committee last spring that we should wait until November for yet another review of tax reform proposals.

Throughout this year, the position taken by the majority leader on tax reform was hard and difficult and courageous. He performed a great service not only to the Senate, but also to all our citizens. I am pleased, therefore, to rise at this time to join in acclaiming the members of the Finance Committee and the majority leader for their magnificent effort.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I should like to join in this well deserved tribute to the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader (Mr. MANSFIELD). I know of his singleminded commitment to the objective of tax reform which he expressed first in the Democratic Policy Committee early in the summer. He sensed the interest of the country in the objective of tax reform. He understood, from his many years in the Senate, that unless such a commitment were made by the leadership, tax reform might well fall through the cracks as we considered the tax questions raised

by the surcharge. He has stuck to his commitments steadfastly.

He was criticized considerably for making that commitment in July and August. Doubts were raised later as to whether or not, because of the sheer immensity of the task, that commitment could be made. It was with the cooperation of the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), that it was possible for the majority leader to make that commitment.

It seems to me most appropriate, as the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts has pointed out, that at this point, prior to final vote on this tax package, the Senate and the country be reminded of the leadership role played by the distinguished Senator from Montana.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Florida such time as he desires.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

In the first place, I want to compliment in the highest possible terms the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the ranking minority member of that committee; and the members of the committee generally also are entitled to their share of congratulations. I have noted particularly the fidelity with which the chairman and the ranking minority member have stuck by the committee bill. I think that is the finest evidence of real leadership, and I compliment them for doing that.

The second thing I would like to say, Mr. President, is that I have frequently found occasion in the past to express regret about the complex which seems to seize upon the Senate when we consider an important and involved tax measure. It is the type of measure in which most consideration should be given to the committee recommendations, particularly in a matter of this kind, in which after 3 months of hearings, a 585-page bill, which is offered as a substitute for the House bill or to replace the House bill, is the fruit of all that work.

I do not know whether it is because we in the Senate are somewhat frustrated because under the Constitution we are banned from initiating legislation in this field, or what the reason may be; but I think that the most unsound thing we do in the Senate is in attempting to write on the floor a tax bill, no matter how complex or involved the matter may be, and that is exactly what we have done in connection with this bill.

I regret that we show that attribute almost yearly; and I must express regret again this time, because I think it is unsound to follow that practice. It is not a compliment to the committee or its fine leadership or its fine work. To the contrary, it seems to be born in the idea that individual Senators, on the floor, in their judgment, many times most impulsively, have sounder views on the complex matter of Federal taxation than does the committee after its months of study, hearings, and testimony. I cannot join in that kind of approach to the passage of an involved tax bill and that is one of the reasons I shall vote against the bill.

The principal reason, though, why I shall vote against the bill is that it attempts to undo one of the real things

that had been attempted to be done by this bill, and that was to fight inflation. The fight against inflation will be a particularly tough and important one in the next 2 years, 1970 and 1971.

The bill which is now ready for adoption, and it will be passed so far as the Senate is concerned by its vote, shows this kind of net result in revenue in 1970 and 1971. I am using the composite table prepared by the staff of the Committee on Finance.

In the year 1970, this particular bill, which is now before us and about to be voted on, has a net reduction from the committee bill of about \$3.0526 billion. If that is an attack on inflation, if that is an effort to regularize our fiscal practices, this Senator cannot see it. For the year 1971, from this same table, it appears that the amendments we have agreed to on the floor of the Senate will cut the revenue provided by the committee bill by \$5.049 billion. In other words, there would be a net reduction in revenue of over \$8 billion in those 2 critical years, and they are the 2 critical years in the fight against inflation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. The net reduction in those critical years is better than \$8 billion. That is moving exactly in the wrong direction rather than in the right direction. That is the principal reason I shall vote against the bill.

There is one ray of hope in this matter. I have found it possible at least three times before, and maybe more, in voting against the complex bills in this field which have been rewritten by the Senate on the floor to vote for a much better bill which came back from conference; and I do hope in this instance we will have that kind of record made again by the conferees of the two Houses.

In my mind it would be not only unfortunate but most misleading to the public and would defeat the objectives of all concerned in trying to bring about this legislation, to come back with this bill in its present form, with a net reduction in revenue as against the committee bill, of over \$8 billion in the 2 critical years.

Mr. President, having made those brief remarks and again expressing my compliments to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, and the Senator from Delaware, I wish to inform the Senate I shall vote against the bill and hope that when they take it to conference we will get back a vastly improved bill.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I also join in complimenting the members of the Committee on Finance, the chairman, the ranking minority member, and also all the other members who just as diligently through all the many days and weeks of hearings attended to their business in attempting to fulfill the mandate of the Senate, a mandate which I think

was foolish and which I think should never have been given. According to the statement of the majority leader at the time of the passage of the surtax bill, it was a mandate of the Democratic policy committee. I think it was a shortsighted and foolish mandate which we will all live to regret in this country.

Mr. President, for the past 2 weeks or more the Senate has been operating in a circus-like atmosphere. The political Christmas tree known as the Tax Reform Act of 1969 has not only been decorated, it has been gaudily overdressed with flashy and topheavy economic ornaments which threaten to short circuit every light, and may well end up burning down the house.

In the Senate's unprecedented spending spree, it has ignored the cruelest tax of all, inflation. Commonsense and reason has been cast into the fire of political advantage. Champagne has been dished out when the budget can scarcely afford 7-Up.

There is scarcely a citizen of this Nation who has not felt the effects of continued deficit spending by the Federal Government. For the 8 years prior to President Nixon's inauguration America suffered from the combination of the policies of those in Congress who cannot bear to see the budget balanced and administrations which did not have the will to face the economic realities of life.

Now we have an administration which has pledged itself to fiscal sanity. We have an administration which has told its individual departments: "Keep the spending and the hiring down."

The policies of this administration are just beginning to work, but every bit of good which has been accomplished through squeezing and belt tightening and economic restraint will be undone if the Senate version of the tax reform bill becomes law.

While some good things have been accomplished in the bill, the fact remains that the U.S. Treasury would end up with a short fall in revenue for the calendar years 1969-72 of \$27 billion—\$26.284 billion, to be exact—if the bill in the form I find it today is enacted. In addition, in the calendar year of 1973 alone the effect of the Mansfield-Byrd amendment for social security would be an added social security tax bill of \$6.7 billion for middle-income taxpayers.

Because I cannot in conscience contribute to the destruction of fiscal responsibility, which the American people demand and which this administration stands for, I find it necessary to announce that I shall vote against the final passage of the bill, a self-created economic monster. If it passes, and if the Senate-House conference does not restore sanity to this legislation, I shall vote against the conference report.

However, I have a very good feeling that the bill which comes from the conference is not going to be identifiable with the bill which passes the Senate this afternoon. I also want to make it perfectly clear that I will be among those Senators who have announced they will vote to sustain a veto by the President. In fact, on behalf of the taxpayers of this country, I urgently recommend to the President that he exercise his veto responsibility, as he has indicated he

will, if the bill contains anywhere near the degree of fiscal irresponsibility it now contains, because the vast majority of citizens are in accord with his aim and goal to curb inflation.

Since politically the present bill is supposed to please about everybody, I suppose that taking the position I have enunciated carries with it certain risks. Then so be it. I cannot and will not vote for a measure which could well bring about a situation which in turn would precipitate an economic collapse in this country.

Yesterday afternoon the distinguished Senator from Nebraska offered an amendment in which was incorporated the concept of an administrative budget. I hope we get off this unitized budget kick we have been on for the last 2 years. It does not mean a thing. It is misleading to the people of the country. We will never understand where we are until we get back to the concept of an administrative budget. How in the world can we claim that we have a surplus in this country when we are counting as a surplus the dollars which are paid into trust funds such as social security, highway funds, and other such earmarked accounts?

I have termed this bill the Lawyers and Accountants Civil Relief Act of 1969.

I predict, and believe, that we will have created, if the bill as it now stands is enacted into law, a heyday which will keep our accountants and lawyers busy not only for the space of years but for many years to come. I do not begrudge them their fees, but I am concerned about those middle-income taxpayers who are going to have this additional expense.

There is this to say about the bill, many of us have advocated, and sought, relief in the past for the average citizen. I am talking about those in the lower income and lower median income brackets. This bill does not now do this. It has been rendered completely out of balance by floor amendments. Educational investment credits have been added. This is one of the more meritorious floor amendments. It is a benefit which I have previously supported. In another climate, in another situation, this benefit has been completely logical, because it would give assistance to these low- and middle-income taxpayers and would have helped them to educate their children. I have supported it.

I also advocated at times an increase in the personal exemption, but that was not done at a time when we had taken 5 million people from the tax rolls and had decreased the taxes of some 7 million others.

So it is not that these things are bad, but rather that as amendments to the tax reform bill which the committee brought out, taken together, they are unacceptable for anyone who gives consideration to fiscal responsibility in this country.

I believe that the bill will be a better bill when it comes back from conference. I hope it will not look like the bill which will probably pass this afternoon.

Mr. President, let me say this in conclusion: There is no tax which is as cruel as inflation. It is said over and over. There are many Senators who are

wealthy, but they will take care of themselves in an inflationary period, but the man who cannot properly take care of himself is the poor fellow working for perhaps \$3,000, or perhaps even \$8,000 a year to support his family, or the man and woman who have finished the productive years of their lives and are dependent upon social security, a pension, or fixed incomes. How can we say that we are being honest with them if we do not exert our last and best efforts to maintain the stability of the dollar by holding down inflation as the President has asked?

Senators telling constituents that we are giving them more and saying, "Look at what we did for you," is like Little Jack Horner who sat in the corner saying "What a great boy am I" when he pulled

out a plum. We cannot tell them things like that and at the same time pursue a policy which destroys every hour of every day, the very thing we are giving them, with the other hand.

Therefore, Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill and pray that when we see the bill come back from conference, it will be a much better bill as far as the best interests of our country and its citizens are concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a chart which has been prepared by the Treasury Department showing the revenue loss of the bill, which is illustrative of the remarks I have previously made, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REVENUE EFFECT OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 13270

[In millions of dollars]

	Calendar years						Longrun
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	
Total, as approved by Senate Finance Committee.....	+900	+6,458	+301	-3,298	-3,373	-3,438	-2,318
Floor amendments:							
Accumulation trusts.....		-5	-15				
Medical expenses, aged.....		-225	-225	-225	-225	-225	-225
Real estate.....		-10	-10	-20	-30	-45	-90
Transportation expenses, disabled.....		-90	-90	-90	-90	-90	-90
Alternative tax.....		-50	-65	-80	-80	-80	-80
Foundations.....		-20	-20	-20	-20	-25	-25
Minimum tax.....		-20	-20	-20	-20	-20	-20
Education expenses, credit.....				-1,800	-1,800	-1,800	-1,800
Depletion.....		-5	-5	-5	-5	-5	-5
Investment credit:							
Small business exemption.....	-520	-720	-720	-720	-720	-720	-720
Depressed areas exception.....	-10	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70	-70
Foster children.....		-75	-75	-75	-75	-75	-75
Tax relief (Gore).....	-2,250	-3,740	+85	+85	+85	+85	+85
Pensions.....		-5	-10	-15	-20	-20	-55
Citrus groves.....		+5	+10	+10	+10	+10	+10
Subtotal, floor amendments.....	-530	-3,525	-5,050	-3,040	-3,055	-3,080	-3,160
Social security:							
Payments.....		-5,700	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400	-6,400
Taxes.....					+6,700	+6,700	+6,700
Grand totals, floor amendments.....	-530	-9,225	-11,450	-9,440	-2,755	-2,780	-2,860
Total Senate bill, currently.....	+370	-2,767	-11,149	-12,738	-6,128	-6,218	-5,178

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis.

Note: Net revenue loss 1969-74 \$38,630,000,000, net revenue loss 1969-72 \$26,284,000,000.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish very much that it were possible for me to join in the expressions of praise by the distinguished majority leader on the work of the Senate in connection with this bill.

Regretfully, as one Member of this body, I have very little reason to be proud of its collective performance in connection with this product of its deliberations. It is now a hodgepodge of political "goodies" which no longer deserves the title of tax reform.

But, Mr. President, I do join the distinguished majority leader and the distinguished majority whip in their high praise of the chairman of the Finance Committee, the ranking minority member, and all other members of the Finance Committee who worked so hard on this bill. I think it is obvious, in most cases, that by and large, the committee tried to achieve responsible and meaningful tax reform in their deliberations as evidenced by the bill that they reported.

In particular, I want to refer to and commend the great Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

The other day, I had reason to have

printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article about the fact that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has announced his retirement, an announcement which I think everyone in this body hopes he will reconsider and change his mind.

The article referred to the Senator from Delaware as being a giant in the Senate.

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS) is not only a giant in the Senate today but, in the opinion of this Senator, his performance in connection with the pending bill, as in connection with so many other bills, will demonstrate that he is a giant in the history of the Senate.

Time will surely make it clear that he was not only a friend of the taxpayer but that he was also a friend of the consumer as he fought for sound fiscal principles.

Mr. President, many of the amendments which were adopted and added to the pending measure to make it a "Christmas tree" are amendments of great merit.

So far as I personally am concerned, for many years I have advocated and have introduced bills to provide tax

credits for expenses in connection with higher education.

I found it very difficult and distasteful to vote against that amendment when it was offered to the bill, but I felt that the Senate must not abandon fiscal responsibility.

We have to face reality, and this is not the time when we can add to our revenue losses.

For our Nation, like a fat man, to continue eating candy and double helpings of ice cream, would be the height of irresponsibility.

Senior citizens need and deserve an increase in social security benefits. In my view, a 15-percent increase in benefits is not too great, although I believe that a 10-percent increase now, coupled with an automatic escalator provision, based on the cost of living, would be a better deal in the long run for those who rely on social security.

We do a disservice to our senior citizens by tacking social security legislation onto a tax package which is certain to push the cost of living up at an even faster pace.

As it stands, this package contains too little tax reform, too much tax relief and a mighty big boost in prices for everyone.

Mr. President, I have the utmost confidence in the good judgment and commonsense of the American people. I believe that too many politicians do not give them enough credit.

The housewife, the businessman, the worker, are all deeply concerned about galloping inflation. I think they know and understand that Government spending, based upon borrowing, is largely responsible for the plight of our Nation today.

Mr. President, I have little doubt that the bill before us will be passed by the Senate, but, in good conscience, I cannot vote for it. I want the Senator from Delaware to know that he does not stand alone and that the President does not stand alone. Both of them are right, and I am confident the people know they are right.

I shall cast my vote against the bill. THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I can state my position on this bill very simply and very directly. I have searched my conscience. If I voted "no" I would do so in the hope that the bill would be carried to conference in spite of my vote.

It is easy to vote either way, because none of us want the bill as it is, neither those who will vote "yes" nor those who will vote "no."

Because I believe in doing something rather than doing nothing, I shall vote "yes," but I shall feel free to debate and to reject the conference report. I want this bill to go to conference, so I must be honest with myself and vote for it.

I take this action with considerable reluctance, because I am deeply troubled by certain provisions in the Senate bill. I have grave reservations about these provisions in this bill, which I opposed when they were offered as amendments. Yet, there is much which is good and

worthwhile in it, and I am prepared, at least, to send it to conference and to keep an open mind until the conference report is received.

I have long sought meaningful tax reform, introducing bills to achieve that objective not only in this Congress, but in previous Congresses. However, this bill has been transformed into a tax rate-cutting bill, as well as a tax reform bill, and this poses considerable problems in these inflationary times. I am deeply troubled, in particular, by the Gore amendment, which increases the personal exemption; this would seriously impede our efforts successfully to battle inflation in the present and next fiscal year. I opposed the Gore amendment for that reason. In addition, I am concerned about the amendment which gives tax credits for education which must be costly to Federal aid to education. And by the Cotton amendment, which gives the President unlimited authority to impose import restrictions. The Cotton amendment is particularly unfortunate, since its subject is totally unrelated to the tax bill to which it was added, and it signals to the world that the United States may be entering a protectionist era. Should it survive the conference I would consider seriously opposing the conference report on that ground.

It must be emphasized that this bill contains many valuable reforms, reforms which many of us have sought for years: Improvement in the oil depletion allowance, a fairer tightening of the real estate tax shelter, and the low-income allowance, to mention but a few. In addition, this bill also contains a very important anti-inflationary provision—that is, the 6-month extension of the income tax surcharge—at a reduced 5-percent rate, as requested by the administration.

In some areas the Senate bill is a great improvement over the House-passed measure. Changes made in the Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate in the past 2 weeks have brought about a bill which contains equitable tax reform in the area of foundations, charitable contributions and real estate. The bill, as amended in the Senate, also contains valuable incentives for low- and moderate-income housing and a deduction for the transportation expenses of the handicapped—a provision which I have been seeking for many, many years.

A provision of this bill would also increase social security payments by 15 percent. I supported this provision, and, while this increase has been cited as having an inflationary impact, I am not persuaded that its inclusion in this bill is a reason for rejecting it. These increased benefits are financed from the social security trust fund—outside of general revenues—and the House of Representatives is now considering an increase of this amount in a separate bill. An increase of benefits for those over 65 cannot be viewed in the same light as other provisions in this bill which would have a negative revenue effect. Rather, it represents a correction of inequities. Like those disadvantaged in need of the immediate establishment of a humane and efficient system of family assistance, social security beneficiaries need this increase in benefits if they are to stay above the line of dependency and poverty.

I am reluctant to see these very positive features of the Senate bill now go down the drain. I do not want to see all these many months of creative and committed work on tax reform wasted. I am particularly reluctant to vote against this bill when to vote for it would be a vote to send it to a Senate-House conference which will have the opportunity to alter or eliminate the more unfortunate features of the bill and to limit its inflationary impact.

On balance, I still believe that it is possible to salvage an equitable and fiscally responsible bill, in which tax reform will predominate over tax-rate cutting and inflationary impact. For that reason I will vote for this bill. It is my intention to carefully examine the work of the conference, to evaluate its report independently, to make a fresh judgment at that point on the virtues of the tax reform bill, and to cast my final vote on the conference report accordingly. Only then can a definite judgment be made on the measure. For now, the momentous work done on the measure should not be aborted.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I want to note that the Senator from Delaware is a really great Senator. I only regret that he cannot live eternally. He has performed a great duty for the U.S. Senate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. May I have 30 seconds?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield whatever time the Senator needs.

Mr. JAVITS. He has exposed all aspects of this bill. As a Senator representing a State with 18 million people, I thank him and I ask him to feel that, no matter what else he may have done in his life, this is an historic and a great example of the capacity, the patriotism, and the devotion which he has shown.

I would also like to pay tribute to Senator LONG, Senator TALMADGE, Senator GORE, and other Senators who have fought so hard and so valiantly in respect of the bill. I know they will forgive me if I pick JOHN WILLIAMS, who sits in front of me, as my favorite.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE).

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I intend to vote for the bill. I think it is a good bill. It is far from perfect, but it is far better than it would have been without some of the changes that have been made in the Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate.

I would like to make a brief statement about the amendment that I offered yesterday, and two of the amendments that I did not offer, but plan to pursue in the future at an appropriate time.

First, the amendment that I offered last night as an amendment to Senator MILLER's amendment would have raised almost \$1 billion. Senator MILLER's amendment is good in that it raised the rate of the minimum tax from 5 to 10 percent. On the other hand, it raises the question of the possible creation of a tax shelter for some taxpayers. This is because Senator MILLER's amendment allows a deduction from the preferred items of the amount of taxes on ordinary income. It is therefore conceivable that

a taxpayer with large, ordinary income, and also a goodly amount of preferred income, could use the taxes paid on the ordinary income to escape paying any taxes at all on the preferred income. Of course, there is some justice to Senator MILLER's claim that a taxpayer who was paid a large amount of taxes should be treated differently from the taxpayer who has paid little or no taxes. Recognizing this principle, my amendment would have allowed a deduction of one-half of taxes paid. I believe that this would achieve equity while at the same time foreclosing any possible loophole. The different revenue estimates justify this assertion.

The Senate Finance minimum tax provision would have generated \$700 million in additional revenue. Senator MILLER's proposal which was finally adopted, by his estimations, generated \$740 million. My proposal would have generated slightly less than \$1 billion.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation setting forth revenue estimates of my proposal be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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., December 11, 1969.

HON. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARTKE: This is in reference to your request for an estimate of the effect on income tax liability of a provision to impose a 10 percent tax on the preference items in the Senate Finance Committee version of the tax on preference items after deduction of one-half of Federal income tax otherwise payable and \$30,000.

Time did not permit of a computer run for this estimate; we estimate, without benefit of a computer run, that this proposal would result in an increase over present law of approximately \$440 million in individual income tax liability and \$550 million in corporate income tax liability.

Sincerely yours,

LAURENCE N. WOODWORTH.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I would now like to discuss two amendments that I did not offer. I did not offer these amendments because the Senate has been overburdened with amendments to the tax reform bill, and because my amendments raised profound and fundamental questions. While I believe these proposals have merit, it may be that some modifications or changes are desirable. My first amendment, No. 369, would repeal some of the more outstanding preferences in our tax code. Beginning in 1985, the following tax preferences would no longer be allowed:

First. Intangible drilling and development costs in the case of oil and gas wells would have to be capitalized and could not be taken as a deduction in the year that they were paid or incurred.

Second. Percentage depletion on natural resources would be repealed, and only cost depletion would be used.

Third. The capital gain provision of the tax laws would be treated as ordinary income.

Fourth. The special treatment of stock options would be repealed and all income arising from stock options would be taxed as any other type of income.

Fifth. Interest received from State and local bonds issued after December 31, 1984 would be taxed.

Sixth. New residential rental housing and property constructed after July 25, 1969, could only be depreciated by a method which did not exceed the amount available under the 150 percent declining balance method.

Seventh. Personal property subject to a net lease could only be depreciated on methods which are not faster than the 150 percent declining balance method.

Eighth. Any deduction for a charitable contribution of appreciated property would have to be reduced by the amount of gain which would have been realized if the property had been sold at its fair market value.

Ninth. Provisions of the tax law permitting financial institutions to deduct reserves for losses on loans would be repealed.

Tenth. The amount of any excess investment interest for a taxable year could not be deducted.

This amendment in no way implies hostility or objection to the social and economic goals to be achieved by the various named preferences. A provision in the tax code is a preference to the extent that it allows any taxpayer to accumulate wealth or enjoy personal consumption without paying the full tax. A preference, then, means deviation from the norm, and the proponents of a preference should have the burden of proof as to the use of the tax code for such a purpose and the measure of its success. My amendment would place the burden of proof on those enjoying special tax treatment, and not make tax reform conditioned upon public outrage.

No one has a permanent right to the U.S. Treasury. Nothing in this life is permanent, and the ordinary taxpayer must make his plans with the realization that his tax burden can change from time to time. It is only fair that those who enjoy preferences face the same uncertainty. For as John Steinbeck said, "in the long run, we are all dead."

My second amendment, No. 385, would create a Senate Tax Reform Commission, composed of 12 members selected for their professional qualifications, excellence, experience in finance, public finance, taxation, or related fields. They would be selected by various Members of the Senate. In the drafting of this amendment, I tried to achieve as much independence for this Tax Reform Commission as possible. Once the members of the commission are selected by the Members of the Senate, they should be entirely on their own to suggest desirable changes in our tax code.

It is my hope that this 2-year commission would create an expertise and fund of knowledge that the Members of the Senate could draw from. The debate of the last 2 weeks shows rather convincingly that there are many ideas for beneficial change in our tax code, but little concrete knowledge.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. TALMADGE. Does the Senator desire additional time?

Mr. HARTKE. Yes, 1 minute.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HARTKE. This commission, then, would consider the various tax reform proposals and more importantly try to determine the various proposals' economic and social consequences. Tax reform is insufficient in itself if it does not include careful evaluations of the economic and social change. Also, this commission in evaluating a certain area would develop various alternative approaches. In this way, the Senate could select from a series of possible changes, and not be faced with the rather sterile rejection or approval of one proposal. This commission would also consider desired changes in the tax code to enhance productivity, strengthen our economy, and the achievement of social goals. Finally, this commission would study the relationship between Federal, State, and local, and property taxation. The present U.S. taxation system is a crazy-quilt of different systems, often working against each other.

A columnist recently suggested that taxes are too complex to be handled by Congress. He suggested turning the entire function over to the executive branch. I consider this a most unwise proposal. Taxes are becoming increasingly technical and complex, but every administration is subject to the same pressures that are more conspicuously revealed in Congress. The administration, however, has the expertise and the technical staff so that their decisions seem neater. If Congress is to meet its increasing responsibility in the field of taxation, it must create the necessary machinery.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish, first, to commend the two principal staff aides and their assistants who have worked so well and diligently on this bill in helping solve numerous difficult problems which have faced us. I am referring to Tom Vail, of the Finance Committee, and Larry Woodworth, of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. I also express our appreciation and thanks to the Treasury experts and advisers.

I think all of us would agree that there are few committees whose work is so conscientiously performed as that of the Finance Committee, and there can never be too many tributes to the ranking minority member, Senator WILLIAMS of Delaware, whose conscience and conscientiousness are a byword, and to the work which was done by all the members of the committee on both sides of the aisle, by the very distinguished chairman, who has patiently given consideration to individual concerns and problems of each Senator and has aided them, and to the Senators on his side of the aisle, and to our members on this side of the aisle on the Finance Committee, including the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN), the Senator from Arizona

(Mr. FANNIN), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN).

For all of the work done and the contributions made, we are all appreciative.

At the same time, as many of them have pointed out and as other Senators have pointed out, this bill is, by the largest understatement of the year, far from perfect.

It has much in it which is designed to meet the true needs of tax reform. It has much added to it which operates to increase the burden on the Treasury, and to reduce the revenue to a point where normal caution would, it seems to me, have dictated otherwise.

I am reassured that the social security increases will be taken care of in another bill if removed from this one. They should be treated in a separate bill. I favor the increases in social security. I do not know of a matter which has aroused more interest in Pennsylvania, as a matter of fact, than the plight of the social security beneficiaries who have been too long denied the very reasonable amounts which they surely need.

There are many reasons why the allowance for dependents should be increased from \$600. It has not been increased since 1948. I believe that at least some modest increase is desirable. I would like to see one that does not result in the removal or deprivation to the taxpayer of the proposed increases in the standard deduction allowances.

An amendment which I supported, the Percy amendment, would have preserved, for the most part, this important feature in the Senate bill as it came to us. I am not sure what the conferees will do, but I have a suspicion that the conferees are more than likely to come up with something similar to the Percy amendment, which was defeated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the Senator 3 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Or which is more likely to resemble the Percy amendment than either the House bill, the Senate bill, or the Gore amendment.

I agree with the Senator from New York when he says he reserves the right to either support or oppose the conference report if it does not remove some of the unwisdom which has now become embedded in the bill. Each of us approaches his final decision in full awareness of the fact that, in seeking to do good for some, we have not done well by all; and therefore, we ask ourselves, "Shall I vote for the bill, or against it?"

My reasoning follows that of others who say that if we throw overboard all the hard work that has gone into this bill for many weeks, we may not have tax reform at all.

On the other hand, if the bill comes back to us in anything like the shape it is in now, perhaps we ought not to have a tax bill at all, or perhaps the President will veto the whole thing; and I would suspect that a veto, under those circumstances, would not be overridden.

Therefore, it is my hope that the conference will result in a bill which represents the distilled wisdom of the con-

ferrees, and which can be found acceptable to both parties. Because I want to see tax reform and tax relief, and because I want to see tax reform and tax relief, and because I favor many of the features of the bill, I shall vote for it.

Finally, Mr. President, just a word to express the great regret that all of us feel that the distinguished Senator from Delaware has announced that he will not be a candidate to succeed himself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Delaware yield me 1 additional minute to further extend my praises of him?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield the Senator 2 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a rule in Delaware that the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware can be reelected for as long as he wishes, and they wish he would wish for longer than he wishes for. He is the only American Senator who has, by custom and tradition, the same privilege which is extended under the Constitution of Canada to Canadian Senators, who serve for life. The Senator from Delaware could indeed serve for life if he so desired. It is our loss that he has reached another conclusion, and we will miss, indeed irreplaceably, the great, courageous, and dedicated service which he has performed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I think much of what has been done here was an exercise in futility, because I think a great portion of it will be stricken out by the conference committee; and if it is not, there is great probability that the bill will be vetoed.

It is, in many respects, a bad bill. I think the bill is too punitive of some elements in our society which have provided the capital flow which has been the dynamic behind the great economic growth of the United States of America.

I think there are other provisions, designed to help people, which will have the ultimate effect of doing them grave injury, through the debasement and destruction of the buying power of their money.

Therefore, I intend to vote against the bill. I join my colleagues in commending my distinguished friend from Delaware, an able and tremendously patriotic Senator. In spite of my battles with him over the depletion allowance, I wish him well, and wish he were not leaving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

In my judgment, much of the harsh criticism this bill has received is premature. I think most of us recognize that there are provisions in the bill which perhaps should not be in it. On the other hand, there are many that should be there. In the time I have been a Member of the Senate, it has been my experience that bills of this magnitude usually come back from conference in far better shape than when they left the Senate. In my judgment, that will be true this time. After a conference between the

House and the Senate, this bill will be put into shape, where it will be less inflationary in the years 1971 and 1972, and the relative inflow and outflow of funds will be substantially the same.

I pay tribute to the distinguished chairman and the ranking minority member of our committee, who have worked so diligently, as have all the members of the Committee on Finance, in perfecting this measure. As the distinguished majority leader has stated, it required almost 4 months' work. We heard witnesses day after day, and week after week, and we sat in executive sessions for the same period of time. We had outstanding attendance of the members of our committee, both at the hearings and at the executive sessions.

Lastly, I pay tribute to the excellent staff that provided us so much outstanding assistance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

In my judgment, Dr. Larry Woodward, the chief of staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, and Tom Vail, the chief counsel for the Senate Committee on Finance, did one of the most outstanding jobs I have ever experienced in my more than 20 years in government. They are knowledgeable, dedicated, and candid. When you ask them a question, you get a responsible, forthright, honest answer. The Senate owes them a great debt of gratitude, and I cannot pay them tribute in terms too warm.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. TALMADGE. How much time does the Senator from Delaware have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Three minutes.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, to put in perspective what we are doing with this bill, the Committee on Finance reported out a bill which would have resulted in a surplus of \$6.5 billion for 1970. Now that we have the amendments put on it, it will result in a deficit of \$2.7 billion.

For 1971, the Finance Committee bill would have just about broken even, with a surplus of \$3 million. Under the bill as now amended, we would have a deficit of \$11 billion.

For 1972, the Finance Committee bill would have had a deficit of a little over \$3 billion; and under the bill as amended, there will be a deficit of \$12 billion.

If we really want to do a job in increasing inflation and high interest rates, the bill presently before the Senate is the way to do it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the lead editorial in the New York Times entitled "Inflationary Blackmail" be printed in the RECORD.

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

INFLATIONARY BLACKMAIL

The Senate's decision to incorporate a 15 per cent increase in Social Security benefits and a \$100 monthly minimum into its version of the tax bill is a disgraceful exercise in political blackmail. It is, unfortunately, thoroughly in keeping with the irresponsibility that has marked every step of the Senate's effort to distort what began as a tax reform bill into an engine of accelerated inflation.

We have no quarrel with the notion that Social Security benefits need improvement to offset the cost-of-living increases that have cut the value of present pension payments since the last 13 per cent raise in benefits went into effect in February 1968. And certainly there is room for debate as to whether that improvement should be the 10 per cent recommended by President Nixon or the 15 per cent the Democrats favor.

But tacking the higher benefits onto the tax bill is a transparently cynical device to deter President Nixon from vetoing a bill that is turning into a Christmas tree loaded with inflationary candles. Few Congressional actions are more popular than putting more money in the pockets of the elderly, and the imperturbable Senate majority feels rubber dollars are as good as ones that have genuine purchasing power. On that basis, it apparently feels the President will have no option except to sign the omnibus tax measure, however uneconomic it becomes.

It is the President's obligation to insist that increased Social Security benefits be considered on their merits in a separate measure. The actual increase in the Federal consumer price index since the last benefit rise comes to 9 per cent. The Nixon proposal of a 10 per cent across-the-board increase in benefits not only covers that rise but also provides an escalator to keep pace with future increases in living costs.

The question that Congress ought to weigh is whether the present period of rampant inflation is the right one in which to lift the benefit level on a more fundamental basis. We have no doubt that a strong argument can be made for such action once the price level returns to some semblance of stability, but it certainly should not be a matter of shotgun determination now.

That reserve applies even more strongly to the steep increase the Senate has voted in the benefit floor. This newspaper has long contended that the present \$55 minimum is scandalously low. Yet a precipitate jump to \$100 sets a wretched example for the exercise of restraint in wage-price decisions in the private economy.

It will require political courage for Mr. Nixon to stand up against these giveaways and defend both the nation's fiscal soundness and its ability to meet the social needs that cry out for expanded Federal aid. The President can and must demonstrate that courage by making it plain now that he will veto any tax bill that spurs inflation, even one packed with goodies for Social Security pensioners.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, there is not much time remaining. I would like to complete my statement.

I supported the Williams motion to recommit. I regret very much that it was defeated. I intend to vote for the bill only for the purpose of getting it to conference with the clear understanding and the hope that the conference committee will come back with a bill which will be fiscally sound, one that I can support.

If they do not do so, I will not be able to vote for the conference report. And I am quite sure that the President will veto it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr.

President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wyoming.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I shall vote against the bill. In so doing, I want it to be understood that I have nothing but the greatest respect for the members of the Finance Committee. It has been my privilege and pleasure to serve with them since early September.

I pay my respects also to the staff which has been most helpful to me despite the fact that I am the most junior member of that committee. Their impartial, ever-obvious willingness to serve all of us fairly and patiently attests to their commitment to duty.

Mr. President, I take this opportunity to say a word about the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

Impelled not by political motivation, but only by what he believes is best for our country, JOHN WILLIAMS often stands alone in taking the honest, responsible position.

He pleads unpopular causes.

The very nature of representative government gives encouragement to those who would engage in political demagoguery, and I think that is what has characterized the actions of many on this matter for the last several days.

I leave to history, as all of us must, the rendering of final judgment and decision upon the wisdom of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. Insulated from the heat of present emotions, given the advantage of looking back upon events still before us, I predict history will make an objective evaluation of this man that will fully confirm the great regard in which he is held by all of us.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I join the chairman of the committee and others in paying my respects to the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation.

I also pay my respects to the chairman of the committee for the excellent job that has been done in trying to get a bill before the Senate. I agree completely that we could not have had a more competent staff. We could not have done our job without them. Larry Woodworth and Dennis Bedell are two of the most competent staff members that I have ever worked with.

As to the complimentary remarks concerning me, I thank all Senators.

I was sitting here thinking what consternation there would be if I were to say that I had changed my mind, but I will not so they are safe.

Much has been said concerning the \$6.4 billion additional revenue raised by tax reform in this bill. That \$6 billion is not all tax reform. I think we should point out the breakdown. The \$6.4 billion is arrived at in this manner; \$4.2 billion is represented by the extension of the surcharge another 6 months and extending the excise taxes. The repeal of the investment credit accounts for \$2.5 billion additional revenue in the bill as reported by the committee, and the tax reform accounts for \$1.4 billion.

When we add that up we have \$8.1 billion, and the tax relief measures in the

Finance Committee bill, as reported, totalled \$1.7 billion.

That brings us back to the net gain under the committee bill of \$6.4 billion. I repeat, the \$6.4 billion surplus for 1970 represented in the committee bill does not altogether consist of reform. It is the revenue derived from the extension of the surtax, the extension of the excise taxes, and the repeal of the investment tax credit. Furthermore, the \$1.4 billion from tax reform that was in the bill, as it came from the committee, has been whittled down on the floor of the Senate by \$500 million. That only leaves \$900 million of actual tax reform in the bill. The \$2.5 billion to be gained from the repeal of the investment credit has been whittled down on the floor by \$800 million. That leaves only \$1.7 billion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I shall vote against H.R. 13270, the Tax Reform Act of 1969. The original purpose of this bill was to remove from our tax structure certain inequities which have accumulated during the past 56 years. The act purported to provide fairness to those who are able to pay, to remove from the tax roles millions of citizens who fall into the very low income or poverty levels, and to do these things in a fiscally responsible way, having due regard for the goals of the Nation and the dangers of inflation.

The measure now before the Senate fails to achieve these purposes.

Inequities have been added to inequities.

Many of the very low income citizens continue on the tax roles.

The revenue lost to the Federal Treasury by virtue of amendments honestly conceived and properly proposed offers the prospect of a huge budget deficit.

I did not find it an easy matter to vote against an amendment to raise the standard deduction.

Nor was it a simple decision to vote "no" regarding a 15-percent increase in social security benefits.

Particularly, it was a hard matter to vote against the amendment granting tax credits for expenses of the higher education of our young people. As a matter of fact, I have previously introduced legislation to grant such tax credits as a way to help families bear the burden of ever-increasing costs of college educations for their children.

I did vote in favor of the amendment providing the retention of the 7-percent investment credit on investments of up to \$20,000 per year, primarily to aid small businessmen and farmers.

I also voted in favor of the amendment adding a new section to the bill providing that the 3-percent floor on medical expenses and the 1-percent floor on medicine would not apply to individuals who are 65 years of age or older.

But aside from the effect of the several individual amendments, the total effect of Senate floor action on this bill would mean that the Federal Government must borrow money to finance the tax benefits

added, and that it must do so at the very same time we are increasing taxes by the continuation of the surcharge.

Moreover, Mr. President, these revenue losses to the Federal Treasury increase the supply of money and thereby fire the flames of inflation precisely at the time when this administration, by resorting to some very difficult measures in cutting Federal spending and halting inflation, has reduced inflationary pressures.

President Nixon has announced his intentions to veto this tax bill if it comes to his desk in the form in which the Senate is attempting to pass it. He has given us his reasons for feeling that this would be necessary. I agree with those reasons—they are exactly the same ones which compel me to vote against final passage.

This bill, before us now, is a fiscally irresponsible bill which gives tax cuts at a time when tax cuts feed the fires of inflation as they already threaten to engulf the economy of this Nation.

Fiscal responsibility is not a matter of being all head and no heart; it is a matter of social responsibility, too.

The country's troubles multiply when legislators do not add and subtract properly.

It is no kindness to the electorate to legislate without regard to the connection between spending and taxing. Inflation eats into every paycheck, and undermines the Nation's ability to put its troubled house in order.

Mr. President, one is compelled to express appreciation for the work of the Senate Finance Committee, and to recognize that they worked under a time limitation, as did the Senate itself as we near the end of the first session of the 91st Congress. Many factors worked against a more orderly and deeper study of tax reform. Yet, to recite these serves no purpose.

The bill before us simply fails to provide tax reform which is urgently required and sought by all.

If this bill passes the Senate today, and if the conference report comes back to this body reporting a fiscally responsible bill, I shall, at that time, vote in favor of the acceptance of that conference report.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, two of the facts of life of this body are that a Senator cannot vote "maybe" and that often the final vote does not present a clear-cut choice between "yea" and "nay".

The Tax Reform Act of 1969 is a case in point.

When discussion of tax reform started last spring, I listed certain goals which I thought the bill should attempt to meet.

There were: First, meaningful tax relief for low- and moderate-income families; second, no extension of the surtax without meaningful tax relief, and maybe not even then; and third, a balance or near balance between revenue lost through tax relief and revenue gained through tax reform.

The bill we vote on today does provide the first item, or at least directs more tax relief to those income groups than the House- or Senate Finance Committee-approved bills.

Of course, the bill also contains extension of the surtax—reduced to 5 percent for an additional 6 months. When I tied

surtax extension to tax reform last spring, I had two thoughts in mind.

First, separation of the surtax question from tax reform might have weakened the push for the latter. By keeping the two together, we have at least accomplished a step toward putting more equity into our tax system.

Second, I was not persuaded that the surtax had been or would be effective in slowing the climb in prices. I am still not persuaded, but on balance the long-range pluses from the tax relief provisions outweigh the short-range minuses resulting from a 6-month extension of the surtax.

The gap between the revenue which will be lost and the revenue which will be gained in the Senate bill is a more difficult problem with which to deal.

Without getting into specific figures, it is clear that as now presented, the Senate bill will cost the U.S. Treasury more than the House bill. And it goes without saying that with increasing demands on the Federal dollar, such a decrease cannot be accepted lightly.

Certainly we could have closed or partially closed numerous loopholes untouched or only slightly touched by this bill, and I voted for a number of such amendments.

And certainly we have cut back on loophole closing recommended by the Senate Finance Committee or approved by the House, and I have voted for several such amendments. The problem, of course, is that many such provisions do serve a useful social benefit.

Because some tax benefits are good for society, such as those which might help small businesses to compete better with conglomerates, it becomes difficult to close them all.

A better approach, it seems to me, might be to enact a stiffer minimum tax for persons taking undue advantage of loopholes and limiting the way they can make deductions. This stiffer approach would not necessarily seriously affect useful tax benefits but everyone would pay more for the privilege of using the loopholes. That is why I cosponsored an amendment to set a graduated minimum tax. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated.

At any rate, I am faced with a "yea" and a "nay" vote on the Tax Reform Act of 1969. Mindful of the revenue lost which would result if the Senate bill became law without change, I will vote yes with the hope that the conferees will do what they can to correct the revenue shortfall.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the passage of my amendment deleting intangible drilling and development costs as a preference item under H.R. 13270 was a victory for the independent oil producers and the economies of our oil- and gas-producing States.

That amendment deleting intangible drilling and development costs for taxpayers who gross \$3 million or less annually was necessary to encourage greater investment in the exploration and development of our oil and gas resources by the independent producer. Industry spokesmen indicate the producer of not more than 3,000 barrels a day will receive the greatest benefit from this legis-

lation, thus covering approximately 90 percent of our Kansas oil producers.

Witnesses before the Finance Committee indicated that more than 85 percent of the Nation's efforts to search for oil reserves is conducted by these independent producers. Government and industry report that the lack of incentives, not lack of prospects, has been the principal reason for the sharp reduction in exploration drilling during the past 12 years.

Reports from independent oil producer spokesmen indicate Kansas is an area of great potential. In particular, northeastern Kansas is demonstrating the largest leasing and drilling campaign seen in Kansas for many years. That activity along with heavy leasing in northwestern and western Kansas indicates the potential for profitable oil production. This legislation should provide the necessary economic incentives to increase that exploration and development.

Further, assistance was provided by rewriting the section which included depletion as a preference item and subjected it to a 5-percent tax. Under the amendment accepted by the Senate, the depletion allowance would be set off against intangible drilling and development costs, and the only tax paid would be on the excess of depletion.

Without this amendment and because the Senate later approved a 10-percent tax on preference items, the amendment is, in effect, worth twice as much to those taxpayers who gross \$3 million or less annually.

During Senate debate, Senator LONG, chairman of the Finance Committee, made a very good point—that the oil industry would have paid \$650 million in additional taxes under the House-passed bill and that the section dealing with intangibles alone would have constituted a burden of \$250 million in additional taxes.

In Kansas, where oil and natural gas production means one-half billion dollars to the economy, the small independent producers and the supply, equipment and services firms servicing the oil and gas industry depend directly on the vitality of that industry. The 27,800 Kansans employed in oil and gas production in 1968 and the 100,000 persons in the families of those employees are affected by this tax legislation. But more than that, a combination of these tax incentives will give new vigor to the economy of Kansas and other oil and gas producing states, and all consumers will benefit by increased oil and gas supplies.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I strongly favor an audit fee for private foundations, as provided in the present legislation.

The foundations operate with tax-free funds. The Treasury Department should police these funds to be certain they are used for public purposes. The audit fee would pay for this.

In this legislation for the first time we are attempting to distinguish between operating foundations and to set them aside from private foundations in general, which act only as conduits to pass income onto others. In the bill, the House committee, the House itself, and the Senate Finance Committee clearly recognized the differences between an operat-

ing and a grant-making foundation, and for the first time we have provided language defining an operating foundation.

By operating foundations, I refer to those foundations which expend their own resources, not derived from tax income, entirely for educational and museum purposes. I have in mind, for example, two operating foundations in the State of Virginia—Colonial Williamsburg and the Mariner's Museum at Newport News—which are engaged solely in educational endeavors completely analogous to tax-exempt museums operating in the same field across the Nation.

The Ribicoff amendment, which I supported, provides for an audit fee equal to one-fifth of 1 percent of the assets in 1970, one-tenth of 1 percent in 1971, and thereafter. That amendment further provides for an annual report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation by the Treasury in regard to the costs of enforcement. The Treasury shall recommend the rate of the audit fee to cover the costs.

Therefore, I say we should point out in the record that we are dealing with an unknown and that we do not have enough information to determine just what the audit fee should be. In view of this, we should request the Treasury in its annual report, as required under the Ribicoff amendment, to look specifically at the distinction to be made between operating foundations and private foundations in general.

In closing, let me reemphasize I am advocating a reasonable fee, not an exemption, for operating foundations. Therefore, what I am saying is let us go ahead for now, but be certain that Treasury recognizes this problem, and the distinction between operating foundations and private foundations in general. Treasury should concentrate on this in developing its report to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having expired, the question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MATHIAS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. STEVENS (after having voted in the affirmative). On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. SAXBE (after having voted in the negative). On this vote, I have a live pair with the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote.

The bill clerk concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from

Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) is absent on official business, and his pair has been previously announced. The Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. SAXBE) and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) have previously announced their respective pairs.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 223 Leg.]

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gore	Mondale
Allen	Gravel	Montoya
Baker	Harris	Moss
Bayh	Hart	Muskie
Bellmon	Hartke	Nelson
Bible	Hatfield	Packwood
Boggs	Hollings	Pastore
Burdick	Hughes	Pell
Byrd, Va.	Inouye	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Jackson	Proxmire
Cannon	Javits	Randolph
Case	Jordan, N.C.	Ribicoff
Church	Kennedy	Schweiker
Cook	Long	Scott
Cooper	Magnuson	Smith, III.
Cranston	Mansfield	Sparkman
Dodd	McCarthy	Spong
Dominick	McClellan	Stennis
Eagleton	McGee	Talmadge
Eastland	McGovern	Williams, N.J.
Ervin	McIntyre	Yarborough
Fong	Metcalf	Young, N. Dak.
Fulbright	Miller	Young, Ohio

NAYS—22

Allott	Griffin	Percy
Bennett	Gurney	Russell
Brooke	Hansen	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Holland	Thurmond
Curtis	Hruska	Tower
Dole	Jordan, Idaho	Williams, Del.
Fannin	Murphy	
Goodell	Pearson	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—3

Mathias, for.
Stevens, for.
Saxbe, against.

NOT VOTING—6

Anderson	Goldwater	Symington
Ellender	Mundt	Tydings

So the bill (H.R. 13270) was passed.

Mr. LONG. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment in the nature of a substitute for the House passed version of H.R. 13270 and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair be authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. LONG, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, Mr. BENNETT, and Mr. CURTIS conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unani-

mous consent that the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13270) be printed; and that in the engrossment of the amendment of the Senate to the bill the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to make appropriate technical, clerical, and conforming changes and corrections, including the placement of new provisions added to the bill by floor amendments, corrections in section, subsection, and so forth, designations, and cross references thereto, of the bill and of the sections of the Internal Revenue Code, and corrections in the table of contents of the bill.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, no one in the Senate respects the tradition of the Senate more than I. I have served on conference committees when we knew there would be disagreement. It is the duty of the conferees to work out an agreement between the House and the Senate versions of the bill. Nevertheless, it is the tradition of the Senate that they put on the conference committees those Members they feel can reasonably support the Senate position.

I felt so strongly I could not support this bill in its present form, and it was with great regret I had to vote against it after having worked on it so hard for the past several months.

I cannot in good conscience serve as a conferee and pretend to support the position of the Senate on something which I think is so radically wrong and irresponsible. I opposed all of the major amendments by the Senate, and it would not be fair to serve as a conferee.

I ask to be excused as a conferee.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order? Would the Chair direct Senators to take our seats?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Montana was recognized.

Mr. LONG addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would hope the Senator from Delaware would relent in his decision about this matter, but if he insists on it I will have to ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) be added as a conferee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Iowa is added as a conferee.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I understand the conferees have been named by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I understand the conferees do not now include the name of the Senator from Delaware. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The Senator from Delaware withdrew.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, could the Senator from Delaware be reinstated at his request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not without unanimous consent.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the Senator like him to be reinstated?

Mr. DOLE. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would like to see him reinstated. Would he approve?

Mr. DOLE. I hope he will reconsider. I think it would be a great tragedy if he were not a conferee. Every Member on this side of the aisle shares that view.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I think it would be inappropriate unless the Senator from Delaware were present.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Presiding Officer is correct.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Gerald J. Gallinghouse, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I rise to ask the distinguished majority leader the order of business today, tomorrow, and Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the question raised by the distinguished Republican leader, I think we should indicate for the RECORD tonight where we stand for the rest of the week, next week, and up to and including the day on which Christmas Eve will fall.

Before I answer the question, I wish to express once again to the distinguished Senator from Delaware my deep understanding of the situation in which he found himself. It is just another indication of his integrity and honesty. Despite the fact that he is not going to be a member of the conference committee I would hope he would reconsider his position, resolve his doubts, and do what he can, because his presence would be constructive in bringing about a resolution of the differences between the House and the Senate.

Mr. President, getting back to the question at hand:

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 600, H.R. 14580.

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

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes.

CXV—2418—Part 28

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Assistance Act of 1969".

PART I—ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND

SEC. 101. Section 202(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which relates to authorization, is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "fiscal year 1968,";

(2) by inserting after "fiscal year 1969," the following: "and \$390,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970," and

(3) by striking out "June 30, 1969" in the second proviso and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

SEC. 102. Section 212 of such Act, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "\$200,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$167,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970".

AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND HOSPITALS ABROAD

SEC. 103. Section 214 of such Act, which relates to American schools and hospitals abroad, is amended—

(1) by striking out of subsection (c) "fiscal year 1969, \$14,600,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$25,900,000"; and

(2) by striking out of subsection (d) "fiscal year 1969, \$5,100,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$3,000,000".

ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS

SEC. 104. Section 252(a) of such Act, which relates to authorization, is amended—

(1) by striking out "fiscal year 1969, \$420,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$419,000,000";

(2) by striking out "\$90,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$81,500,000"; and

(3) by striking out "June 30, 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1970".

PROGRAMS RELATING TO POPULATION GROWTH

SEC. 105. Section 292, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1969, \$50,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$100,000,000".

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PROGRAMS

SEC. 106. (a) Section 301(c) of such Act, relating to general authority, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) (1) In determining whether or not to continue furnishing assistance for Palestine refugees in the Near East through contributions to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, the President shall take into account (A) whether Israel and the Arab host governments are taking steps toward the resettlement and repatriation of such refugees, and (B) the extent and success of efforts by the Agency and the Arab host governments to rectify the Palestine refugee relief rolls.

"(2) No contributions by the United States shall be made to the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East except on the condition that no part of the United States contribution shall be used to furnish assistance to refugees who are receiving military training as members of the so-called Palestine Liberation Army or any other guerrilla-type organization or to refugees who have engaged in any act of terrorism."

(b) Section 302(a) of such Act, relating

to authorization, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1969, \$135,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$150,750,000".

SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE

SEC. 107. Section 402 of such Act, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1969 not to exceed \$410,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970 not to exceed \$420,000,000".

CONTINGENCY FUND

SEC. 108. Section 451(a) of such Act, relating to authorization, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1968 not to exceed \$50,000,000, and for the fiscal year 1969 not to exceed \$10,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970 not to exceed \$20,000,000".

PART II—MILITARY ASSISTANCE

MILITARY ASSISTANCE AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 201. Section 504(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, relating to authorization, is amended—

(1) by striking out "\$375,000,000 for the fiscal year 1969" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$325,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Amounts appropriated under this subsection shall be available for cost-sharing expenses of United States participation in the military headquarters and related agencies program; and no part of any funds made available under any other provision of law shall be used for such expenses."

SPECIAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 202. Section 506(a) of such Act, relating to special authority of the President, is amended by striking out "1969" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1970".

RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO GREECE

SEC. 203. Part II of such Act, relating to military assistance, is amended by inserting between sections 508 and 509 the following new section:

"SEC. 508A. RESTRICTIONS ON MILITARY AID TO GREECE.—Military assistance to Greece under this Act shall, until further action by the Congress, be limited to expenditure of funds obligated prior to the date of enactment of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969."

RESTRICTIONS ON TRAINING FOREIGN MILITARY STUDENTS

SEC. 204. Chapter 2 of part II of such Act, relating to military assistance, is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 510. RESTRICTIONS ON TRAINING FOREIGN MILITARY STUDENTS.—The number of foreign military students to be trained in the United States in any fiscal year, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this part, may not exceed a number equal to one-half the number of foreign civilians brought to the United States under the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 in the immediately preceding fiscal year."

PART III—GENERAL, ADMINISTRATIVE, AND MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

SEC. 301. Section 637(a) of such Act, relating to administrative expenses, is amended by striking out "fiscal year 1969, \$53,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "fiscal year 1970, \$50,000,000".

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it had been anticipated that we would consider two conference reports from the Committee on Banking and Currency. They will not be considered this afternoon, but they will be considered some-

time tomorrow. Following their disposal and the disposition of the foreign aid authorization bill, it is anticipated that the Senate will turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 561, H.R. 6543, the cigarette smoking bill.

If we finish the foreign aid authorization bill tomorrow, it is the intention of the joint leadership to take up the cigarette smoking bill tomorrow and hopefully finish it. If not, we have no choice but to come in Saturday. It is with reluctance I raise this possibility because I thought it might be possible to have either the defense appropriation bill complete on Saturday, or Labor-HEW, or the Department of Transportation appropriation bill, but because of a pile-up of factors over which no one seemingly had control, it will be impossible to get up any of these bills before Monday.

Hopefully on Monday we can take up the Defense Department appropriation bill, to be followed by the Labor-HEW bill or the transportation appropriation bill.

Then, we will have a foreign aid appropriation bill and a supplemental appropriation bill.

In other words, in the next 11 days—and that is all the time we have in which to work before Christmas—we will have five appropriation bills and a cigarette bill, as well as the authorization bill for foreign aid. There may be one or two other bills in the meantime, but it indicates that we have a pretty tough schedule ahead of us.

I am only sorry we do not have a good deal more legislation waiting.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. FRIDAY AND FROM FRIDAY TO 10 A.M. SATURDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. If we do not finish the foreign aid bill and the cigarette bill tomorrow I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on Friday we stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock Saturday morning.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit a question at this point, I assume that if we do finish those two bills Friday it will be possible for Senators to do some Christmas shopping and buy their wives a present on Saturday; otherwise not, is that right?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed. I devoutly hope we will finish. I do want to make this announcement as definite as I can because Senators have been faithful and canceled many important appointments which were of importance to them.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I hope that timewise the distinguished majority leader makes it as emphatic as he can.

I feel sure the defense bill will be ready and I do not see why the Labor-HEW bill should not be ready also. It could be ready Saturday but the clerks have to do some work on it. I do not see any reason why the bills will not be ready. I think every Senator has some interest in those bills. We could get to that matter before the Defense bill or vice versa.

At any rate, I hope that on Monday we are not confronted with someone saying, "Do not bring that bill out because I cannot be here until Tuesday."

Mr. MANSFIELD. It would be too late for that.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator about the housing bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That bill will be reached some time tomorrow.

Mr. DOMINICK. Do I understand the Defense appropriation bill will not come up until Monday?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. It will not be taken up in full committee until tomorrow, and it would be an impossibility to get the volumes of hearings from the Government Printing Office before sometime Saturday. I think that in the interests of all concerned, we could not possibly proceed before Monday.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, I would like to yield to the Senator from Florida who has been waiting very patiently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania had the floor originally and he yielded to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I will yield the floor after I have an opportunity to ask the majority leader this question. Does the majority leader expect any further votes tonight?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. One of the two bills that the Senator referred to is a banking tax bill which the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Utah had expected to take up earlier today, but they have been unable to do so. May that bill be taken up in the morning?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. The Senator from Alabama was called away on official business unexpectedly. He will be back at 10:30 or so tomorrow morning, and upon his return we will take up the two conference reports.

ORDER FOR A BRIEF PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana wish the statements to be limited to 3 minutes?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not now, not with a morning hour in the afternoon.

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

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

REPORT ON REAPPORTIONMENT OF AN APPROPRIATION

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the Department of the Interior for "Management of lands and resources," Bureau of Land Management, for the fiscal year 1970, has been apportioned on a basis which indicates a need for a supplemental estimate of appropriation; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

A letter from the Chairman, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, Washington, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore: A resolution adopted by the City Council of Pomona, Calif., remonstrating against certain statements published in the National Enquirer.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2244. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-605).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

H.R. 8449. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1906 (Rept. No. 91-604).

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SPONG:

S. 3236. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish the eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry for grants under the existing program of grants to improve the quality of such schools; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GOODELL (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. SAXBE, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 3237. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning ecological-environmental education, and to establish a National Advisory Commission on Technology and the Environment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. GOODELL when he in-

roduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. PELL, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. NELSON):

S. 3238. A bill to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. GOODELL):

S. 3239. A bill to amend section 302(b) of the National Housing Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

S. 3237—INTRODUCTION OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL RECLAMATION EDUCATIONAL ACT OF 1969

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, Americans of 1969 are in some ways born into the most enlightened age in history.

Propelled on the strength of a revolution in science and technology, our country has evolved from a rural to a predominantly urban Nation that finds itself on the moon and rocketing beyond.

In less than 200 years—blessed with that particular grace shed upon her by divine providence—America has turned her remarkable energies from the fertility of her soil, to the engine of the industrial revolution, to the metabolism of urbanization.

Yet in terms of their knowledge of their environment and of ecology itself—"the great chain of life"—our people may be said to be living in the stone age. In a sense, they might easily believe that the earth is flat, the oceans bottomless, and our atmosphere limitless.

They have little understanding in an immediate, personalized way of the challenge to our survival posed by our deteriorating environment.

At the heart of that deterioration is planless industrialization, urbanization, and the population explosion. Together they have combined to threaten seriously the continuation of life on this planet.

World population will double by the year 2000.

Here in the United States, land is being urbanized at the rate of 3,000 acres per day.

Waste producing concentrations of people and industry are fouling our air, polluting our water and contaminating our land at a frenetic pace.

As one indication of this, we are spewing 150 million tons of pollutants into our atmosphere annually.

In the last few years, State and Federal governments have begun to move firmly toward control of air and water pollution in the United States.

If, however, we are to survive in a society which uses enormous amounts of matter and energy, I believe that we must create a broad understanding among our people of the complex public issues involved in the maintenance of environmental quality, and the preservation of the delicate, life sustaining ecological cycle.

Mr. President, I believe that it is a matter of the utmost urgency that we

embark upon a national effort to create a citizenry that is sensitive and alert to the need for developing informed attitudes of concern for environmental quality. We must sow the seeds of such awareness throughout the entire continuum of American education. We must plant those seeds for tomorrow, and we must marshal the entire community in the effort.

To assist in this objective, I introduce the Environmental Reclamation Education Act of 1969, on behalf of myself and Senators BROOKE, CANNON, HATFIELD, JAVITS, PERRY, PACKWOOD, SAXBE, and SCOTT.

Title I of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a truly national environmental-ecological education program ranging from the preschool to the graduate school level. A 3-year \$37 million authorization is recommended.

It contemplates the utilization of such programs—which will include curriculum development and teacher training—in State and local school systems, institutions of higher education, adult education courses, community action programs, and in educational television.

It also authorizes the establishment throughout the Nation of a system of regional ecological-environmental education centers, which would develop, collect, and disseminate to the general public information, materials, data, and statistics concerning—

First, the specific ecological-environmental problems peculiar to their particular regions;

Second, the nature, sources, causes, extent, prevention, control and abatement of air and water pollution, and activities affecting undesirable environmental and ecologic change;

Third, establish requirements for the control of emissions of air contaminants and water pollutants, including relevant State and local laws and public hearing requirements, and the enforcement thereof;

Fourth, the present and prospective impact of technology upon the environment and the ecological cycle;

Fifth, methods for monitoring atmospheric waste, the measurement and forecasting of air and water pollution, and the identification of significant meteorological, geographical, and ecological factors within their particular regions; and

Sixth, environmental and ecological factors related to long-term urban and regional planning.

Our people must be marshaled in the effort to preserve our environment through the long-term approach of education.

They must realize that environmental deterioration is not a plague visited upon their community by one industry or group. It is the common problem of all, the inevitable accompaniment of social activity in a producer-consumer society.

While American technology has contributed significantly to the unprecedented economic and social progress of the United States, its development in some instances has been without adequate consideration of its consequences upon the human environment. It is clearly desirable that we have a broad overview of technological developments,

their applications, and their impact upon our society in environmental and ecological terms.

Certainly within the Federal Government particular attention must be given to this question in the context of Federal policy priorities and objectives.

It is hoped that the Federal Government can point the way—for State and local governments and the private sector—to more responsible management of technological change consistent with our national environmental goals.

Title II of my bill would create a National Advisory Commission on Technology and the Environment to examine the capacity of the Federal Government to accomplish this at the present time.

It would investigate, analyze and recommend methods to identify deficiencies in the existing processes of governmental assessment and decisionmaking, as they relate to the continuing evolution and impact of technology upon the quality of our environment.

Mr. President, we are approaching the 200th anniversary of the birth of our Nation. We have long since mastered her mountains and plains with physical and social organization, communication, transportation, and economics.

In some respects and in many areas America is monotonous, faceless, and out of touch with nature. The air is foul, the water black, the streets crowded and dangerous. The vast, suffocating urban colossus imposed on so many of our people causes many to doubt our ability to manage effectively ever again the quality of our environment.

What is needed to meet this challenge to mind, body, and spirit is a national commitment to effective substantive programs to clean up and police our environment.

President Nixon has already committed his administration to a national approach to environmental protection, with the establishment of the Environmental Quality Council. I am confident that he will move decisively in this area.

What is called for in addition is a new kind of patriotism—rooted in the very soil, air and waters of America—which seeks to preserve and protect our life sustaining environmental resources for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans.

Environmental education can be the catalyst of that new patriotism—a challenge and a determination to develop a better informed, more effective citizenry willing and able to meet the threat of our degraded environment.

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

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

The bill (S. 3237) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants to conduct special educational programs and activities concerning ecological-environmental education, and to establish a National Advisory Commission on Technology and the Environment, introduced by Mr. GOODELL, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Wel-

fare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3237

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Environmental Reclamation Education Act of 1969".

TITLE I—ECOLOGICAL-ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS—STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that air and water pollution, environmental debasement, industrial and technological development which interferes with the ecological cycle, and the denuding of our land poses a serious threat to the health, strength and vitality of the people of our nation, the propagation and protection of plant and animal life and the protection of property and other resources; that the tremendous growth of population and industry has resulted in substantial increases in atmospheric waste, and air and water pollution throughout the United States; that such abuse of the environment and interference with the ecological cycle is increasing, particularly in our urban and suburban areas; that there is a lack of authoritative information and creative projects designed to educate the American people about meeting the threat posed to our environment and to life itself, by industrialization and technological development, undertaken without regard to their long term effects and upon our environment and the ecologic cycle; and that public support and understanding of the need for prevention and control of such environmental abuse requires intensive and coordinated efforts on the part of Federal, State and local governmental agencies, business and other private organizations, and community action groups.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to encourage the development of new and improved programs in the field of ecological-environmental education for use in State and local school systems, institutions of higher education, adult education courses, community action programs and in educational television programming, to encourage the development of curricula and teacher training programs in such field at all educational levels, including community education programs; and to demonstrate the use of such curricula in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 102. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970, \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971, and \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972 for the purposes of carrying out this title. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

USES OF FUNDS

SEC. 103. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 102, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, hereinafter referred to in this Act as the "Secretary," shall assist in educating the American people on the problems of environmental abuse and the long term consequences of advertent and inadvertent interference with the ecological cycle by—

(1) making grants to or entering into contracts with institutions of higher education and other public and private agencies, institutions, or organizations, for—

(A) the development and implementation of ecological-environmental education programs, including curriculum developments, for use in State and local school systems, institutions of higher education, community education programs, including seminars, workshops, conferences, and summer camps, and in educational television;

(B) the formulation and organization within institutions of higher education of inte-

grated courses of study in the field of ecological-environmental education leading toward the establishment of degree-granting programs in such field;

(C) the development of specialized teacher-training program in the field of ecological-environmental education at all educational levels;

(D) the establishment of a system of regional ecological-environmental education centers, which shall develop, collect, and disseminate to the general public information, materials, data, and statistics, concerning—

(i) the specific ecological-environmental problems peculiar to their particular regions;

(ii) the nature, sources, causes, extent, prevention, control, and abatement of air and water pollution and activities affecting undesirable environmental and ecologic change;

(iii) established requirements for the control of emissions of air contaminants and water pollutants, including relevant State and local laws and public hearing requirements, and the enforcement thereof;

(iv) the present and prospective impact of technology upon the environment and the ecological cycle;

(v) methods for monitoring atmospheric waste, the measurement and forecasting of air and water pollution and the identification of significant meteorological, geographical, and ecological factors within their particular regions; and

(vi) environmental and ecological factors related to long-term urban and regional planning; and

(E) the establishment of State and local councils to encourage ecological-environmental education among the general public, utilizing the resources of institutions of higher education, schools and regional education centers created pursuant to clause 1 (D) of this section; and

(2) undertaking, directly or through contracts or other arrangements with institutions of higher education, and public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, evaluation of the effectiveness and relevance of the program funded pursuant to clause (1) of this section.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ECOLOGICAL-ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

SEC. 104. (a) An Advisory Council on Ecological-Environmental Education (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") is hereby created to—

(1) advise the Secretary concerning the preparation and implementation of regulations and criteria governing programs funded pursuant to the provisions of this title; including criteria designed to achieve an appropriate geographical distribution of funded projects throughout all regions of the Nation;

(2) evaluate such applications for grants and contracts made pursuant to the provisions of this title as the Secretary may direct, and make recommendations to the Secretary concerning approval or disapproval of such applications;

(3) review the administration and operation of programs funded pursuant to this title, including the effectiveness of such programs in meeting the purposes for which they are established and operated, making recommendations with respect thereto, and making annual reports of its findings and recommendations to the Secretary;

(4) receive and review progress and evaluation reports on programs and projects carried out under this title; and

(5) propose comprehensive ecological-environmental education goals toward which unified national action can be directed.

(b) The Council shall consist of twenty-one members, including the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, and the Secretary of the Interior or their duly designated nominees, the Science Advisor to the President, the Chairman, President's Council on Environmental Quality, the United States Com-

missioner of Education, the Surgeon General of the United States, the Director, United States Public Health Service, the Director, National Institute of Mental Health and twelve other persons appointed by the President who shall select such persons from the public and private sector with due regard to their fitness, knowledge and experience in academic, scientific, medical, legal, conservation, urban and regional planning, and information media activities, as they relate to our industrialized consumer-oriented society, and its effect upon our environment and the ecologic balance.

(c) Members of the Council not regularly employed by the Federal Government shall, while serving on the business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$125 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 105. The Secretary shall, when requested, render technical assistance to local educational agencies, public and private nonprofit organizations and institutions of higher education in the development and implementation of programs of ecological-environmental education. Such technical assistance may, among other activities, include making available to such agencies, organizations, or institutions personnel of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare or other persons qualified to advise and assist the development and carrying out of such education programs.

PAYMENTS

SEC. 106. Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION

SEC. 107. In administering the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or private agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

TITLE II—NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMISSION ON TECHNOLOGY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 201. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that American technology has contributed significantly to the unprecedented economic and social progress of the United States and its people; that technological advancement has proceeded without adequate consideration of its consequences upon the human environment; that industrial and technological advancement has created certain adverse effects upon our environment and the ecological cycle upon which all life depends; that new, independent, institutionalized organizations are needed within the Federal Government to assess on a continuing basis the impact of the growth and spread of various technologies upon national environmental goals and resources; that decisions affecting the course of technology and its long term effects upon environment require the broadest possible public participation, and should not be delegated solely to governmental, business, scientific and political interests; and that the future of American technology can best promote the continued economic and social advancement of the Nation, if systematic assessment of the nature and effects of its development is undertaken.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to create an Advisory Commission to investigate, analyze and recommend methods to identify deficiencies in existing processes of assessment and governmental decision-making with respect to the evolution of technology and its adverse effect upon environmental quality and ecological regimes.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 202. There is hereby established an Advisory Commission on Technology and the Environment (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-one members to be appointed by the President from the public and private sector with due regard to their fitness, knowledge and experience in scientific, medical, legal, public administration, social and physical science, business, and local, State and Federal Government activities. Representatives of the public at large shall be included. Not more than eight members shall be full time employees of the United States.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers.

(c) The President shall designate one of the members to serve as Chairman and one to serve as Vice Chairman of the Commission.

(d) Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 104. (a) The Commission shall undertake a comprehensive investigation and study of the present and prospective impact of technology upon the environment and the ecological cycle, and the existing governmental processes of assessment and decisionmaking with respect to the evolution of technology in the United States as it relates to environmental quality. It shall include without being limited to—

(1) an analysis and evaluation of particular areas of technology by contracting with institutions of higher learning and other private nonprofit organizations to undertake studies of specific problems defined and selected by it, except that such problems shall involve technological developments or applications that are sponsored by the Federal Government or are otherwise affected in a direct way by federal activity or regulation;

(2) an analysis, review, and evaluation of basic research on the subject of technological development and its impact upon the environment;

(3) a review and evaluation of specific assessments of present and future technological impact upon the environment made by Government agencies and departments, including criteria and procedures employed in the assessment process, the nature and technical adequacy of the evidence relied upon, and the representation of potentially affected interests; and

(4) an analysis and evaluation of continuing assessment systems in relevant departments and agencies of the Federal Government and in the Congress.

(b) The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress interim reports and, not later than three years after the first meeting of the Commission, one final report, containing detailed statements of the findings and conclusions of the Commission, together with its recommendations, including such recommendations for legislation and administrative action as it deems advisable.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 205. (a) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or members thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings, take such testimony, and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission deems advisable.

(b) Each department, agency, and instru-

mentality of the executive branch of the Government, including independent agencies, is authorized and directed to furnish to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman, such information as the Commission deems necessary to carry out its functions under this title.

(c) Subject to such rules and regulations as may be adopted by the Commission, the Chairman shall have the power to—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of an executive director, and such additional staff personnel as he deems necessary, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, but at rates not in excess of the maximum rate for GS-18 of General Schedule under section 5332 of such title, and

(2) procure temporary and intermittent services of the same as is authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, but at rates not to exceed \$50 a day for individuals.

(d) The Commission is authorized to enter contracts with Federal or State agencies, private firms, institutions, and individuals for the conduct of research or surveys, the preparation of reports, and other activities necessary to the discharge of its duties.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS

SEC. 206. Members of the Commission not otherwise employed by the Federal Government shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day they are engaged in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission. All members shall be entitled to reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of their duties as members of the Commission.

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

SEC. 207. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of this title the sum of \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1970; \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1971; and \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1972.

TERMINATION

SEC. 208. On the nineteenth day after the date of submission of its final report to the President, the Commission shall cease to exist.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR HUGH SCOTT COSPONSORING THE ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION RECLAMATION ACT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to be among those who have joined today with the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) in the introduction of the Environmental Reclamation Education Act of 1969. It is the purpose of this bill to enhance the preservation and protection of our life sustaining environmental resources for the benefit of present and future generations of our citizens. As such, this legislation represents a major, substantive effort to improve the quality of American life.

President Nixon has already committed his administration to a national approach to environmental protection through the establishment of the Environmental Quality Council. I have every confidence that decisive moves in this area will be forthcoming.

The Environmental Reclamation Education Act offers such an opportunity. It would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to develop a truly national environmental educational program ranging from the pre-

school to graduate school level. Proper emphasis on a curricula development and teacher training would be provided. Adult education courses, community action programs and the use of educational television are also contemplated as a part of this broad, national approach which would be funded under an initial 3-year authorization of \$37 million.

Title II of this act would create a National Advisory Commission on Technology and the Environment to examine both the impact of technological change on the environment, and the ability of the decisionmaking and other governmental processes to deal effectively with environmental concerns.

Mr. President, only an informed citizenry can act willingly and intelligently to reverse the trends which threaten to continue to degradation of our environment. Our bill has this as its goal, and I urge early and favorable consideration.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

S. 3220

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3220, to protect a person's right of privacy by providing for the designation of obscene or offensive mail matter by the sender and for the return of such matter at the expense of the sender.

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

EXTENSION OF PUBLIC HEALTH PROTECTION WITH RESPECT TO CIGARETTE SMOKING—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 419

Mr. COTTON submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 6543) to extend public health protection with respect to cigarette smoking, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 420 AND 421

Mr. GOODELL submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 14580) to promote the foreign policy, security, and general welfare of the United States by assisting peoples of the world to achieve economic development within a framework of democratic economic, social, and political institutions, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. MUSKIE (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. HART, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOBB, and Mr. JACKSON) submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to House bill 14580, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 423

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to H.R. 14580, the pending Foreign Aid Authorization Act of 1969. The purpose of the amendment is to establish a modest pilot program of loan guaranties for community self-development in Latin America. The principal feature of the amendment is its emphasis on Latin America financing for Latin American development. Today, loan guaranties from the Agency for International Development are available only for U.S. investments in foreign countries. The amendment I have proposed will encourage Latin American banks and other private sector institutions to lend funds for community development projects in their own nations. In so doing, it will promote a system of joint participation by both the rich and the poor in Latin American development.

Under the amendment, a 3-year pilot loan guaranty programs could be established in no more than five Latin American countries, and the total amount of loans outstanding at any one time would be \$15 million.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 423) is as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 423

On page 89, insert the following new part after line 12:

PART IV—AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

"Sec. 401. Title III of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which relates to investment guaranties, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"225. Agricultural credit and self-help community development projects

"(a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate the participation of the private sector of Latin American countries in the economic development of such countries, the authority conferred by this section should be used to establish pilot programs in not more than five Latin American countries to encourage private banks, credit institutions, similar private lending organizations, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations to make loans on reasonable terms to organized groups and individuals residing in a community for the purpose of enabling such groups and individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. Agricultural credit and assistance for self-help community development projects should include, but not be limited to, material and such projects as wells, pumps, farm machinery, improved seed, fertilizer, pesticides, vocational training, food industry development, nutrition projects, improved breeding stock for farm animals, sanitation facilities, and looms and other handicraft aids.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to private lending institutions, cooperatives, and private nonprofit development organizations in not more than five Latin American countries assuring against loss of not to exceed 25 per centum

of the portfolio of such loans made by any lender to organized groups or individuals residing in a community to enable such groups or individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance from other sources on reasonable terms. In no event shall the liability of the United States exceed 75 per centum of any one loan.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Not more than 10 per centum of such sum shall be provided for any one institution, cooperative, or organization.

"(d) Notwithstanding the limitation contained in subsection (c) of this section, foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this section, including the discharge of liabilities incurred under this section. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to authority conferred by any other provision of law to implement guaranty programs utilizing excess local currency.

"(e) The President shall, on or before January 15, 1972, make a detailed report to the Congress on the results of the pilot programs established under this section, together with such recommendations as he may deem appropriate.

"(f) The authority of this section shall continue until June 30, 1972."

AMENDMENT No. 424

Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FONG, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. MILLER, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCHWEIKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMITH, Mr. STEVENS, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to H.R. 14580, 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.)

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 5

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Subcommittee on the Evaluation and Planning of Social Programs, I wish to give notice that the current series of hearings on S. 5, the proposed Full Opportunity Act, will resume on next Tuesday, December 16. The hearing will begin at 10 o'clock in the morning in room 1318.

Witnesses to be heard by the subcommittee are Mr. Joseph A. Califano, Jr., and Prof. Ernest Hilgard of Stanford University.

Other members of the subcommittee are the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH).

HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, Secretary of Transportation John Volpe recently announced the appointment of a new Director for the Highway Safety Bureau and a reorganization of the agency. I commend Secretary Volpe on his choice of Mr. Douglas Toms to head

the Bureau. He is well qualified for the post and will bring new energy and direction to a program that has been stagnated and leaderless for nearly 10 months.

The reorganization of the Bureau, removing it from the Federal Highway Administration and placing it directly under the office of the Secretary, is a significant decision. For months the safety program has been seriously limited by inadequate organization. Given the priority it deserves, the program should begin to achieve the results we all hoped it would.

Mr. President, for more than 6 months I have urged that the Safety Bureau be given independent status within the Department of Transportation. I am highly gratified that Secretary Volpe has taken this step and am confident it will improve the effectiveness of the safety program.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Secretary Volpe's announcement and a brief biography of Mr. Toms be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY JOHN A. VOLPE AT PRESS CONFERENCE WITH DOUGLAS TOMS, FRIDAY, DECEMBER 5, 1969

One of the most disturbing and distressing problems facing me as Secretary of Transportation is the fact that we are killing 55-thousand people on our streets and highways every year. We are determined to stop this slaughter.

Yesterday, President Nixon announced his nomination of Douglas Toms of Olympia, Washington, to be Director of one of our Department's most important constituent agencies, the National Highway Safety Bureau.

We are extremely fortunate to have obtained Mr. Toms services. He is eminently qualified and is a widely-recognized expert in the field of highway safety.

We have spent considerable time in filling this most-important post, but we took the time because the responsibilities and challenges are such that a truly top caliber official had to be found. We needed a leader who was not only capable and skilled, but also dedicated and concerned. Doug Toms is just such a person.

He has served as my special consultant for highway safety since September. He has thoroughly reviewed the present organization and programs of the Highway Safety Bureau and has filed a report with me containing a number of recommendations. He did his job well, and we are giving all his recommendations thoughtful consideration.

One of the recommendations that I have acted upon concerns the status and position of the Bureau.

The enabling act that created the Highway Safety Bureau allowed for it to be placed under the immediate direction of the Secretary of Transportation. By administrative action, however, it was subsequently placed under the Federal Highway Administration. We are, today, reversing that action and placing the Bureau directly under the Office of the Secretary.

Such action has been recommended on two previous occasions—by the following statutory groups—this past summer.

The National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council and

The National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.

We feel that this will allow us to give safety the attention and emphasis it demands and deserves.

All of the N-H-S-B functions relating di-

rectly to motor vehicles and their drivers will come under the Office of the Secretary. Several other functions, such as safety design engineering in the construction of new highways, will remain in the Federal Highway Administration.

The actions we are taking now—the appointment of Doug Toms and the initial realignment of highway safety responsibilities—are first steps. We now have our man, and we now have our organization in the right place. We will follow these first steps with a fulfillment of our responsibilities as we work strenuously to assure that our highways and vehicles are safer, and that the terrible toll of over 150 Americans killed in crashes every day will be cut sharply.

Safety—in all aspects and all modes—has top priority in this Department. We look forward to significant accomplishments.

BIOGRAPHY OF DOUGLAS W. TOMS, DIRECTOR-DESIGNATE, NATIONAL HIGHWAY SAFETY BUREAU

Mr. Toms has served in the field of traffic management since 1960 having been successively as an educator, consultant, and administrator in that field. At the time of his appointment by President Nixon, Mr. Toms was serving as Special Consultant to Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe for Highway Safety and was on leave of absence from his position as Director of the Department of Motor Vehicles for the State of Washington.

Born: September 17, 1930, Michigan.
 Legal residence: State of Washington.
 Home address: 1907 Lakehurst Drive Olympia, Washington 98502.
 Marital status: Wife, Geraldine; children, Gregory.

Education: Central Michigan University, BS, Accounting; Michigan State University, MA, Traffic Administration, and he has completed all work except the dissertation towards a Ph. D. with the emphasis in Traffic Administration at Michigan State University.

Experience: Since March, 1965, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles of the State of Washington and for two months prior was Acting Director. In 1964, he served as consultant to the Department of Licenses and the Legislature of the State of Washington. From 1960 through 1964, Mr. Toms was an Assistant Professor at California State College at Los Angeles.

Professional memberships: President of the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators; former National Chairman of the Registration and Title Commission; past chairman of the Driver Licensing Committee of Region IV; former member of the U.S. Air Force Traffic Safety Advisory Committee; in 1963-1964, he was Conference Chairman of the California Driver Education Association.

THE VICE PRESIDENT HONORS HIS FATHER

Mr. DOLE, Mr. President, last evening the Vice President spoke in Baltimore at a dinner organized to honor the memory of his late father, Theodore Spiro Agnew.

The theme of his Greek heritage led the Vice President into an exploration of the present-day status of what the ancient Greeks considered man's most ennobling endeavor, the pursuit of knowledge. Mr. AGNEW raised many well-considered and highly pertinent questions about education in America and its role, influences and responsibilities today and in the coming years. I commend these thought-provoking observations to the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Vice President AGNEW's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks

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

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT, THEODORE SPIRO AGNEW SCHOLARSHIP FUND DINNER, BALTIMORE, Md., DECEMBER 10, 1969

I am grateful for your presence tonight. More than an honor to me, it is a profound tribute to the memory of my father. Many of you knew him, knew the kind of man he was and knew that such men are rare in any community—at any time.

I am proud to say that I grew up in the light of my father. My beliefs are his and my father believed deeply in America. My father was deeply involved in the life of the Greek community, for this, to him, was part of being an American.

"My Brother Ahepans" he said eight years ago, "Who better understands the true value of freedom and dignity than we . . . who are the direct descendants of the authors of those principles—the Ancient Hellenes? Who better understands the true value of freedom and dignity than we who have matured and prospered in the workshop of democracy, the United States of America?" This Ahepa-conceived Scholarship Fund is particularly appropriate to honor my father's memory, for he cherished education as the key to a better life. That belief is Greek as much as it is American.

Pericles, the father of the first democratic state, said in the fifth century before Christ, "Athens is the school of Hellas." The Athenian ideal was that of the free citizen in the free state. But a state of freedom was never a state of ignorance. Education was, and always will be, integral to civilization.

As Pericles said, "The grave impediment to action is . . . not discussion, but the want of that knowledge which is gained by discussion preparatory to action." Courage from conviction distinguishes the free and civilized citizen.

To Socrates, to Plato, to Aristotle, all education served the soul. The Golden Age of Greece gave birth to the concept that public education was prerequisite to intelligent citizenship. Twenty centuries before Thomas Jefferson, Aristotle connected the public and private interest with cultivation of the mind as a free society's ultimate aim.

Never was there a separation of individual and collective good nor was there a distinction between a life of pleasure and a life of civic fulfillment. The Athenian spirit was not only to live but to live well. Civic duty was an honor, and a life balancing work and comfort was the goal. Neither property nor prosperity were vices, only their misuse or a misunderstanding of their value was deplored.

This is our Greek heritage—deeply philosophical and political—and while the world has grown in technical prowess, it has never surpassed the Athenian ideal of free citizenship. Ancient Athens remains the school of civilized nations. And from ancient Athens we can draw lessons of good and evil applicable today.

The rise and fall of all free nations mirrors the rise and fall of Athens. The overall lesson is that freedom and the good life are demanding possessions. To use them well and possess them permanently, discipline and education are required.

If I am known to raise my voice in criticism, it is because I see danger in our nation's course. Because America, like ancient Athens, can become foolish and corrupt; because a life of ease is not synonymous with a life of fulfillment; and because no generation can confer wisdom upon its children. Each generation must work to earn its own.

Heraclitus, one of Greece's earliest philosophers, perceived that all is flux. Change is the only constant. Arcesilaus, the skeptic, said, "Nothing is certain, not even that." Is this not true of today? Power is ephemeral and no excuse for conceit. Freedom, prosperity, moral and military strength are evanescent, not eternal. They cannot be secured

once and then forgotten but must be carefully and continuously cultivated.

Education is the source to replenish a free society. America understands renewal and reform. We labor to renew our cities and reform our government. Yet we have left education—the source—relatively untouched. Of course, we have expanded and multiplied educational opportunities. We have had added preschool programs, community colleges, and enlarged universities to multiversities. But we have not sufficiently probed to the essence of the pure institution, and this explains much of our present problem.

By inclination, Americans think quantitatively. We are appreciators of the bigger. The danger in this lies in possible error in the original assumption. If what we are doing is not right to begin with, quantitative adjustments compound the wrong.

We have sometimes failed to perceive that as times change, we must not only change our programs but our premises governing education. Albert Einstein once defined education as "that which remains after you have forgotten everything you learned in school." Yet the American public continues to think of education as a terminal process limited to the youthful years of life. In a society where skilled laborers must learn new techniques six times before retirement, where 50 percent of technical engineering knowledge becomes obsolete within a decade, where 70 percent of all knowledge that will serve our present student generation during their lives is as yet unknown and undiscovered . . . it is time to stop regarding education as circumscribed by a particular period of a lifetime.

We must stop developing educational programs for twelve years, or sixteen, or twenty years and start creating programs that gear themselves to useful, satisfying lives.

In the first place, the penchant for clustering higher education in the post adolescent decade adversely affects the human spirit. We are consigning a huge group of our young citizens to an academic limbo totally alien to their human instincts. Whether we realize it or not, whether we intend it or not, we have created a disenfranchised social class called youth.

How? Although our young population—between the ages of eleven and twenty-five—has not grown disproportionately, the proportion of young people in school has increased dramatically. High school attendance has doubled in two decades; 94 percent of our young people attend high school; 75 percent graduate from high school; and in higher education, the growth is even greater. College enrollment has tripled in twenty years; 40 percent of all young people attend college for at least a year. Including advanced technical training, the figure approaches 50 percent.

By pricing teen-age labor out of the market and expanding secondary and higher education, we have stretched post-adolescent dependency a full ten years. While the age of physical maturity has declined, we have confined a generation on campuses at a point in life when their fathers and grandfathers were supporting households. We have subsidized youths' education at the expense of many of their human rights. And society, in many cases, has forced its youth into an academic mold alien to their aptitudes or inclinations. The distinguished psychologist, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim, writes of higher education's debilitating effect;

"What makes for adolescent revolt is the fact that a society keeps the next generation too long dependent in terms of mature responsibility and a striving for independence . . . all too many who now go to college have little interest, ability, and use for what constitutes a college education. They would be better off with a high level vocational education which is closely linked to a work program which gives scope to their needs for physical activity and visible, tangible

achievement. The complaint of many of these students is that nobody needs them. They feel parasites of society, and hence, come to hate a society which they think makes them feel this way."

In our reverence for education and our desire to do right by our children, we have inadvertently denied this generation's right to participate as mature citizens. The damage it does to the individual is no greater than the damage it does to the university. Denied political participation in the real community, the youth seeks to politicize the only community he has, the academic one. This defeats the purpose of the university which journalist William Shannon notes:

"... is to transmit knowledge and wisdom and to enhance them by research and study. The university is not a forum for political action. It is not a training ground for revolutionaries. It is not a residential facility for the psychiatrically maladjusted. It is not a theater for the acting out of racial fears and phantasies."

As we demean, we pervert. Consider the single problem of those black students, trapped by the best intentions into a situation where he cannot compete. The demands for black studies, black dormitories, special black grading systems, are often smoke-screens evading the basic failure in black primary and secondary education. Brandeis professor and former Presidential Aide, John P. Roche, sees black separatism on the campus as a last ditch attempt for survival by culturally deprived students who have been admitted to college just because they came from inner city ghettos. They are bright, but unprepared to compete with their highly articulate classmates. Without swimming lessons, they have been dumped in the mainstream and they are not going to drown without a struggle. Bayard Rustin, pioneer in civil rights and Executive Director of the Philip Randolph Institute, takes a harder line:

"Everyone knows that education for the Negro is inferior. Bring them to the University with the understanding that they must have (the) remedial work they require. The easy way out is to let them have black courses and their own dormitories and give them degrees. . . . What in hell are soul courses worth in the real world? No one gives a damn if you've taken soul courses. They want to know if you can do mathematics and write a correct sentence . . . an element in that society.

The point remains that we have neglected the real problem of compensatory education for the shallow solution of sympathy. And there are other equally compelling areas of neglect.

We have neglected vocational and technical education for the elegant ornament of liberal arts. Certainly, the social sciences are important but they are not sacrosanct. And in our society, which needs skilled labor, we must restore the manual arts to their rightful place of esteem. We have done a grave disservice to the working man by neglecting his central importance to our society. We have failed his appetite for the arts, his preparation for leisure, and, in many cases, his need to renew his skills.

If we are not going to have revolution within our educational community, we will be wise to take a revolutionary look at our institutions of education. We should not be reluctant to ask daring questions or consider bold solutions. Is the four year college necessary in all cases? Are there better ways to combine secondary and undergraduate programs? To accelerate graduate work? Or to space it out over the years? Should we invest more in adult education and enrichment? Are present primary and secondary school programs creating enough outstanding citizens—citizens with an appetite for learning and an aptitude for service to others?

The answers require courage and coopera-

tion from every sector of our society. There is little point in questioning the value of graduate degrees in the soft sciences if businessmen continue to treat these degrees as keys to open the inner doors to better jobs. There is no point in discussing black studies without an objective ordering of educational priorities by the black community. There is no hope for major academic reform without the support of America's academicians.

There is no chance for change if parents revere the college degree as a symbol of their parental success. Until every interest group reappraises its attachments to existing institutional forms, we cannot achieve a new structure.

Today's students have an obligation, too, to question radicalism and demands for relevance as satisfactory answers. Revolution is ridiculous and relevance often an excuse for more amusing and less arduous involvement. Where is this drive for reality in the demand for non-graded courses? The real world distinguishes between excellent and mediocre effort. Is doing one's own thing ennobling or selfish; profound or simply vacant?

Finally, I think government has an obligation to review its many programs affecting youth and ask itself whether it is doing a good job or even what it intends to do? Right now, this Administration is taking a hard look at youth policies. We are looking at the ways we have prolonged the period of dependency . . . disenfranchised our young adults . . . discriminated against non-college youth and directed others, in disregard of their desires, into higher education.

We are saying that many young people have cause to complain. They are alienated—not by our hypocrisy, or racism, or the war in Vietnam—but by our best intentions and inappropriate institutions. Their claims of hypocrisy, racism or immoral wars are not borne out by the facts. Their frustration at being held apart from responsibility and reality is understandable.

The educational community should ask whether encouraging ever increasing numbers of young people to attend college—when 40 per cent already do—benefits the lower half of the intelligence scale. We should question whether society's demand for college attendance compounds social antagonisms between those who go and those who do not. For if everyone is expected to attend college, life will only be harder on those who simply cannot achieve in an academic setting.

The Federal government should re-evaluate those policies which protract dependence . . . civil service age requirements, restrictive apprenticeship programs, present age limits on voting and public candidacy.

We should question whether some programs do, in effect, discriminate against the working young . . . such as the Peace Corps and VISTA which could benefit greatly from their marketable skills.

All of these questions should be asked not in the fear that we are out to destroy popular education, but as a positive search to broaden educational opportunities and to make our educational institutions fit the public rather than make the public fit the institutions. The threat to education does not lie in asking these questions but in not asking them.

The challenge of American education from the cradle to the doctoral degree is our most important work. Our nation's future depends upon it, for as the Greek maxim goes, in the face of youth we find the future. America need not falter like ancient Athens if we learn from ancient Athens. We can retain our vigor and replenish our power by renewing our institutions.

Hope brought my father to America, and in honor of his limitless hope, the Theodore Spiro Agnew Scholarships will be bestowed. Because he was a child of Greece, they will go to youths of Greek descent. And because he was a citizen of America, their recipients will study here.

For as my father revered his Greek heritage and, like Pericles, saw Athens as the school of Hellas, so he would want . . . as we want . . . America to be the school of free men everywhere.

Above all, this scholarship is established in the spirit of my father's legacy to me—his painfully accumulated knowledge that the principles of freedom need and deserve our constant protection—that we must work to make democracy live.

NOMINATION OF CLARENCE M. COSTER AS ASSOCIATE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. MONDALE, Mr. President, for approximately 3 years the city of Bloomington, Minn., has had the good fortune to have as its chief of police, Clarence M. Coster, whose nomination has been confirmed by the Senate as Associate Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. In his brief but effective tenure in Bloomington, Mr. Coster built a fine reputation as a first-rate administrator and a forward-looking policeman.

Both of these qualities will serve him well in his new position. Through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration program, the Nation has a unique opportunity to effect meaningful improvements in law enforcement. Mr. Coster's years of personal experience in various law enforcement functions—from patrolman in San Francisco to narcotics agent and coordinator of riot control activities for the State of California to Chief of Police in Bloomington—will be invaluable in LEAA's efforts to help the States develop the most effective improvements for police.

Although Mr. Coster's background is in police work, he has had ample opportunity to view the other parts of the criminal justice system at work. He knows the sad state of corrections and the huge backlogs that clog the courts, and I am sure he will bring a sense of urgency to meeting the needs of all parts of the criminal justice system.

In addition to his duties as Bloomington police chief, Mr. Coster served on the Governor's Commission on Law Enforcement, Administration of Justice and Corrections. He was chairman of the science and technology subcommittee of that commission and helped to formulate its recommendations. His awareness of the relevance of modern technology for law enforcement is another indication of his innovative approach to police work.

Mr. Coster is, I believe, well qualified to be Associate Administrator and I support his nomination.

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD, NUTRITION AND HEALTH

Mr. MATHIAS, Mr. President, the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health was an important and constructive undertaking. Although some of its recommendations cannot be fully implemented at once, the conference did give us new insights into the problems of hunger and malnutrition in this country, and also gave new impetus to the search for solutions.

One of those who addressed the conference was the Honorable Theodore R. McKeldin, former Governor of Maryland, twice mayor of Baltimore, and a leader in the national Republican Party for many years. In his brief remarks, Governor McKeldin outlined the scope of some of the problems in Maryland, and pledged his support for the efforts initiated by President Nixon and the conference.

I ask unanimous consent that Governor McKeldin's statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THEODORE R. MCKELDIN AT THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON FOOD, NUTRITION, AND HEALTH

The Nixon Administration is less than one year old. In that year we have seen, I believe, an unprecedented commitment to meet the needs of the poor, the underfed and the sick. This White House Conference, and the President's commitment yesterday to a follow-up conference next year, show that he means business. He is our President and whether we are rich or poor, well or ill, Republican or Democrat we must support this effort to make our Nation healthy, well-fed and socially sound.

I, for one, want to do all I can to help the President succeed in this task for, if he succeeds, we all succeed!

As a former Governor of my State of Maryland and as a former Mayor of Baltimore, I am thoroughly familiar with the need, not only in our cities but in our rural areas, and I believe I know how important it is for us all to succeed. For example, in Maryland in 1969, with our national economy producing more goods than ever before, we are told that elderly poor people use food stamps to buy dog food and cat food for their own consumption because they do not have enough money for decent diets.

In Baltimore City, we know that 40,000 school children need free school lunches. Last October (1969) we were feeding only 5,000 of these children. Today we are feeding 30,000.

The money came from the hard-pressed city and state—not from the Federal Government. With Federal aid we could meet the need in our city.

In Maryland 25% of the children under one year of age have been found to suffer from malnutrition. Among our school age children about 10% suffer from malnutrition.

These conditions cannot be permitted to continue. This Conference can and must help America come to grips with this problem. I believe it will, and I congratulate the President on his speedy recognition of the necessity for immediate action.

THOMAS C. HENNINGS MEMORIAL LECTURE AT WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, this year the Thomas C. Hennings memorial lecture at Washington University in St. Louis was delivered by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT).

Speaking before the audience, Senator FULBRIGHT discussed in depth and with perception the war in Vietnam. He analyzed the effects of that war upon our society and presented his views as to the way in which it might be ended.

I believe Senator FULBRIGHT's speech

deserves careful reading not only by Senators but by high administration officials and the American public.

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

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

THE WAR AND WHY WE MUST END IT
(Statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations)

In his speech of November 3 President Nixon spoke of the "right of the people of South Vietnam to determine their own future" as the single American war aim which is not negotiable. "Let historians not record," declared the President, "that, when America was the most powerful nation in the world, we passed on the other side of the road and allowed the last hopes for peace and freedom of millions of people to be suffocated by the forces of totalitarianism."

The President's words are a reasonable expression of the theory behind our war in Vietnam. Like many theories, however, it does not tell us much about the practice. To remedy that omission a few additional quotes are necessary—such as the following:

"They just marched through shooting everybody. Seems like no one said anything—they just started pulling people out and shooting them. They had them in a group standing over a ditch—just like a Nazi-type thing."*

These words are probably familiar to you by now. They are an eye-witness description of the alleged massacre at Songmy.

Another illustration of the Vietnamese war in practice is provided by an American soldier who had reported four other GI's with whom he had been on patrol for the abduction, rape and murder of a young Vietnamese girl. This soldier recalled the following reaction from a member of the military police company to which he was subsequently assigned:

"One M.P., I remember, told me he could have understood it if I'd gone to bat for a GI who was murdered, but how could I do it for a Vietnamese? But he was very tolerant about it. He said it was only human to make mistakes."¹

I recall to you also the now famous words of an American major after the Tet offensive in 1968: "We had to destroy Ben Tre in order to save it." This statement comes as close as any I have heard to summing up the theory and practice of America's war in Vietnam. It may stand some day as Vietnam's epitaph.

I. The stakes

American intervention in Vietnam never has been rationalized primarily in terms of indigenous Vietnamese considerations. It was said—and is still said—to be an exemplary war—an object lesson for the makers of "wars of national liberation," and a war designed to inspire worldwide confidence in America through a demonstration of fealty to our presumed commitments. For these great purposes it has been judged necessary to make use of the Vietnamese people—or at any rate the "silent majority" of the Vietnamese people—as pawns—luckless expendables in a test of America's will.

Mr. Nixon has long subscribed to this theory of an exemplary war. Early in his campaign for the Presidency he made reference to Vietnam as "the cork in the bottle of Chinese expansion in Asia."² In the spring of 1968 he asserted that the war was "not for the freedom and independence of South Vietnam alone, but to make possible the conditions of a wider and durable peace. . . ."³ And in his speech of November 3 the President predicted that American withdrawal from Vietnam—our "defeat and humilia-

tion," as he chose to put it—"would spark violence wherever our commitments help maintain the peace—in the Middle East, in Berlin, eventually even in the western hemisphere."

Rooted in the analogy of Munich, the idea took firm hold during the Johnson Administration that, by fighting a relatively small war in Vietnam now, we were sparing ourselves a much greater war—or a whole series of wars—later on. This notion has been reaffirmed by President Nixon. Again speaking on November 3 of the consequences of "precipitate" American withdrawal from Vietnam, the President laid it down as a flat prediction that "Ultimately, this would cost more lives. It would not bring peace. It would bring more war."

With due respect for the President's strong conviction, I submit that the theory of the exemplary war—a war to end "wars of national liberation"—is unsound.

Analogies are dangerous devices, giving people who take them very seriously an erroneous conception of their ability to read the future. Drawn upon in this way, the past is far more likely to deceive than to enlighten. History, as any good historian will tell us, does not really repeat itself in the sense of a pattern of events unfolding in one set of circumstances in exactly the same way that they did in seemingly similar circumstances in the past. All that history can ever provide is a general insight into the broad tendencies of political behavior and a certain sense of what is and is not possible in human affairs. History can endow us with wisdom but never with prescience because nothing is foreordained. There may, for example, be certain similarities between Hitler's design for conquest and Mao Tse-tung's concept of wars of liberation, but whatever element of truth there may be in the analogy, there is a larger element of untruth. For one thing, Hitler acted on his plan while Communist China is neither participating in the Vietnamese war with her own troops nor otherwise engaged in military activities anywhere outside of her own borders. This strikes me as a significant flaw in the Mao-Hitler analogy.

Expanding on the exemplary war thesis, President Nixon expressed the opinion on November 3 that calling off our war in Vietnam "would result in a collapse of confidence in American leadership not only in Asia but throughout the world." The President's own chief foreign policy adviser, Mr. Kissinger, effectively challenged this proposition in an article written shortly before he went to work in the White House. "Whatever the outcome of the war in Vietnam," he wrote, "it is clear that it has greatly diminished American willingness to become involved in this form of warfare elsewhere. Its utility as a precedent has therefore been importantly undermined."⁴

Wedded as they have been to the idea of Chinese communism as a conspiracy for the conquest of Asia, if not of the world, our policy makers have been more than resourceful in disposing of facts that do not fit the cherished preconception. Conceding in principle that the world communist movement is divided, and that North Vietnam is not merely a pawn of China, our policy makers nonetheless invoke these very specters in their efforts to justify our involvement in Vietnam. Mr. Rusk used to warn of a "world cut in two by Asian communism." The President's speech of November 3 was suffused with associations of this kind, including a reference to "those great powers who have not yet abandoned their goals of world conquest." For whatever their reasons—conviction, pride, or dogmatic anti-communism—our policy makers have never been willing to recognize the Vietnamese conflict for that which virtually every expert and seasoned observer has long recognized it to be: a civil conflict in which

Footnotes at end of article.

communism is and always has been secondary to the drive for national independence. As the former Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Townsend Hoopes, put it in his excellent memoir on the reversal of the Johnson escalation policy:

"North Vietnam was fighting primarily to achieve an unfulfilled national purpose. While it was, to be sure, fully aware of the implications for the wider application of the Mao-Ho-Giap insurgency doctrine, it was fighting not an abstractly ideological war, but a very particular war—in a particular place, characterized by a particular kind of terrain and weather, peopled by a particular breed of men and, above all, conditioned by a particular history. What really drove Ho's sacrificial legions was not the dream of world conquest, nor even the notion of generating a new momentum for Communist advance and triumph throughout Asia. What motivated Hanoi and enabled its leadership to hold 19 million primitive people to endless struggle and sacrifice against odds that were statistically ludicrous was the goal of national independence."²

Once it is clear that the war in Vietnam is neither a valid global testing of the liberation-war doctrine nor a proxy war in a grand Chinese strategy for the conquest of Asia, it follows inescapably that the United States has been fighting a war without need or justification—a war based on demonstrably false premises. My own premise of course is that our legitimate interest in southeast Asia is not ideological but strategic, having to do not with the elimination of the Vietcong or of any other indigenous communist movement but with the discouragement of overt Chinese military expansion. The prevalent view among southeast Asian specialists outside of government is that the Chinese challenge in south Asia is more political and cultural than military, that a strong independent Communist regime is a more effective barrier to Chinese power than a weak non-Communist regime, that the Hanoi government is nationalist and independent, and that, accordingly, once peace is restored—if ever it is—North Vietnam will serve as a barrier rather than as an avenue to Chinese expansion.

Assuming still that our national interest in Asia is strategic rather than ideological, it follows that the United States has no vital security interest in the preservation of South Vietnam as an independent, non-Communist state. Indeed the United States has no vital interest in whether South Vietnam is governed by Communists, non-Communists or a coalition; nor is it a matter of vital interest to the United States whether North and South Vietnam are united or divided. Our interest is in the prevalence, whatever its form, of indigenous Vietnamese nationalism; beyond that strategic interest gives way to ideological preference—if not, indeed, to ideological obsession.

On the basis of their grudging, minimal contributions to the fighting in Vietnam it would appear that our Asian and Pacific allies either do not take the ostensible threat to their own security very seriously or are content to have the United States do their fighting for them. Of our nominal allies Thailand is the closest geographically to Vietnam; it is challenged by a minor communist insurgency within its own borders and its leaders have been effusive in their enthusiasm for the American involvement in Vietnam. Nonetheless, we have paid the Thais an enormous sum in military equipment and financial support, including salary bonuses and PX privileges for their soldiers, to get them to send a force to Vietnam which at its maximum reached twelve thousand men.

South Korea has provided 48,500 tough, effective combat soldiers, with the United States paying for everything above the base

pay of the troops: premium pay for combat, food and shelter, logistic support—and generous additional support for the Republic of Korea's home army.

The Philippines, after haggling and entreaties, sent a noncombatant engineer battalion of about two thousand men to South Vietnam in 1967, for which the United States gratefully agreed to bear all costs in addition to maintaining military assistance to the Filipino home force. President Marcos recently announced his intention of withdrawing the Filipino battalion from Vietnam.

Australia, which raised an army of 682,000 in the Second World War, has, at its own expense, provided a token force of 7,600 men for Vietnam, more, quite obviously, as an investment in Washington's gratitude than as a serious contribution to the war. New Zealand, which had raised an army of 157,000 men in World War II, provided what Townsend Hoopes describes as the "astonishingly token contribution of 450 men;"³ it has since been increased to 550 men. Both Australia and New Zealand have been rewarded with lavish praise and gratitude from the United States.

Gratitude for what? For making a tiny contribution to what they themselves consider their own defense? For patting America on the back at a time when most of the world was pelting us with epithets? How has the United States, the greatest and strongest nation on the face of the earth, been reduced to such pitiable gratitude for such small favors? The explanation, according to our policy makers, is that the United States has global responsibilities which compel us to bear burdens which no one else will bear. Then the familiar image is invoked: of America, the martyred giant, manning the ramparts of freedom, humoring the recalcitrance and enduring the insults of those who are free from the "discipline of power," bearing without complaint the unfair burdens which destiny has thrust upon us. Diplomats have described this role as the "responsibility of power"; others have called it imperialism.

I call it nonsense. Power is a narcotic, a potent intoxicant, and America has been on a "trip." We soared for a while, gladly dispensing goods and services for the tribute which nourished our vanity. Then our un-piloted space ship came down in the swamps of Vietnam, and suddenly, instead of soaring, we found ourselves slogging in mud. The contrast could not have been greater and it has shocked and confused us. We must hope that it will also have sobered us, and that we will be able to find our way out of the swamp, not, let us hope, to take flight again, but just to get back on our feet, which is the posture that nature intended for us.

To get back on our feet we will have to shake off the lingering effects of the narcotic of power. For a start we might stop the prideful nonsense about "defeat" and "humiliation." Liquidating a mistake is neither a defeat nor a humiliation; it is a rational and mature way of accommodating to reality, and the ability to do it is something to be proud of. When President Johnson used to declare that he would not be the first American President to lose a war, and when President Nixon warns, as he did on November 3, against "this first defeat in American history," they are not talking about the national interest but about the national ego and their own standings in history. A war is not a football game which you try to win for its own sake, or in order to maintain an unblemished record of victories. A war is supposed to be fought for purposes external to itself, for substantive political purposes, not just for the glory of winning it. When its political purposes are recognized as unworthy, as they have been in Vietnam, it is rank immorality to press on for a costly, destructive and probably unattainable victory.

As for their own personal roles, both the incumbent President and his predecessor

seem to have subscribed to an essentially military view of history's judgment. "History," as they have invoked it, is a kind of divine magistrate, lavish in its praise of victors and scornful of all losers. To some extent that is probably true—witness the glorifications of despots like Caesar and Napoleon—but if it is true, all it shows is that historians, like laymen, employ some primitive standards in judging their fellow men.

Everybody knows that we could "win" in Vietnam; we could wipe that poor country and every living thing within it off the face of the map. What would "history" have to say about that?

II. The kind of war it is

The stakes of the war in Vietnam have been debated, without resolution, for five years. In recent weeks we have learned something about the way the war is being fought. What emerges from the atrocities, from the destruction of whole villages by artillery and B-52 raids, and from the indiscriminate killing of the "free fire" zones is the picture of a war whose means have consumed its ends. As the major said of Ben Tre, we are having to destroy Vietnam in order to save it.

A whole new set of questions now arises. Even if all of the rationalizations for this war were valid—even if it were containing China, preventing future "wars of national liberation," and upholding the principle of self-determination—would we have the right to do what we are doing to the people of Vietnam and to ourselves in the process?

I am not advocating an exercise in national flagellation. Quite a number of people—I among them—suggested the need for a national effort at critical self-evaluation after the murder of President Kennedy. It seemed appropriate at the time but nothing came of it. We did not look into ourselves and, instead of the cathartic reconciliation that we hoped might come of the shock we had experienced, there has occurred over the last six years a rising tide of both personal and political violence in American society.

Soul-searching and expiation are preacher-talk; they make good sermons but how many people have ever walked out of a church and really searched their souls? As any good psychiatrist is likely to tell you, moral incantation seldom if ever results in serious self-examination, much less in altered behavior. It ought to, but it doesn't. What it does result in is *rationalization*, in the reinterpretation of disagreeable facts and events in such a way as to make them bearable. That is what we did after each of the political assassinations of recent years, and that is what we are starting to do with the information we have been given about atrocities in Vietnam. Arousing as it does our national defenses, guilt is simply not very useful as a means of eliciting serious introspection. The people who are most willing to feel guilty are usually blameless humanitarians; perhaps, for some reason, guilt has a certain attraction for them. The rest of us are usually satisfied to rationalize, improvising whatever arguments are necessary for self-justification.

If we really want to understand the meaning of the Songmy massacre and all the other acts of indiscriminate killing in Vietnam, we are not going to do it by declaring a national day of atonement. That might satisfy other needs but it is not likely to result in the acquisition of accurate and useful information about ourselves. That can only come from an appreciation—as guiltless an appreciation as possible—of the common human susceptibilities with which every one of us—old and young, communist and noncommunist—is endowed by the simple virtue of being human. I stress this point to you as students because I have had the impression of a certain Puritanical stuffiness on the part of many young people, a certain reluctance to face the likelihood that deep in the soul of the most high-minded student activist are

²Footnotes at end of article.

some of the same fears and longings that lurk within the soul of the most ravenous, bloodsucking, imperialist warmonger.

The really important and useful thing to know about Songmy is not the unspeakable things that certain GI's did but the unspeakable things that most human beings are capable of doing in extreme circumstances. The American soldiers who wiped out the civilian population of that Vietnamese village were not monsters but ordinary young men acting under the pressures of intense fear and anger. "You see," said one major, recounting the confession of one of his men that he had killed three children, "a half hour before, a kid had thrown a grenade that killed the guy's best buddy. So you have to understand." Another veteran of the Songmy massacre, Mr. Paul David Meadlo, who admitted on national television that he shot some thirty or forty men, women and children, is described by people in his home town of New Goshen, Indiana, as "a very nice boy," "the nicest guy you'd ever want to meet."⁸

In his chilling account of the rape and murder of a Vietnamese girl by four American soldiers on a patrol, Daniel Lang recounts how the fifth member of the patrol, who turned the others in, encountered almost uniform hostility for his act of conscience. As the fifth soldier himself later recalled, "They were among the ones—among the few—who did what everyone around them wanted to do." At their trials numerous witnesses testified to their good characters and soldierly virtues. One of the defense lawyers summed things up:

"There's one thing that stands out about this particular offense. . . . It did not occur in the United States. Indeed, there are some that would say it did not even occur in civilization, when you are out on combat operations."⁹

Most of what is happening in Vietnam—the face-to-face killing of women and children as at Songmy, the out-of-sight killing of women and children by artillery and B-52 raids in the "free-fire zones," the deliberate burning of entire villages by the so-called "Zippo squads," and the assassination of thousands of presumed Vietcong cadre under the "Phoenix" program—all these things are happening outside civilization. They are happening in a jungle of our own creation. That is the kind of war it is—a war in which civilians are indistinguishable from soldiers, a war in which mass murder is the strategy of both sides, a war which has released the furles within the human soul, a war which degrades all those whom it does not destroy.

These atrocities in Vietnam, committed by Americans, must be taken as a warning and a symbol of what can happen to a whole society. We are, I believe, far short of the state of moral disintegration that Germany reached in the 1940's and I am all but certain that we will not descend into that abyss. It is not, however, utterly and eternally out of the question. We are susceptible to the same virus of brutalization that other societies have come to, and nothing contributes more to the moral breakdown of a society than the long continuation of an unjust and unnecessary war.

It is more nearly an inevitability than an accident that a war of this kind should make a travesty of its own nominal objectives. Finding himself in a strange, dangerous and technologically primitive place, the ordinary GI responds with something short of the perspective of a cultural anthropologist. Not only are the Vietnamese primitive by the American soldier's standard but they are also dangerous; combatants and civilians are indistinguishable; even a woman or child may throw a grenade at him. Fearing and despising the people he is supposed to be saving, the GI soon de-

humanizes them, or is likely to; they are not people but "gooks" and "dinks." Again, I emphasize these are not monsters but perfectly decent Americans who are dehumanizing the Vietnamese people; they do it almost as an act of self-defense. Nonetheless, it brutalizes them. As the anthropologist Edward T. Hall has commented, "Without widespread acceptance of the 'gook philosophy' Pinkville could never have happened."¹⁰

I would not want the perpetrators of the Songmy massacre let off. On the contrary, I want them tried and, if guilty, punished—not for retribution but for deterrence, not because they are different from the rest of us but because they are so much like the rest of us, because what they have done almost any of us could have done.

Vietnam has knocked us Americans off our pedestal. It has taught us that we are no better than the rest of the human race—although neither are we any worse. And that is the useful thing to be learned from all these horror stories and from the war itself. It was moral presumption—the so-called "responsibility of power" and the traditional American notion that we are better than other people—that led us into this war in which we have largely destroyed Vietnamese society while brutalizing ourselves. If out of all this we learn to respect and guard against the destructive instincts that lie within all of us, then something at least will have been retrieved from the disaster.

President Nixon said one thing in his recent speech with which I agree. He said that "North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that." In my opinion we have already done it, but I also think we can undo it—not with glory, because there is no glory in a charnel house, and not with "honor" in the sense in which soldiers use that term. But we can do it with dignity and we can do it with self-respect—the self-respect of human beings who have learned something about their own humanity and its terrible fallibilities. The question of course is how.

III. The way out

The Administration has a plan—so they tell us—for getting out of Vietnam. They won't tell us exactly what it is, or exactly how it will work, or when it will be accomplished, but they insist that they have a plan. They call it "Vietnamization."

As defined in the President's speech of November 3, "Vietnamization" means that American forces will be withdrawn gradually while the Saigon army is built up to take over a greater share of the war. How far this process will go remains unspecified. In recent closed hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee both Secretary of State Rogers and Secretary of Defense Laird refused to answer these questions: how long will "Vietnamization" take? and does it mean that all American troops will be withdrawn or only American ground combat troops, leaving a residual support force of 100,000 or 200,000 or 300,000 men? All that the two Secretaries would tell us was that the President has a "plan," that he does not deem it wise to divulge it to the public—or to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee—but that, if we were patient, took things on faith, and watched developments, we would be pleased with the result.

Equally unclear is the crucial question of what the President's plan calls for if "Vietnamization" fails, if the Army of the Republic of Vietnam comes near to collapse as it did in 1964? In his speech of November 3 the President warned of reescalation. As he put it, "If I conclude that increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation." Pressed for an explanation of the meaning of the President's words, all the Secretary of State would say in the Foreign Relations Committee was that the Admin-

istration did not expect the Army of the Republic of Vietnam to collapse and therefore had no plan for that contingency. The Secretary of Defense was equally unenlightening but he told a House Appropriations Subcommittee on November 17 that Vietnamization "could lead the way to a military victory in the sense of the South Vietnamese being able to defend their country, even against North Vietnam."¹¹ Asked whether the United States might reescalate the war if Vietnamization should fail, Mr. Laird replied, "I would not rule out that possibility completely."¹²

Until and unless the Administration provides clear, specific evidence to the contrary, Vietnamization can only be taken as "heads I win, tails you lose," a strategy aimed at victory for the Thieu-Ky government. And that, as the Paris peace talks have shown, is an outcome which the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong will never accept, unless it is forced upon them by military defeat.

Since it is all but inconceivable that the shaky Saigon army can hope to win the victory which half a million Americans and the Saigon army besides have been unable to win, it would appear that the best possible prospect for Vietnamization—"best," that is, for Thieu and Ky and for the Nixon Administration's prestige—is a continuing war of stalemate and attrition, with a reduced number of Americans reverting to their pre-1965 "advisory" role in a semi-permanent war of counterinsurgency. For the Vietnamese people this of course would mean continuing terror and death for the indefinite future. That is the price which it is proposed to exact from them so that the Americans can withdraw with what their leaders conceive of as "honor."

Whether the Army of the Republic of Vietnam can be gotten to fight even this well is by no means certain. After twenty years of warfare the South Vietnamese army still has failed to demonstrate anything approaching the fighting spirit of their Vietcong counterparts. Information gathered by the *New York Times* this fall in a three-week country-wide survey of South Vietnamese fighting proficiency showed that the brunt of the fighting is still being carried by the Americans, who, by the favored yardstick of success in this war, the "body count," are responsible for two of every three North Vietnamese and Vietcong reported killed. Promotions in the Army of the Republic of Vietnam still depend greatly upon a man's family background, wealth and political influence. The result is in an unaggressive, unmotivated, demoralized, war-weary fighting force, greatly superior to its enemy in numbers, equipment, and in every respect—except the ability to fight and win battles.¹³

American soldiers in the field have little confidence in the ability of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam to take over the fighting. One Green Beret captain, part of a 12-man team which has been trying to shape up a South Vietnamese force in an outpost near the Cambodian border, commented to a reporter: "Let our glorious allies in on anything, and the enemy knows about it within an hour."¹⁴ A group of GI's gathered around their radio at an outpost in Vietnam greeted President Nixon's glowing account of the progress of Vietnamization on November 3 with what one account describes as "loud, ironic laughter."¹⁵

The crucial issue of the war is the character of the government which rules in Saigon. As long as American policy is committed to survival of the Thieu-Ky regime or one very much like it, "Vietnamization" will remain a euphemism for victory. The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong have said that they will fight indefinitely to prevent that and they have shown their ability to do so. As outlined by President Nixon, Vietnamization, according to a Rand Corporation expert, "is a policy that must goad the Hanoi leadership to challenge it by increasing the pressure of United States casualties; to which

Footnotes at end of article.

the President promises to respond by re-escalation against all past evidence (and consistent, reliable intelligence predictions) that this would neither deter nor end such pressure."¹⁰

A recent American visitor to Hanoi (Richard Barnet) told me, upon his return, that the North Vietnamese are confident that the South Vietnamese are incapable of taking over the war; that they doubt that President Nixon thinks they can either; that they do not believe the United States is sincerely willing to give up its control of South Vietnam; and that, accordingly, they anticipate the strong possibility of reescalation by the United States. The North Vietnamese leaders also emphasized that, while they might agree to the participation of Thieu and Ky themselves in a new government, they will not agree to the continuation of the "Johnson constitution," as they call it, which they regard as an instrument of American control, nor to an election managed by the Thieu-Ky government. Rather than accept any of these, they said, they are prepared to go on fighting indefinitely.

The weakness of the policy of "Vietnamization" is the weakness of the South Vietnamese government itself. Its claims to legitimacy is based on rigged elections and on an American-sponsored rather than an authentic Vietnamese constitution, which specifically bars all Communists from participating in the government. The electoral law barred "neutralists" as well as Communists from running for office in the supposedly free election of 1967. In a memorandum to the Secretary of Defense on March 14, 1968, Under Secretary of the Air Force Townsend Hoopes gave the following characterization of the Saigon government:

"The GVN is a narrowly based military clique. While it is systematically corrupt, this fact does not particularly distinguish it from other military governments in Asia. . . . What does distinguish the GVN are its inefficiency, lack of popular support, and inability to protect or govern large areas of South Vietnam. . . . For better or worse, it is Ho Chi Minh and Hanoi who have harnessed nationalism to their cause and who have demonstrated superior determination, organization, and fighting qualities. To survive without permanent massive U.S. support, the GVN must win broader allegiance and extend its effective authority. Yet its will and ability to do either of these things have never been in greater doubt."¹¹

In his speech of November 3, President Nixon said that "we really have only two choices open to us if we want to end this war: either "precipitate" withdrawal or, falling acceptance of our terms in the Paris peace talks, Vietnamization. The President, I think, is mistaken. There is a third and better option than either of these: the negotiation of arrangements for a new interim government in South Vietnam, for elections conducted by the interim coalition regime with or without international supervision, and for complete American withdrawal. The obstacle to such a negotiation is our continuing attachment to the Thieu-Ky government. If we could bring ourselves to deprive Saigon of its veto on American policy—as we could do without impairing either our own vital interests or, I daresay, the best interests of the South Vietnamese people—there would be no need either for the "precipitate" withdrawal which the President likes to talk about or for the condemnation of the Vietnamese people to prolonged war, which is the true meaning of "Vietnamization."

There is good reason to believe that, in return for our agreement to an interim coalition government and to ultimate total American withdrawal from Vietnam, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese would be willing to make significant concessions. They have already indicated that they would not expect total American withdrawal prior to sub-

stantive negotiations but only a commitment to a definite schedule for withdrawal. They have also indicated that a transitional government need not necessarily include members of the National Liberation Front. In addition, the North Vietnamese government is on record as being willing to accept a neutralist, independent South Vietnam which they would not seek forcibly to reunite with North Vietnam. It should also be possible, in such a negotiation, to make arrangements for a general amnesty on both sides and for prevention of the "blood bath" which the Administration confidently predicts should the Vietcong ever gain power in South Vietnam.

Whether and to what extent the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are sincere in the concessions they say they are willing to make can only be ascertained in serious, substantive negotiations. To get these negotiations going two things are required of the United States: our willingness to require Thieu and Ky to take their chances along with the other factions in South Vietnamese politics and our willingness to commit ourselves to a phased but total American military withdrawal from Vietnam.

We do not have to force such a settlement on the South Vietnamese government. We need only put them on notice that these terms have become our war aims, that we hope they will join us in negotiating their realization, but that, if they are not, we shall nonetheless negotiate the conditions of American withdrawal, while they, in turn, will be at liberty to continue the war on their own, to negotiate for new alliances, or to come to their own terms with the Vietcong. If we did withdraw and the Army of the Republic of Vietnam, with its one million well-equipped soldiers, could then be inspired to defend the Saigon government, it would survive. If it could not be so inspired, then the South Vietnamese government would not survive. But we have done enough, having fought their war for over four years at the cost of over forty thousand American lives thus far.

As long as the Nixon Administration adheres to its present position that it will "discuss" but not "negotiate" a settlement without Saigon's approval, thereby giving Saigon a veto on our policy, Mr. Thieu will have every incentive for continued adherence to his present uncompromising stance. He minced no words in stating his government's position upon his return from Midway last June. "I solemnly declare," he said at that time, "that there will be no coalition government, no peace cabinet, no transitional government, not even a reconciliatory government." Again, on Vietnamese television on September 19, Thieu dismissed the idea of a standstill cease-fire as "unrealistic," pledged never to cede "so much as a hamlet" to the Vietcong and said he would make no further concessions at Paris. He said that his government would never accept the existence "in any way" of a communist party in South Vietnam.

Lacking either a reliable army or the support of their own people, the Saigon generals have only one solid base of power; their veto over American war policy. If they had anything like the same influence in Vietnam that they have had in Washington, Thieu and Ky would have beaten the Vietcong long ago. The critical question therefore remains: Are we going to allow Saigon to continue to exercise this veto or are we going to give them the simple choice of joining us in making a compromise peace or continuing the war on their own?

Our basic asset, which neither the Johnson nor the Nixon Administration has been willing to acknowledge, is that this war is not now and never has been essential to our interests, essential, that is, to the freedom and safety of the American people. The exact terms of peace do not, therefore, matter very much from the standpoint of American in-

terests, but the early restoration of peace matters enormously, because every day that this war goes on the sickness of American society worsens.

Looking back on the history of Vietnam since World War II, if we had not intervened in any way either to support the French or to create the Diem Government, the nationalists would probably have achieved the independence of a unified Vietnam. It would have been achieved under the only authentic nationalist leader in Modern Vietnamese History, Ho Chi Minh, and we would probably be today on as good terms with a unified Vietnam as we are with Yugoslavia.

After all this killing and destruction, and unless we remain in permanent occupation of Vietnam, the eventual outcomes will probably be the same that it would have been if Americans had never gone to Vietnam. Our leaders may then suffer a loss of prestige but our country will have recovered its self-respect. And, as for the Vietnamese, they are a nation of tough, resilient peasants who will make their own accommodations to reality. As a young South Vietnamese army officer told an American reporter: "In thousands of years of our history we have seen the Chinese and the French and the Japanese come and we have forgotten them all. In time we will forget the Americans, too. Whether they did good or ill, they will only be a footnote to our history."¹²

FOOTNOTES

¹⁰ Private Michael Torry, quoted by Robert M. Smith in "G.I. Says He Saw Vietnam Massacre," *The New York Times*, November 20, 1969, p. 14.

¹¹ Quoted by Daniel Lang in "Casualties of War," *The New Yorker*, October 18, 1969, p. 132.

¹² Dover, New Hampshire, February 12, 1968.

¹³ Cincinnati, Ohio, April 2, 1968.

¹⁴ Henry Kissinger, "Central Issues of American Foreign Policy," in *Agenda for the Nation* (Kermit Gordon, ed., Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1968), p. 591.

¹⁵ Townsend Hoopes, *The Limits of Intervention* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 126-127.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 170.

¹⁷ Quoted by Henry Kamm in "Songmy 2: The Toll of Frustration and Fury," *The New York Times*, November 23, 1969, p. E2.

¹⁸ Quoted by J. Anthony Lukas in "Meadlo's Home Town Regards Him as Blameless," *The New York Times*, November 26, 1969, p. 10.

¹⁹ Daniel Lang, "Casualties of War," *The New Yorker*, October 18, 1969, pp. 124-132, 146.

²⁰ Letter to *The Washington Post*, December 5, 1969, p. A26.

²¹ *Department of Defense Appropriations for 1970*, Hearings before the Subcommittee on Department of Defense of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969), p. 415.

²² *Ibid.*, p. 412.

²³ B. Drummond Ayres, Jr., "South Vietnamese Soldier, Still Untested in Major Combat, Shows Little Willingness to Be Aggressive," *New York Times*, November 21, 1969, p. 7.

²⁴ Arnold Abrams, Southeast Asia correspondent of the *Seattle Times*, "Holding the Fire in Vietnam," *The New Leader*, November 10, 1969, p. 8.

²⁵ "Soldiers Laugh at Nixon's Optimism on Vietnamization of the Fighting," Reuters report in the *Arkansas Gazette*, November 5, 1969.

²⁶ Daniel Ellsberg, "Notes on the President's Speech of November 3, 1969," November 4, 1969, p. 4.

²⁷ Townsend Hoopes, *The Limits of Intervention* (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1969), pp. 188-189.

²⁸ Maynard Parker, "Preparing for the Worst," *Newsweek*, November 24, 1969, p. 40.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, many have spoken out about the need to expand vocational education opportunities for our young people. In my own State, only 14 percent of our youngsters complete a 4-year college program. The question of what happens to the other 86 percent is of concern to many of us. They, too, must become self-sufficient, productive citizens in our society. The subject of vocational education was discussed in a speech earlier this year by Alice Widener during a Governor's Symposium on Vocational Education in Columbus. I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From U.S.A., June 1969]

COLLEGE EVERYONE? *

It has been said we have a sick society. I don't believe this. But I do believe we have a sick public education system. It is predicated on the mistaken belief that every boy and girl should go to college and that those who don't go are doomed to inferiority. That system is injuring about 85 per cent of the youth in America. These are the boys and girls who are not going to be graduated from a four-year college course and emerge with an academic degree in hand. Certainly, they are not material for a junk heap. But they are led to believe that if they are academic high school drop-outs or college drop-outs, they cannot "make it" in our society.

You're all familiar, I'm sure, with an advertisement in slick magazines, newspapers, and on television, showing a young mother and father bending over an infant in a cradle. "Insure your child's future," says the ad. "Take out a college education policy." That ad is relevant to the family situation, of course, only if the infant shown in the cradle is exactly like every other infant in every other cradle, regardless of what the individual talents, aptitudes and mental gifts of that baby might be. Let us suppose that the infant is going to be greatly gifted in a field of endeavor unrelated to purely academic studies. Are a mother and father going to doom that infant in the cradle to a future of frustration? I think they should not.

The myth or slogan "Every boy and girl should have a college education" is largely responsible for juvenile delinquency in the United States of America. It is largely responsible for the welfare problem, for the

* Editors' note: Last spring there was held in Columbus, Ohio, a Governor's Symposium on Vocational Education, convoked by Governor James A. Rhodes and sponsored by the Ohio State University College of Education. The theme was "Learning to Serve to Earn" and the official program stated: "... like other resources, skilled manpower must be cultivated and replenished. . . . A most fundamental fact of life is that people need jobs, not only as a means of earning a living, but as a basis for identity, a basis for participating citizenship, a basis for worthy leisure, a basis for participating in the fruits of a technological society."

This is the full text of the speech delivered by Alice Widener to the Governor's Symposium, April 8, 1969. Requests for copies have come from educators, public officials and business executives throughout our nation. U.S.A. is grateful to Dr. Robert M. Reese, chairman, Academic Faculty for Vocational-Technical Education, College of Education, Ohio State University, and chairman of the Governor's Symposium, for kind permission to publish the text in advance of publication by The Ohio State University College of Education.

high crime rate, for the Hippies and Yippies, the freak-outs and drop-outs. It is largely responsible for the narcotics problem among youth today. I think it's about time we junk the inflexible educational snobbery that junks youth. It's about time that the great business corporations and enterprises in our country stop saying about employment, "College graduates only need apply." This snobbery, intellectual snobbery, is like all snobbery—it is grounded on wrong assumptions. It is beginning to destroy the great universities and colleges in our country. Many victims of the "college everyone" myth are suffering from a most acute financial burden. Still worse, college populations are exploding by thousands and thousands of boys and girls who don't belong on campus and are raising hell because they really don't belong there.

We in the United States have a great stake in the field of education. We fail to understand that the problems we are discussing here today are those of every advanced nation in the world. It is a problem in Italy and Great Britain, West Germany, France and Great Britain. In the advanced nations, people no longer are living in a mainly agricultural society. A few enormously productive farms can produce food enough to sustain large populations. So there is a migration of population away from small uneconomic farms to the cities. The education of mass population in urban public school systems is a gargantuan task.

In France, for example, every problem being discussed by American vocational and technical education teachers is being discussed with utmost urgency. I discussed these problems with Yves Jaigu, a government official occupied with what the French call "l'aménagement du territoire," the refurbishment of the territory. In Brittany, for example, 85 per cent of the farms were owned by widows—small, uneconomic farms operated by the survivors of two world wars. Naturally, those farms couldn't make money enough for modern needs. Naturally, the families there are moving to urban communities to try to make a living. So France has to try to find out what to do with Brittany and is seeking to make it into an advanced technological communications center. But there is a language problem with aspects similar to that in our own racial problems. In Brittany, many older people speak only Breton. They have spoken that language in the area for a thousand years or more. There are French and Frenchwomen from Brittany who can't speak French, only Breton, and go to the Ile de France area—Paris and its environs—to get jobs. And so their is a language-employment problem.

We have it too in our country. We have hundred of thousands of people in urban and industrial communities who don't speak English, they speak American Negro. There is nothing wrong with it and nothing to criticize about it. But they speak it. Therefore, when their children enter academic school system in which the major language is English, they have severe difficulties. The problem arising from this situation is very similar to that in many other lands—in Northern Italy, for example, where Sicilians and Neapolitans come to find employment. In Milan newspaper help-wanted ads, I have read "No Sicilians need apply." It isn't that northern Italian industrialists are so prejudiced against Sicilians, it really is very difficult to employ a Sicilian who doesn't speak North Italian. The situation involves a language problem and other problems of social adjustment.

In general, we Americans don't know very much about modern, progressive vocational-technical education as it exists today in many countries of Western Europe. We discuss the subject in terms of a Europe before it had electric light. Time and again, I've asked public officials, labor leaders, industrial plant managers and educators in our country whether they are familiar with what

the best vocational-technical education schools abroad are doing. "Well, what are you doing?" they say to me. "Are you pleading for vocational-technical education in order to have a European-type class structured society in America? Do you want schools like those in Europe where a boy of ten is forced to decide his future and if he can't pass an exam the university doors are shut to him? Do you want vocational-technical schools that will sentence boys and girls forever to the working class?"

When I ask these officials and managers whether they ever have visited the marvelous CERIA School in Brussels, or the Fiat Free School in Turin, they say, "I never heard of 'em." Their knowledge is so limited about the modern schools in Europe that they might as well be discussing Ohio when it had only gaslight and outhouses. Yet in Europe today, a funny thing is happening. The best vocational and technical education schools are in danger of becoming the slob schools. At CERIA in Brussels, Professor Doms told me last spring, "You know we don't know what to do because we had 2,500 boys and girls here. We increased it to 3,000. We have 6,000 on the waiting list, from 25 nations, and some of the richest families in Europe are trying to induce us through offers of high tuition fees to accept their sons and daughters as pupils at CERIA. You see, many of the wealthy people in Europe today are not men and women of hereditary fortunes. They are people who earned their wealth and came up the hard way. They study their children and see that perhaps Jean or Marie is not interested in going to the University of Louvain or to the Sorbonne. But Jean or Marie has ideas about wanting to start a hotel somewhere, or an industry, and is eager to learn the know-how. These wealthy parents want to send their children where they can get such training. Of course, the vocational and technical-training students receive basic academic training too. And if they develop a keen interest in academic studies they can pursue them."

I have met hundreds of CERIA students and I can assure you they are literate. They read, write and spell correctly, which is more than I can say for a lot of college graduates in the United States today.

Each time I plead in my newspaper columns for vocational-technical education in our country, someone from a university sociology or political science department writes to the editor, "Mrs. Widener is an anti-intellectual that I don't like Ph. D.'s! It is fantastic. For the benefit of the press here today, let me make myself so clear that what I'm saying cannot be distorted: I am for every academically gifted boy or girl going to college if he or she really wants to learn and can learn. I am for a progressive, dynamic vocational-technical education system suited to the last third of the 20th century and the challenges of the 21st century. I am for a vocational-technical education system that will provide boys and girls in grade school with opportunities to develop themselves as individuals, according to their own natural gifts and desires. I believe such a system should have equal status and equal pay to those of the academic system. I am for the kind of vocational-technical education systems that will not close any doors to future academic learning and will not draft any boy or girl in America into the labor market against his or her will.

I predict that if we don't provide the right kind of vocational-technical education that will give 85 per cent of our young people the opportunities they need, and also keep the doors wide open for them to go as high educationally as they want, then we're going to fall in public education. If we think we have severe problems now, just wait until we get a few more! Ladies and gentlemen, I am not going to talk any bunk from this podium if I can help it. So let's get down to cases:

In San Francisco, a few years ago when

the Job Corps was started, I was stuck in the airport between plane trips for five hours. The ladies in Traveler's Aid were enormously busy so I offered to help them, thinking their work was due to the Vietnam War. "We'd be delighted if you'd help that boy over there," they said. "But he looks too young to be going to Vietnam," I remarked. "We're not busy with war work," they explained. "We're helping the Job Corps enrollees." So there was a big fat boy who said he was 14. (He must have told the government he was 16.) He was crying his eyes out. He was from Grand Rapids and had been flown by jet plane to San Francisco to study electronics at a Job Corps center. "I don't want to be here," he cried. "I love farming and I love pigs. Ever since I had a baby pig, I wanted to be a hog farmer." I said "Good for you. You're lucky. You know what you want to be." But he wasn't lucky, because evidently someone in government thought there was something wrong about his wanting to be a hog farmer, and here he was at the airport in San Francisco, having been flown from Grand Rapids at taxpayers' expense, crying his eyes out.

I wrote a newspaper column about it and right away I heard from Washington, D.C. The Office of Economic Opportunity invited me to tour some Job Corps centers. I went to Camp Kilmer in New Jersey on a hot August day. In the broiling sun, I sat on the grass for hours talking with 19 boys of whom 15 were black. Seventeen had criminal records. Their ages were 19 to 21. They were unhappy boys; boys from the junk heap piled up in the academic public education system. All were high school drop-outs. I found out why. It went like this: "Ma'am, I just couldn't stand all that book learnin'. I didn't see the sense in it. I had to get me some pocket money. I wanted to work to help out with my family, Ma'am, I don't mind studyin' for two or three hours a day, but then I wanted to go out and learn me a trade or get a job and I didn't know how to work. They told me it was against the law and I was a problem." One boy said to me, "It wasn't my prostitute mother or drunk father that done me out. I got done out in school."

Sitting with those boys on the grass in the sun and listening to their problems, I thought maybe I was the first person they'd met who didn't want to do something to them but was willing to listen to what they had to say. At other Job Corps centers, I learned other facts. For instance, if you take a pre-adolescent girl of 11 or 12 who wants to know what she looks like with lipstick, and if she doesn't know how to earn any pocket money and is forbidden to earn any and can't get any from her family, she is going to steal a lipstick at a ten cent store. That starts her on the road to delinquency, if she is caught. Do you think that hasn't happened? It happened to my maid's granddaughter.

I am not against the Job Corps. It was a crisis program that came along much too late. It cost the Federal Government hundreds of millions of dollars to maintain. How long are we going to continue a public school system that produces an army of drop-outs who will grow into candidates for a Job Corps? It tries to do for young men and women of 19, 20, and 21, what should have been done for them when they were 10, 11, and 12. We have a misfit public school system in our nation. As Governor Rhodes said this morning, we have a "decadent education system." It is unsuited to the social and economic needs of our times and future times. If it is true that we have a "sick society," then I am all for children not getting the disease! The only way they are going to remain immune is for them to have the right kind of opportunities when they are young, extremely young. I believe that vocational-technical education should begin in grade school. The Job Corps, well-intentioned as it was, is only a palliative, trying to job-train boys and girls who should have been job-

trained years earlier before they became drop-outs and delinquents.

In reply to my newspaper columns about our national need for vocational-technical education, I have received heartrending letters from parents of every race, color and creed, victims of intellectual snobbery and financial servitude thrust on them by the intellectual snobs. The "college everyone" slogan has forced them to try to keep up with the Joneses and send Johnny and Mary to college whether or not Johnny and Mary wish to go or are capable of spending all their time profitably in the pursuit of academic "higher learning." Parent after parent has written to me, "I know my boy likes to work with his hands, but the teacher says if he doesn't go on to college he has no future." Or, "My daughter can't pass math; she wants to be a beautician. But her guidance counselor says if she doesn't go to college she can only do menial work."

I believe the word "menial" as applied to honest work ought to be struck out of the dictionary and people's vocabulary.

Invited to Ohio in 1967, I went to the Mahoning Valley School for problem boys. There were 350 boys, 325 with criminal records. I guess the percentage was about 60% black, 40% white. In the cafeteria and library with the vocational-technical education students, I heard exactly what I'd heard at the Job Corps. "Ma'am, we got done out in school. I knowed I wasn't as smart as some of the others. I jes' couldn't get the hang of it. The first time I made two and two come out five, the teacher marked it right. I knowed it wasn't right. She passed me along anyway. I knowed it was a lie. I hated her and I hated the school." Or, "Ma'am, school to me was the place to get out of my daily life, my home life. When the school let me down, that's when I got done out." I heard that over and over again. If you citizens of Ohio let that wonderful Mahoning Valley school go down the drain, you're out of your mind! One of the boys, with a criminal record, talked his heart out to me. Afterwards, he wrote to me and now we correspond regularly. That was two years ago. There hasn't been a holiday since—Valentine's Day, Easter, Fourth of July, Christmas, Thanksgiving, that I haven't heard from him. He has made it all the way from a reformatory to the Air Force.

From Mahoning Valley, I went to the Thomas Edison School in the Hough area of Cleveland. That is the big problem area where they had the riots. Every window pane within blocks of the school—which used to be for "bad boys" and was converted into a vocational-technical school several years before the riot—was smashed. Every blade of grass was trampled on. But not a window pane at the Thomas Edison School was broken or a blade of grass trampled. Why? The teachers and pupils there explained it to me. "It's our school, our hope," they said. "It was a holy area during the riots. God ran that place. The people in Hough know it is our ray of hope."

At Mahoning Valley School, I asked the boys if I could visit the toilets. They were stunned. A woman comes to this boys' school and wants to go into the toilets. Why? Here's why: Because the condition of the toilets tells volumes about a school. In some of the best private schools in New York City, the walls are scribbled with obscenities and vile messages. In the toilets at Mahoning Valley School, I discovered, the walls were absolutely spotless. Moreover, it is one of the few schools I have seen where there isn't a scratch on the desks. I asked the boys why they don't deface the school and smash windows there. "It's ours," they said. "It's our place where we can learn what we need to learn and want to. It's the place that we can learn how to earn a living, where there's hope, a place of real use to us. We want to keep it the way it is so that other guys can use it after we leave."

After Chesly Manly of the *Chicago Tribune* read my columns about Mahoning Valley and the Thomas Edison School, he teased me about having written a sob story. I told him to go there and see for himself.

"You're one heck of a good reporter," I said. "You'll see." He did go and then phoned me. "I went to the Thomas Edison School," he said, his voice choked with emotion. "I talked to the students and teachers there. That's the greatest place. Why can't we have schools like that all over the country?"

Last summer, the State of Florida held its first statewide convention of vocational and technical education teachers. That conference, in just about the southern-most state of the Union, was a model for America in good race relations. There was complete interracial communication and cooperation. Nobody gave a damn about "integration." It was the most beautiful experience I've had in many years. I asked a Negro teacher who has been in the Florida State education system for 25 years why conditions were so ideal at the conference. "We're working together towards a good goal for a common, constructive purpose," she replied.

I dedicate myself to that purpose and I believe every single one of you should dedicate himself and herself to it. Go out and preach the gospel of vocational-technical education. Follow your lifework; carry out your programs; let the opponents do as they wish. You stick to your guns and make a sick public education get well. When it is well, American society will have solved its biggest problem.

CHILDREN'S EDUCATIONAL RIGHTS

(By Alice Widener)

In 1776, a small group of far-sighted men, who had been thinking long and hard about the art of politics, gave the American people a Constitution ensuring their political, economic and religious liberty. In 1862, a small group of men, who had been thinking long and hard about the art of education, gave the American people a Land-Grant Colleges Act ensuring their educational liberty. The Act entitled each State in the Union to select 30,000 acres of public land per each Member of Congress for use in constructing vocational-technical colleges.

On July 2, 1862 when President Abraham Lincoln signed the Land-Grant Act establishing the land-grant colleges, or "cow colleges" as academic opponents snobbishly called them, he freed more slaves than he did on January 1, 1863, when he signed the Emancipation Proclamation. The slaves freed by Lincoln in 1862 were all the young people in America, regardless of race, sex, color and creed. From then on they were able to strive for a high degree of education in science, mechanics, agriculture, industry and business. Previously, the earning of a college degree was almost entirely restricted to two per cent of male Americans pursuing mainly classical studies in Latin, Greek and Hebrew for the professions of the ministry, law and medicine.

What the great education revolutionists of mid-19th century America really did was to create in our nation a college system of vocational and technical education. Just as our 18th century political revolution had its Founding Fathers, whose names today are known to all, so did our 19th century educational revolution have its Founding Fathers. But though their wisdom, courage and vision were in many ways as great, their names—with the exception of Lincoln's—are not generally familiar to us today.

They should be. The social ills they correctly diagnosed in 19th century society as being due to an out-of-kilter college education system are precisely the same as the social ills requiring correction in 1969 due to an out-of-kilter elementary and secondary education system.

Unless our century produces now a new group of revolutionary Founding Fathers

in education, to do for young Americans what our 18th and 19th century great revolutionists did, our nation will not be able to continue its marvelous advancement which affords most citizens in the United States the highest standard of living in the world.

In the middle of the 19th century, a few great men—Jonathan Baldwin Turner, Justin S. Morrill, Hiram Corson, Ezra Cornell and their allies—became aware that though 93 per cent of Americans lived on farms higher education in our nation was geared to about two per cent of American youth whose families for the most part lived in cities and belonged to a wealthy minority.

Among these 19th century education revolutionists Turner was the ideological leader. A native of Massachusetts graduate of Yale and professor of *belles lettres*, Latin and Greek at Illinois College, Jacksonville, Illinois, Turner conceived in the early 1850's the "Turner Plan" for a system of practical higher education. He delivered a speech calling for the democratization of higher education and for "industrial universities." Persistent, patient and persevering, Turner spoke his piece, always the same piece, whenever he could and wherever he could for ten years. It influenced progressive thinkers throughout the nation, and it influenced Justin S. Morrill, son of a blacksmith in Vermont, who became a member of the U.S. House of Representatives and later a U.S. Senator. Justin Morrill was the main Congressional author of the Land-Grant Colleges Act.

In 1859, President Buchanan vetoed the Morrill Act. But neither Morrill nor Professor Turner abandoned their common cause.

In 1931, Professor Eugene Davenport, Dean Emeritus, University of Illinois College of Agriculture, recalled, "Professor Turner told me personally in his study a few years before his death that he and Mr. Lincoln were discussing the Buchanan veto when Lincoln jokingly remarked, 'Turner, get me elected President, then put your bill through Congress again and I'll sign it.'"

1852 BILL OF RIGHTS

What were Turner's ideas, the ones that led Lincoln to emancipate all American youth from educational slavery? Here they are as adopted in an educational Bill of Rights by the Turner-inspired State of Illinois Farmers Convention of 1852:

"(1) As representatives of the industrial classes, including all cultivators of the soil, artisans, mechanics, and merchants, we desire the same privileges and advantages for ourselves and our posterity in each of our several pursuits and callings, as our professional brethren enjoy in theirs.

"(2) The institutions originally and primarily designated to meet the wants of the professional classes as such cannot, in the nature of things, meet ours, any more than the institutions we desire to establish for ourselves, meet theirs.

"(3) Immediate measures should be taken for the establishment of a university, in the State of Illinois, expressly to meet these felt wants of each and all of the industrial classes of our state."

The Convention favored the Turner Plan for "a university for the industrial classes in each of the States to apply existing knowledge directly and efficiently to all practical pursuits and professions in life, and to extend the boundaries of our present knowledge in all possible practical directions."

President Lincoln's signing of the Morrill Act gave the impetus to men seeking solutions to the problems arising from the agricultural, scientific and industrial development of our nation, and to its geographical exploration. The Morrill Act created a social bond among Americans, bringing them together while permitting them to develop their individuality.

"Conditions in America during the early part of the [19th] century . . . were largely those of a frontier country," wrote W. J.

Kerr, President of Oregon State Agricultural College, in 1931. "The great mass of the people were uneducated and provincial. Despite their many admirable qualities, the majority . . . knew little about science or the applications of it. . . . Higher education was strictly traditional and classical. It had no relation to the resources of the country or to the occupations and objectives of the great mass of the people. Yet it was securely entrenched in both public and private support, all classes contributing to its maintenance."

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

Today, in 1969, precisely the same situation exists in relation to our elementary and secondary education. Geared to pursuit of an academic or professional education in college, our elementary and secondary schools do not meet the needs of the great mass of people or the resources of our nation.

In 1862, when the Morrill Act was passed, 93 per cent of Americans lived on farms and seven per cent in the cities. Higher education was geared to the needs of the urban minority. Now, a century later, seven per cent of Americans live on farms and 93 per cent are in urban communities. Lower education (that is, elementary and secondary schools) is geared to the needs and desires of a minority, the third (approximately) who enter college, of whom only half are eventually graduated from a four-year course. Nationwide, only 12 per cent of our youth in public schools are receiving any kind of vocational/technical education. Yet the felt wants of the mass urban populations, and their needs, require education affording them gainful employment according to their aptitudes as mechanics, merchants, distributors, service and technical personnel, and other practical occupations.

In 1967, 60 per cent of all new employment opportunities were in the service areas. In 1967, Congress appropriated several billion dollars in aid to education, but only \$252 million under the Vocational-Technical Education Act of 1963 and other vocational education acts.

Yet the 1966 Digest of Education Statistics, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported: 99 percent of our children are attending school; and in the 14 to 17 age group (the usual high school age), 93 per cent are enrolled in educational institutions. Approximately 70 per cent of the young people graduate from high school today, and more than one-third of the young adults [graduating] may be expected to enter college.

These statistics show that as of 1965 almost a third of our high school students were drop-outs. The latest figure from the Office of Education shows that despite all efforts to keep students in school, 25 per cent are high school drop-outs. Furthermore, approximately two-thirds do not go on to college, yet their education is directed at college entrance.

Worse, of the third who do go to a four-year college, only half remain there and earn a degree. The other half drop out, mainly in the first and second years. And so the following comparison can be made.

In 1861, American higher education was geared to the real needs of only two per cent of youth; in 1969, American elementary and secondary education is geared to the needs of about 15 per cent of American youth.

FULFILLMENT MAKES FOR CLAIM

It is interesting to note that by far the biggest number of college dropouts is in the liberal arts and social sciences, not the professional schools. Also, the acute social unrest in colleges occurs mainly among students in the arts and social sciences, not in the professions.

In cities, almost all social unrest has been among students in academic high schools and colleges. The vocational and technical schools have been virtually free of it.

On October 18, 1968, the *London Sunday*

Times reported in an article entitled "The Detonators" that all recent student rebellions in England had occurred in the academic colleges; none in the technical and vocational institutions. Everywhere, students are crying out for "relevance" in education.

Is the calm in vocational and technical schools due to students' inferior intelligence, or is it due to their receiving the kind of education that fulfills their individual needs, enables them to display their individual aptitudes, and furnishes them with definite, practical goal?

FULFILLMENT MAKES FOR ACHIEVEMENT

Many theories are being advanced about the relative intelligence of children, and about the influence of environment and heredity on their intelligence. These theories are mainly guesswork; most of the same notions were advanced during the 1850's in the fight against the Land-Grant Colleges Act. Then, it was thought that only upper class "gentlemen" were mentally and morally fit for a higher education. It also was thought that only the "higher subjects" of classical studies were fit for scholarly degrees. Agriculture, mechanics, science and industry were considered to be lower subjects of study fit only for lesser intellects.

Few Americans today are aware that the great Massachusetts Institute of Technology, for example, is a land-grant college.

In 1931, when eminent American scholars assembled at the 45th Annual Convention of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities in Chicago, Dr. W. J. Kerr said:

"Progress today is based on science. . . . The science first taught in the land-grant colleges was of the most objective and practical kind. These early beginnings led to larger and more intensified applications of science, producing cumulative results, which in turn gave fresh momentum to the movement."

The "practical science" in agriculture, pursued first at our land-grant colleges, is what led to the abundance of our present day agriculture, which enables us to avoid famine and feed half the world. Moreover, it was academic freedom at land-grant colleges that enabled individual scientists to make great discoveries and put them to good use under our free enterprise system.

And so we see that our nation was blessed with thousands upon thousands of gifted young people who pursued higher education at "poor boy" or "cow" colleges. They enriched not only America but the entire world.

REASON FOR DROPOUTS

When Chauncey M. Depew, celebrated his 93rd birthday in 1927, he said, "When I graduated from college, it was either the law, the ministry or medicine for the graduate. Today there are 3,000 occupations upon to the college graduate."

Now in 1969 there are many more than 3,000 occupations open to trained young people at the age of 18. But 88 per cent of them are untrained in elementary and secondary schools for any occupation except pursuit of an academic education which two-thirds do not pursue because they do not wish to, or cannot afford to, or are not mentally able to.

Obviously, our elementary and secondary public education system is out-of-kilter with most young people's callings, needs and desires. Obviously, that is why at least 25 per cent drop out of high school. That is a very high rate, one that our nation cannot afford. After all, if any business in America lost 25 per cent of its customers it would go broke.

Nevertheless, today, as we move into the 1970's, all classes of our citizenry, as in the 1850's, are contributing to an education system "securely entrenched in both public and private support that has no relation to the resources of the country and the objectives of the great mass of the people."

SPUTNIK SCARE

Our misfit public school system was snobbish and undemocratic enough in the early 1950's to guarantee a future social upheaval in our nation; but in 1957 it was made infinitely worse when the Soviet Union launched Sputnik into space. Hysterical over what was supposed to be Soviet superiority in science and education, many of our national leaders embarked on what might be called the Sputnikization of American public education. Immediately, there arose the demand that every boy and girl should go to college in order that our nation could meet a need for nuclear physicists and other advanced scientists.

MEANWHILE, ON EARTH

This Sputnikization took place at a time when masses of our agricultural workers left newly automated farms in the South, and flocked North to the cities to find employment. A large percentage of these farm workers were Negroes who spoke a dialect, had little basic education, and suffered from all the handicaps of new emigrés plus the problems of ethnic differences and political disadvantages. At the same time, in many urban communities, there was an influx of Spanish-speaking emigrés from Puerto Rico and Mexico. What the new minority groups in cities most needed was job-training to become economically self-sustaining. What they received in public school was impractical, college-oriented academic training. And the law forced them to remain imprisoned in the academic schools until the age of 16 in 37 states, 17 and 18 in the others.

As captives, the children of the new emigrés became saddest victims of a misfit school system. The dropout rate soared; so did juvenile delinquency and crime rates.

Simultaneously, there occurred a wave of intellectual and emotional sentimentality that affirmed civil rights by pretending all children are alike except for differences in environment. Though no two blades of grass or petals on a rose are alike, it was preached and propagandized that all children could be taught in school, willy-nilly, to pass college entrance exams and go on to a higher academic education.

Because elementary and secondary public education in our big cities is largely irrelevant to the needs of at least 85 per cent of urban youth, there has arisen a social situation that threatens to bring the nation down. Our cities are rife with violence mostly brought on by the frustrations of rootless, goal-less, untrained young people easily misled by agitators.

The social, economic and intellectual pressures being exerted on masses of young people in overcrowded urban schools to acquire a college education are cruel and undemocratic in the extreme. Literally, they cannot take it. Dr. T. Campbell Goodwin, pediatrician and Assistant Commissioner for Children's Services in the New York State Department of Mental Hygiene, says that today state mental institutions are crowded with children falsely labeled as "retarded" or "problem cases."

On August 9, 1967, *The Christian Science Monitor* said in an editorial:

"What's wrong with a good vocational education and a technical high school diploma? Why should it be considered, as it so often is, inferior to a college preparatory course?"

"A survey made by an Ohio educator in his state found 75 per cent of parents and students desiring vocational education in the schools.

"Throughout the United States, and in some other industrialized countries, vocational education has long been a stepchild. Only the academic curriculum has had prestige. The boy (or girl) who turns away from college to train for a job too often loses status in the eyes of his teachers and com-

panions. The high school which boasts of the high proportion of its graduates going to college is disappointed in him.

"The time has come to wipe out these snobberies. One way to do this is to provide much better vocational education than is now offered."

Yet, on December 5, 1967, the *New York Post* reported, "The Board of Education today imposed the death sentence on most of the city's [New York City's] vocational schools. The action, part of a change-over to four-year comprehensive (academic plus vocational) high schools, ends two years of bitter debate within the school system. . . . [Schools Superintendent] Donovan last spring urged the board to drop plans for a single system of comprehensive schools on grounds that they posed 'major difficulties' in terms of facilities, programs, equipment and personnel. The board, overruling Donovan's arguments and earlier threats of rebellion from principals' associations, said today that its 24 'multi-trade' vocational schools, housing 33,000 students, would be phased out or converted . . . within the next eight years."

EDUCATION FOR THE FUTURE

It is the opinion of the *Christian Science Monitor* that, "The era of upgraded vocational education for all who want it is overdue." That was the opinion of the Frontiers of Science Conference in Oklahoma City, January 1969, at which inventors and manufacturers of our space and oceanography technology, of the "picture-phone" and other great new scientific endeavors stressed the national need for trained technicians, mechanics and service personnel.

In July 1967, *Lloyd's Bank Review* carried an article by Gerard Colley, Senior Economist at the Bettle Memorial Institute, Geneva, Switzerland, who pointed out, "Tourism is today one of the fastest-growing sectors in the world economy."

Does anyone deny that with the advent of mass national and international air travel there is necessary a huge number of trained technical, mechanical and service personnel to fill jobs in airports, hotels, eating places, museums, parks, cultural and entertainment centers, banks, shops and markets? Does anyone doubt that service and technical personnel will be needed not only to foster tourism in the developed and developing nations, but also to build and man 21st century space and outer planetary stations and undersea colonies on the ocean floor?

THE REAL LAG

Faster than automation eliminates some jobs, the development of science and technology creates new ones. *The employment "lag" is in trained people, not available jobs.*

As all this becomes more and more evident, there is a change even in the New York City educational attitude. On May 29, 1969, the *New York Times* headlined "Dispute Over Vocational Schools Here Revived," pointed out that city vocational schools "have been largely free of the student unrest that has troubled many academic schools," and went on to say that many youths in the vocational schools "are quick to express their satisfaction."

This student satisfaction in all vocational and technical schools is being expressed in most graduates' sincere desire to go on to higher education in their chosen fields of work. It is very difficult to stifle the eagerness to learn of a young person studying a subject of genuine interest well suited to his or her individual abilities. Very often, along with students' progress in manual or artistic skills there is born a keen desire for more academic achievement.

Since 99 per cent of young Americans between the ages of six and seventeen are in elementary and secondary schools, it is there that they should be able to find opportunities rescuing them from the variables and early vicissitudes of home environment. Children

are not of one mold and they must not be cast into a school system of one mold.

The Founding Fathers who drafted our Educational Bill of Rights in the mid-19th century and created the land-grant colleges were aware of this truth when they revolutionized higher education in America. Now in 1969, we must have Founding Fathers with courage and foresight enough to revolutionize the elementary and secondary education, adapting it to the children's real needs and freeing it from the fetters of academic intellectual snobbery and the dictates of an academic hierarchy and bureaucracy.

WE NEED NEW "IMMORTAL ACT"

In 1962, Allan Nevins, historian for the Civil War Centennial Commission, wrote a paper on "The Origins of the Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities, a Brief Account of the Morrill Act of 1862 and Its Results." Nevins began thus:

"It was an immortal moment in the history of higher education in America and the world when, on July 2, 1862, Abraham Lincoln lifted his pen and signed the College Land-Grant Act, of which Justin S. Morrill of Vermont was the principal author."

In 1862, when Morrill was asked why he had led the fight for the Act that bears his name, he replied, "Being myself the son of a hardfisted blacksmith . . . who felt his own deprivation of schools (never having spent but six weeks inside of a schoolhouse), I could not overlook mechanics in any measure intended to aid the industrial classes in the procurement of an education that might exalt their usefulness."

Now in our century, which is so full of good hope even while it manifests so many human disappointments and fears, can we deny a majority of our youth the opportunity to procure an education exalting their usefulness to themselves and to the society in which they live?

Webster's Dictionary defines the verb "to exalt" as "to raise high; elevate, raise in rank, power, or character; to elevate by praise or in estimation."

In 1862, Abraham Lincoln exalted American higher education by making it wider and better suited to the individual talents and needs of the people. Let us hope that by 1972, another American President will have lifted his pen to exalt our elementary and secondary education by making it wider, by granting to vocational/technical schools both status and funds equal to those of academic schools, by according to vocational and technical education teachers with practical know-how the same degree of prestige enjoyed by academic teachers, and thus creating a 20th century education Bill of Rights for all of American's children.

CRITICISM A TWO-WAY STREET

Mr. CURTIS, Mr. President, I would not want to live in a country where officeholders could not be criticized. It is a two-way street, however. Unless officeholders can criticize the press, the public is deprived of a full discussion on the issues.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fair Exchange," published in the Norfolk (Nebr.) Daily News of November 22, 1969.

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

FAIR EXCHANGE

Even before Vice President Spiro Agnew provided some "equal time" criticism for newspapers after dealing with the TV networks, a prominent editor rose to claim that the Nixon administration was trying to muzzle the media.

But when Spiro says that's not true, and Herb Klein and other administration spokesmen chime in, we do not allow our traditionally skeptical newspaper nature to disbelieve them. Many in private and public life would like to influence the news, to change it, to make it more responsive to a particular point of view, but there are few Americans with a dangerous disregard for the value of a free press.

Norman Isaacs, the executive editor of the Louisville Courier-Journal and Times, and also president of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, accused the administration of undertaking a campaign for "some sort of covert control" of both newspapers and broadcast stations. It is an unfortunate reaction when critics of the media arise.

They are put in the position of attacking a free press, rather than criticizing what the free press does occasionally that one thinks is wrong.

Mr. Agnew has made it clear he believes in no censorship, no control; but he wants to criticize the press just as it criticizes politicians. That ought to be fair enough.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE ADOPTION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on December 11, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted the Human Rights Convention on Genocide during its Paris session.

The text of the convention confirms that genocide is a crime under international law, whether committed in time of peace or war. Of even greater importance, the convention states that all persons committing genocide shall be punished, be they constitutionally responsible officials, or private individuals. Though genocidal crimes are not to be confused with political crimes, those guilty will be subject to the rulings of their competent national court, or, if possible, an international penal tribunal.

Over 70 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention since 1948. The United States has not.

On June 16, 1949, the convention outlawing genocide was submitted to the Senate by President Truman. Public hearings on the convention were held by the Foreign Relations Committee in January and February of 1950. Although the subcommittee reported favorably on the convention, it became stalled in full committee and remained on the table at the time the 81st Congress adjourned.

On this day, the anniversary of the adoption of the Genocide Convention by the General Assembly of the United Nations, I once again ask this Chamber to recognize the importance of this matter. How can it be that this Nation, which is founded on the principle of life and liberty for all, not think it scandalous that we have not affirmed this principle for all peoples throughout the world? I urge the Senate to immediately consider and move toward ratification of this convention.

THE DICTATORIAL JUNTA IN GREECE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, our tragic involvement in Vietnam and such ex-

plorative events as those taking place in the Middle East overshadow developments of great significance in other parts of the world. One such area is Greece, where a dictatorial junta continues to rule that brave and freedom-loving people.

A few days ago, I was visited by the former Greek Minister, Mr. Constantine Mitsotakis, one of the best-known personalities in the postwar history of Greece. Today he is engaged in the struggle to restore parliamentary democracy in his native land. A resistance fighter against the Germans in World War II, Constantine Mitsotakis was first elected M.P. for Chania at the age of 28. From then on he was continuously elected for the Centre Party. He has served in the Papandreou government as Economic Minister in 1965 and 1966. After the colonels' coup, he was arrested and imprisoned, but succeeded in escaping in 1968 and is living outside Greece.

In our discussion, Mr. Mitsotakis emphasized several points which he considers of particular significance concerning the situation in Greece today—points which I feel it is important for the Senate to understand.

First. Perhaps of major concern, Constantine Mitsotakis believes that the next few months—possibly 3—present the last opportunity for a restoration of a democratic government in Greece without a bloodbath. Moreover, he is certain that, given the history and character of the Greek people, a future attempt will be made to force out the colonels' government even if that means a bloody revolution.

Second. Also, he considers the present attitude of the United States to be one of the most powerful factors in maintaining the junta in office. Even the Greek military, he believes, does not favor the junta, but rather tolerates it from belief that it enjoys the support of the Pentagon.

Third. Mr. Mitsotakis believes that the initiative taken at the end of September by the former conservative Greek Prime Minister, Constantine Karamanlis, offering his personal cooperation for the restoration of normality and the safeguard of order and security, creates an opportunity for restoration of parliamentary rule. Mr. Mitsotakis was a liberal opponent of the conservative E.R.E. government—under Mr. Karamanlis—while free debate prevailed. But from the first moment of his escape from Greece, Mr. Mitsotakis placed his services at the disposal of Mr. Karamanlis and declared publicly the need for the political world to rally around Mr. Karamanlis and support his leadership. Mr. Mitsotakis told me he believes that such a movement can succeed only if the junta is denounced by the United States and other nations of the free world.

We can sympathize, I am sure, with the plight of the citizens of Greece, who endured so much during and after World War II to establish self-government. Tribulations of the more distant past resulted in the immigration of thousands of Greeks to the United States. Many went to my State of Utah—principally young men—to work on railroad con-

struction gangs and in the mines. Substantial sums of money earned through this hard labor were sent back to the homeland to assist needy relatives. Homes, families, and business enterprises were begun. Today, the descendants of these immigrants are among our most respected families and are most active citizens of Utah.

It is now 2½ years since the colonels' regime crushed self-government in Greece. During that time, their government has apparently failed to gain even a minority of supporters. Repeated statements that the regime would be regularized by elections have not been redeemed and restoration of parliamentary rule in any form appears to be far off.

It must be remembered that America, applying the Truman doctrine, allotted some \$3 billion to Greece to counteract a Communist threat. Thus we succeeded, without the loss of a single soldier, in preventing Communist expansion in Europe. In this struggle, all Greeks were united and the bloody war was successfully prosecuted without even temporarily suspending parliamentary government.

As Senators may recall, December 12 will see a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of 18 nations of the Council of Europe. It appears that the Council will expel Greece, based upon a report of the European Commission for Human Rights, written after more than 2 years of investigation.

If the Council takes such action or if strong support for expulsion is at the meeting, the United States should surely reassess its position toward the Greek dictatorship. And such a review should take place soon—before the opportunities which appear to be present for the restoration of a popularly based parliamentary regime have passed.

Mr. President, a number of editorials and news reports have been published in the press recently concerning the Greek situation. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 26, 1969]

GREEKS EXTEND EXILE FOR 5

ATHENS.—Five former members of parliament considered security threats by the army-backed Greek government were committed to an additional year in exile under a government decision today, informed sources said here.

The five men have been in exile in remote villages and islands for more than two years. They were deported after the army seized power in Greece in April, 1967.

The sources named the five former members of the Center Union Party—a powerful party before the army takeover—as Ioannis Charalambopoulos, Ioannis Papaspyrou, Panayotis Katsikopoulos, Constantine Koniatakis and Ioannis Alevras.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 30, 1969] ATHENS HERALDS POLITICAL REFORM—LAW IS DRAFTED ALLOWING FORMATION OF PARTIES

ATHENS.—The army-backed Greek Government announced today that it had drafted a law establishing rules for the formation of political parties, which are now banned under martial law.

The draft would be one of 18 "institutional laws" that are to take effect only when full constitutional rule, suspended since April, 1967, is restored.

The Government has pledged to have the 18 draft laws ready by the end of this year, but refuses to commit itself to a timetable for the restoration of the suspended articles of the Constitution and the lifting of martial law.

Today's announcement, which concerns one legal step in a lengthy procedure for the final ratification of the "institutional laws," was seen in part as an effort to placate Greece's critics abroad.

Criticism of the Greek authorities for their failure to restore democracy, more than two and one-half years after seizing power, is expected to reach a climax in the next two weeks when Western foreign ministers meet in Brussels for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization winter session and later in Paris for the meeting of the 18-nation Council of Europe.

FURTHER GESTURES EXPECTED

Diplomats here expected the Athens authorities to make further gestures to demonstrate their good faith, including the release of some of their 2,000 political prisoners.

These gestures were expected particularly before the Council of Europe meeting on Dec. 12, which is to vote on a motion for the suspension of Greece's membership.

The Athens leaders are eager to demonstrate their goodwill in view of the impression that will be created by the report of the European Commission on Human Rights which, after a two-year study, is said to have reached the conclusion that Greece had tolerated the torturing of political prisoners and that the danger of an imminent Communist take-over invoked by the military to seize power in April, 1967, did not really exist.

The report is still secret and the Council of Europe is bound by its statutes not to discuss it or take any action on it before a three-month cooling-off period has elapsed.

INQUIRY ON GREECE REPORTS TORTURES— EUROPE COUNCIL REPORT ALSO FINDS THE MILITARY REGIME BARS MANY BASIC RIGHTS (By Alvin Shuster)

LONDON.—The European Commission for Human Rights has concluded that Greece's military-backed Government allowed torture of political prisoners and denied many fundamental human rights.

Its 1,200-page report, the result of more than two years of investigation, found that torture and ill-treatment were "an administrative practice" that was "officially tolerated." It charged that Greek authorities had taken no effective steps to stop the practices.

The commission, an agency of the 18-nation Council of Europe, also found that, contrary to contentions of the Greek regime, there was no danger of a Communist take-over at the time the army colonels seized power on April 21, 1967, and imposed martial law. It is still in effect.

"There is evidence indicating that it [a Communist takeover] was neither planned at that time nor seriously anticipated by either the military or police authorities," the commission said.

Its still-confidential report, in four volumes, is likely to bolster the case of governments that will push for the expulsion of Greece when the ministers of the Council of Europe meet in Paris on Dec. 12. The council has postponed action awaiting the commission's findings, which have now been submitted to the member nations.

Apart from the blow to Athens' prestige, expulsion from the Council would also mean removal of Greece from the Parliament of Europe, which sits in Strasbourg and prepares social and economic programs for its members.

BRITAIN TO BACK EXPULSION

Britain has decided to vote against the regime at the meeting and is trying to influence others to do so. The United States, although not a member of the council, has indicated concern about Greece's expulsion, fearing, in part, that it might lead to pressure to expel her from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization as well.

Some United States officials also worry that such council action might lead the colonels, out of pique, to withdraw from participation in NATO.

Greek leaders have sought to give the impression of movement toward democracy. They are expected to defend themselves at next month's meeting by citing steps they have taken, including recent talk of a still-vague timetable for the restoration of representative government.

But the regime will be presenting its argument against the background of the most detailed and official condemnation of its actions yet. The report represents the efforts of lawyers who took hundreds of hours of testimony and even traveled to Greece for on-the-scene investigation. Some have called their work the weightiest international legal inquiry since the Nuremberg trial of war criminals after World War II.

Technically, the council cannot take any steps on the basis of the report until three months after its submission. But such countries as Britain, Norway, Sweden and Denmark believe there are sufficient grounds for action now anyway.

CHARTER VIOLATION CHARGED

The conclusions—that the use of torture had been established "beyond doubt," that human freedoms are violated and that no Communist threat existed at the time of the coup—go to the heart of the case. The report concludes that the Greek regime has thus violated the conditions of membership, in particular Article 3.

That article in the charter of the council, founded 20 years ago, states that members "must accept the principles of the rule of law and of the enjoyment by all persons within its jurisdiction of human rights and fundamental freedoms."

Such rights may be suspended under the charter in "time of peril of other public emergency threatening the life of the nation," but the commission found that these conditions did not exist at the time of the coup.

The report said that while there was a period of "political instability and tension" in Greece, this did not constitute a "public emergency." While there were demonstrations in the streets, it said, the situation did "not differ markedly from that in many other countries in Europe."

It also rejected the Greek Government's argument that continued suspension of rights was necessary because of bomb incidents and the growth of "illegal organizations."

"The commission does not find, on the evidence before it," it said, "that either factor is beyond the control of the public authorities using normal measures, or that they are on a scale threatening the life of the Greek nation."

CONFRONTED GREEK AUTHORITIES

The report said that competent Greek authorities, "confronted with numerous and substantial complaints and allegations of torture and ill-treatment," failed to take any effective steps to investigate them or to insure remedies for "any such complaints or allegations found to be true."

Moreover, the report said that Greeks were being denied such fundamental rights as freedom of expression, association, a fair trial, and free elections at regular intervals. Such rights, it noted, are required under the council's charter.

The report, prepared by a subcommittee of the Human Rights Commission, was adopt-

ed by the parent group earlier this month. It was submitted to the member countries nine days ago.

The council, primarily an advisory organization, was organized to further political, social and economic unity of Europe. Its other members are Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, France, West Germany, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Turkey.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Nov. 30, 1969]

AMBASSADOR TO ATHENS—CONTEMPTUOUS RE- MARKS ABOUT U.S. KEEPING AMERICAN EN- VOY'S CHAIR VACANT IN ATHENS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Contemptuous remarks about the U.S. by a high Greek official are producing two wholly unexpected side effects: Keeping the American ambassador's chair in Athens vacant a bit longer and worsening relations between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Moreover, the indiscretion of Panayiotis Pipinellis, Foreign Minister of the Greek military dictatorship, might just tip the balance against full resumption of U.S. military aid to Greece.

At issue is a top-secret briefing by Pipinellis for Greek ambassadors in Western Europe delivered at Bad Schnitznach, Switzerland, on Aug. 26. Two weeks ago, we reported from a verbatim account of that briefing that Pipinellis referred to the U.S. as a "so-called democracy" not to be trusted.

At that point, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was ready to recommend confirmation of Foreign Service officer Henry J. Tasca, nominated on Sept. 9 by President Nixon for the long vacant Athens post. But when Sen. J. W. Fulbright of Arkansas heard of the Pipinellis document he informed the State Department that his committee would not act on Tasca until it had a chance to study the Pipinellis document.

The State Department went into a classic diplomatic stall. In response to three separate telephone calls from Fulbright aides, it curiously pleaded inability to locate a copy of the briefing—curious because a copy was actually in the State Department's hands before we obtained ours. Vexed with the State Department, Fulbright finally obtained a copy through private channels.

That means Tasca may not get confirmed before the new year. More important, the effort of Sen. Claiborne Pell of Rhode Island to put a rider on the foreign aid bill barring military assistance to Greece is strengthened.

In addition to Pipinellis' assault on U.S. style democracy, he belittled Mr. Nixon's Vietnam and defense policies.

"We all thought that, after the Republican victory, there would be greater stress on rearmament and on strengthening the world's defenses," Pipinellis said. "But the real situation has proved quite different. Mr. Nixon went to the Far East without, as it seems, having decided any other concrete program than a declaration to all Asians that America is returning to a policy of falling back to home."

News of U.S. troop pullouts "has been heard with disbelief," Pipinellis said, sarcastically referring to a \$5 billion U.S. defense cutback as "good news."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Nov. 29,
1969]

KEEPING THE HEAT ON THE ATHENS JUNTA

The foreign ministers of 18 nations in the prestigious Council of Europe are to meet Dec. 12 to decide whether to throw Greece out. They should. The ruling junta in Athens has, as charged, violated human rights and blocked parliamentary rule. An organization of the council's idealistic purposes which countenanced the junta would forfeit public

respect. As long as there seemed a chance that the colonels might pick their way back toward democracy, the council could reasonably suspend judgment. But the officers have made it plain they do not intend to relinquish power voluntarily. They are sapping the Greek economy and, by their clumsiness and terror, turning the public's earlier apathy into opposition. Their isolation by the Council of Europe could add an important increment of pressure on their position at home.

After the April, 1967, coup, and especially after the King's abortive counter-coup that December, Greek politicians were in disarray and many observers feared there was no real and acceptable alternative to military rule. This autumn, however, Constantine Caramanlis, a widely respected former premier who had gone into exile, managed to organize the responsible political elements into a standby coalition; he offered himself as head of a provisional government of national unity. Mr. Caramanlis called on the junta to step down; otherwise, he said, other officers should "appreciate their duty"—that is, oust them. For now, the colonels remain in power. But those who oppose them can work with confidence that constitutionalism, not chaos, lies beyond.

Though the United States has taken pains to stay at arm's length from the colonels, the 20-year record of deep American involvement in Athens has given wide currency in Greece to a curious myth. This myth holds that Washington sustains the junta and that, if it chose, Washington could bring it down. Bringing down the colonels is not Washington's duty, or right. But denying them crucial support is: military aid is one kind of crucial support.

Two administrations have withheld major military aid since the coup, except for a brief period last year when jitters about the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia took precedence over distaste for the Athens regime. By Senator Pell's calculation, as much as \$263 million in aid has backed up. In remarks not fully appreciated by the junta's American critics, the Nixon administration states that Greece has "scrupulously fulfilled" its NATO obligations—but without the military aid. The critics have been alarmed by a Pentagon chart listing Greece as having bought \$33 million worth of arms in 1969, as against \$24 million in the preceding six years. Inquiry reveals, however, that the \$33 million figure includes \$27 million for deals that fell through. The colonels are furious. The United States should do nothing to bring them joy.

JOBS NOW, INC.—LOUISVILLE, KY.

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to the outstanding community relations work being done in my hometown of Louisville by a corporation called Action Now, Inc., under the able direction of George T. Underhill, Jr.

Action Now, Inc., represents the involvement of the private sector in the problems of the underprivileged. It does not in any way compete with Federal, State or local agencies. Rather it attempts to complement and aid them. Its primary purpose is to tap one of the city's largest resources—successful management. The directors of Action Now, Inc., are drawn from the Louisville business community, black and white. They have much to offer that cannot be duplicated in a Government agency: Their time is unstructured, they are familiar with their city's problems, they have a vested interest in those problems.

Action Now is a privately financed,

nonprofit organization designed to function as its name implies—to stimulate jobs, housing, and business experience for the disadvantaged. Its three companies function in the areas of job procurement, Jobs Now; adequate housing, Housing Now; and business advice and guidance, Economic Development Now.

Jobs Now is an employment agency only for the hard-core unemployed, including parolees. It has a particularly practical approach to job training which avoids the pitfalls of other such programs. No one is processed through training unless a specific job awaits him at the end of the program. The agency thus enlists a strong commitment from industry—willingness to lower entry-level standards and to work with the hard-core individual. Training includes orientation toward how to succeed on the job; for example, explaining what sort of behavior will be expected and rewarded. A job counselor is assigned to each prospective employee for the period of 1 year, during which time they meet at least once a week to anticipate problems which may interfere with work performance. Job counselors are ghetto products who, in contrast to their counselees, have had successful work experience. Group counseling is used whenever possible, because the hard-core individual more readily opens up to his own peers.

Perhaps the most important service that Jobs Now provides and one that is probably overlooked by other employment facilities is supervisor training. This takes the form of informal group discussion of problems of working with the hard-core unemployed by the supervisors on the job. A significant index of the success of this approach is that companies using this training have not only improved their retention rate of the hard-core dramatically, but they have also reduced the turnover of all employees in entry-level jobs.

Housing Now acts as a technical consultant to religious, civic, and other nonprofit groups. It aims to stimulate new housing for low-to-moderate-income families and the rehabilitation of blighted areas, by helping to arrange financing and construction. It also encourages homeownership by the underprivileged, which provides a sense of personal responsibility and stimulates better community spirit. Projects currently in process represent approximately 1,000 units with an estimated cost of \$15 million.

Economic Development Now actively recruits potential disadvantaged-owned businesses, and then provides thorough, professional marketing advice. The board of advisers selects for study only those businesses with a potential for viability and opportunities for employment. It helps develop specific financing, train management, and stays with the business until successful. Perhaps most important, it publicizes and promotes its programs in the community in order to enlist full community participation.

MCCOOK, NEBR., DAILY GAZETTE CLOSES PAGES TO X-RATED MOVIES

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, our whole Nation should be grateful to the people

who are speaking up for decency and order.

On November 19, 1969, the McCook Daily Gazette at McCook, Nebr., carried an editorial reciting that its pages were closed to X-rated movies. I commend them for it. Because I think the editorial deserves a place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the McCook Daily Gazette, Nov. 19, 1969]

GAZETTE CLOSES PAGES TO X-RATED MOVIES

The McCook Daily Gazette is hereby joining those newspapers across the nation who are refusing to advertise the X-rated movies.

The movie shown last week at the Fox Theater is the first ever shown in McCook to rate the X classification under the new Hollywood system for openly filming and advertising not only questionable material but what some consider detrimental to the moral well being.

Even movies carrying the R (restricted) rating are far from a compliment to the film industry and Hollywood.

Newspaper people are not noted for a "holier than thou" attitude and can generally roll with the tide of change and adjustment, but it is extremely difficult to see how the Hollywood trend today under the disguise of "realism" can be good for society in any stretch of the imagination.

Walt Disney Studios are an exception to the Hollywood trend and we salute them. Likewise, the local theater management is not to blame since it has only limited control over film selection.

The moral decay is not confined to the screen but can be found at most newsstands and the U.S. mail is full of it. Our elected officials must find a way of stopping this.

Pornography flows through the mails with return addresses, indicating absolutely no fear of prosecution. Why? We frankly don't know. The freedom of press guarantee has been used as an alibi in some cases but what is commonplace in the mails today has absolutely nothing to do with freedom of the press and any judge would have difficulty making anyone believe there is a grey area to hide behind.

This newspaper can not stop this rage in our nation or even in McCook but we can and are preventing the film industry from using our pages to advertise X rated movies in the future.

GRAZING FEES—II

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, yesterday I called the attention of the Senate to the inability of the Secretary of the Interior to provide in 15 days the information regarding grazing fees on which he has given the public 30 days in which to comment.

Fortunately, the resolution of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, to which I referred yesterday, was also directed to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The committee has received, and within the time specified, "A Review of the Forest Service Grazing Fee System as Implemented in 1969 on National Forests in the 11 Western States, South Dakota and Nebraska." Prepared in November 1969 by Chief Edward P. Cliff of the U.S. Forest Service, it will be helpful to those seriously concerned with the management of our public lands as they prepare comments on Secretary

Hickel's tentative conclusion not to increase grazing fees on the public lands for 1970. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this report and its appendices be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

A REVIEW OF THE FOREST SERVICE GRAZING FEE SYSTEM AS IMPLEMENTED IN 1969 ON NATIONAL FORESTS IN 11 WESTERN STATES, SOUTH DAKOTA AND NEBRASKA

(By Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, USDA, November 1969)

PURPOSE

By its August 7, 1969, resolution, the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs requested a comprehensive review of the grazing fee schedules as announced January 14, 1969. The review was to include consideration of whether the public interest and equity, as well as the intent of the Congress as expressed in specified Acts, are reflected in the criteria and methods used. The Acts to which the Resolution referred are the Taylor Grazing Act and Title V of Public Law 137, 82nd Congress (65 Stat. 268, 290), the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952. This report presents findings of a review of the Forest Service grazing fees system in 1969.

FEE AUTHORITIES AND POLICIES

User charges for livestock grazing on Federal lands in the National Forest System are established by the Secretary of Agriculture under authorities that flow to him through provision of the Organic Administration Act of 1897 as well as the 1952 Act cited above and other authorities. No provision in the law gives direction specific to grazing fees on the National Forests. In this respect the Department of Agriculture is different from the Department of the Interior which does have specific statutory direction about grazing fees. Under Section 3 of the Taylor Grazing Act (48 Stat. 1269, as amended by the Act of August 6, 1947, 61 Stat. 790, 43 USC [1964 ed.] sec. 315b), the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to issue grazing permits upon payment of reasonable fees and is given therein further direction about fees.

Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952 sets forth Congressional direction applicable to the establishment of user charges for grazing on the Federal lands in the National Forest System (Appendix A).

In response to a long history of looking at user charges, some of which went back to 1947, the Bureau of the Budget in 1957 set forth in a BOB Bulletin general policies for developing an equitable and uniform system of charges for certain Government services and property. Policies of the 1957 Bulletin were incorporated into Circular A-25, the September 23, 1959, policy directive on User Charges by the Bureau of the Budget. The general policy of Circular A-25 was amplified in a 1964 "Natural Resources User Charges" report that spelled out general principles to follow in establishing user charges. Principles specific to establishment of grazing fees were presented in the 1964 BOB report.

Circular A-25 and the 1964 Report specified that fair market value should be obtained where federally owned resources or property are leased or sold. The 1964 BOB report restated the policy that the recipient of special benefits that accrue from the use of federal resources to identifiable recipients above and beyond those that accrue to the public at large generally should pay a reasonable charge for the resource used. That basic concept is believed to have been an endorsement of Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952.

In transmitting the 1965 budget to the Congress, the President said, "Many Federal

Government programs furnish specific, identifiable benefits to the individuals and businesses using them. Equity to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy the benefits should bear a greater share of the costs."

THE FEE SYSTEM

Under the authority above noted the Secretary of Agriculture set forth the new fee system for the National Forest System in a Regulation (36 CFR 231.5), published January 14, 1969, in the Federal Register. (Appendix B). This system has been in effect during 1969 on the 97 National Forests in the 11 Western States, South Dakota and Nebraska. It will raise grazing fees to fair market value in 10 equal annual steps.

As announced by the Bureau of the Budget on January 14, 1969, the grazing fees decision was made using data obtained in 1966 from a westernwide survey of some 10,000 farmers and ranchers, and bankers and other representatives of lending institutions. The basis for the method used in the survey was a series of studies that extended back to about 1961. The Bureau of the Budget provided policy direction and guidelines that had their basis in Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952 referred to above.

The formulation of the 1966 Western Livestock Grazing Survey, the analysis of the data thereby produced, the design of the grazing fee formula, and the implementation schedule announced on January 14, 1969, were all guided by the Congressional mandate and Executive principles previously discussed.

The general principle of the new grazing fees system was establishment and recovery of fair market value for the Government. The system recognized that immediate, full imposition of a fair market value charge could have an adverse impact on the users and, thus, set forth a schedule that would take ten years to arrive at the fair market value level. This was considered to be the reasonable period of time called for in the policy guidelines. It was considered to be in line with the 1952 Act which prescribes fairness and equity.

The system placed into effect in 1969 further employs the principle of uniformity in the basis for grazing fees charges among the several Federal agencies that administer public lands for grazing. Under the new system, a common set of guidelines and procedures was used to arrive at the basis for grazing fees on the National Forests and on the Federal lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management and a uniform fair market value fee level was established. The fee system is fully intended to provide a fair return to the Government and equitable treatment to the users.

THE FEES SYSTEM IN REVIEW

One of our concerns throughout the past ten years of fees studies, surveys, and analyses and evaluation, has been that of equity to the user while attempting to find a fee system that also is equitable to the Federal Government. We have believed that the system now in effect is such a system. As I pointed out to the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee on February 27, 1969, "Our overriding concern has been to sympathetically and responsibly weigh impacts . . . upon the permittees. Our concern, as does the Committee's, continues. Thus, we have been reviewing the fees system in several respects.

We are trying to determine whether or not differences exist from place to place that are great enough to justify continuation of a variable fee system that may be more equitable than the one fee level which all National Forest fees will reach in 1978. In addition the Department is interested in giving special considerations to problems of small livestock operators in low-income areas. The Forest

Service has many of this kind of operator. In F.Y. 1970 we are placing emphasis on improving grazing opportunities to low-income area permittees using a small increase in our range appropriations.

Conservation groups supported the decision as did eastern and some western farmers and ranchers who do not share in the privilege to graze livestock on the National Forests. However, the revision initially was protested strongly by a number of livestock permittees who indicated that increases in fees under the new system will put them out of business. Strength of the protest, as well as the support, is evidenced in the records of the Hearings before the Subcommittees on Public Lands of the Senate and House Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs¹ and litigation in Utah and New Mexico. The grazing fees matter also was discussed to some degree in hearings and meetings of the Advisory Council to and before the Public Land Law Review Commission during the year.

The January 14, 1969, Regulation was challenged by that segment of the livestock industry using public lands through a suit filed against the Secretary of Interior in the U.S. District Court for Utah. Suits were also filed against both the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture² in the U.S. District Court for New Mexico. Injunctive relief was sought against the regulations in each suit. In all instances, the Courts dismissed the cases in favor of the Secretaries.

In the New Mexico District Court case the Court ruled that "It has not been shown that the Secretaries have failed to consider all the factors as directed by Congress. They have acted within the area of discretion and judgment committed to them by law in promulgating the new regulations . . ."

The New Mexico case has been appealed to the United States Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals and will probably be heard in 1970.

Because of the protests to the current fee schedule and the expressed concern of Congress, our concern has extended to specific individual user groups for whom the new fee has been predicted to be an excessive burden. Therefore, in line with the Committee's resolution, we have made an extensive search of our records and other sources of information to determine the degree to which the current fee schedule has been responsible for causing economic hardships.

In making this review we sought to determine if, because of the new fee schedule, (a) permittees are in fact being put out of business as alleged and to what degree permittees are declaring bankruptcy, (b) permittees are waiving permits back to the Forest Service or permit transfers are continuing, (c) permittees have been refused mortgages or if their ability to obtain loans has been reduced, (d) the permit is still used as collateral and to what extent, (e) permittees refused to pay their fees or paid under protest, (f) permittee cooperative contributions to structural and non-structural improvements and maintenance on the National Forests have been reduced.

The setting for our review is the fee sys-

¹ *Grazing Fees on Public Lands: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, 91st Congress, 1st Session, February 27 and 28, 1969. U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, and Review of Grazing Fees: Hearings before the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 91st Congress, 1st Session, March 4 and 5, 1969. Serial No. 91-1, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969.*

² *Pankey Land and Cattle Co. v. Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture, Civil No. 7870, in the U.S. District Court for the District of New Mexico.*

tem as it has been in effect. A summary of 1969 grazing fees on the Western National Forests provides that setting.

1969 GRAZING FEES

In 1969, National Forest cattle fees averaged 1 cent higher than they would have been under the old system. The old fees were hitched to livestock prices and, since average prices paid to farmers and ranchers in 1968 were up from 1967, the increase would have been reflected in 1969. However, averages do not tell the whole story.

Forest Service grazing fees varied widely from place to place under the system in effect from 1931 through 1968. Under the new system, this variability will continue, although decreasing as fees approach the fair market value for 1978. In 1969 National Forest fees for cattle varied from 31 cents to \$1.25; under the old system they would have varied from 22 cents to \$1.90. Sixty percent of the Forest Service grazing users on the Western National Forests paid the same fee or less in 1969 than they would have paid under the old system. However, fees in 1969 increased for the remaining 40 percent of the cattle permittees over what they would have paid under the old system. These increases varied from 1 cent to 9 cents per animal unit month, with the greatest increases where fees have been the lowest.

Sheep fees on the National Forests in 1969 varied from 6¼ cents to 25 cents per sheep month. One sheep fee rate was decreased 17¼ cents per sheep month from what it would have been under the old system. The remaining sheep fees increased, when compared against the 1969 fees under the old system, by from ¼ to 2¼ cents per sheep month.

FEES IMPACTS

Our review of data from the 97 National Forests in the 11 Western States and South Dakota and Nebraska and other sources disclosed the following:

(a) Out of almost 15,000 permits affected by the new fees system, only six (6) relinquished their permit due to ranch liquidation and bankruptcy. This is about 4/100 of one percent of all permits. In none of these six relinquishments was there any indication that the new fees schedule played any part in the foreclosure. Economic Research Service data relating to farm title transfers shows that forced sales as a percentage of all classes of title transfers did not change for 1969 in the Mountain and Pacific Regions, as compared with previous years.³

(b) *The new fee system has had no effect on the movement of permits in 1969.* Total number of permits transferred from one rancher to another has been about the same as in recent years. In 1969 through October, 694 permits (4.6 percent of all permits) were transferred—586 of which were cattle permits. This is from a 1969 total of slightly less than 15,000 permits. This compares with a 5-year (1961-1965) average of 624 transferred annually (4.2 percent of all permits)—534 of which were cattle. Permits transferred in 1969 ranged in size from 1 to 1,283 cattle and from 25 to 6,207 sheep. Transfers were reported on almost every National Forest. Thus, it would appear that demand for Forest Service grazing permits at the normal supply rate was unaffected by the fees decision.

(c) *There were 368 escrow waivers of Forest Service permit privileges filed in 1969.⁴ Al-*

though data for full comparison with prior years is not readily available, it is believed that there is essentially no change in 1969 from previous years in number, size and tenure of loans to Forest Service permittees as evidenced by escrow waivers filed.

Sheep and cattle permittees of all size classes obtained loans in 1969 (Appendix C). Half of the 368 mortgages issued to Forest Service permittees in 1969 for which we have records were for \$50,000 or more. Minimum mortgage value was for \$1,000 to be loaned annually; maximum value was \$2,540,000. Simple average value was \$117,073. Total value of all mortgages initiated in 1969 as of November 1, 1969, was \$42,848,866.

The proportion of all loans made to Forest Service permittees in 1969 by the Federal Land Banks and other banks and savings and loan institutions remained essentially the same as loans of record in 1967 (Appendix D). Proportion of loans by insurance companies decreased significantly while Farmers Home Administration, Production Credit Association, and loans made by individuals increased greatly. If this decrease in insurance company loans and increase in loans by individuals is in fact a change from typical annual loans, it more than likely is a reflection of increased interest rates charged by insurance companies.

(d) *The question of degree of use of permit value as partial collateral is difficult to answer.* Loans are normally made following an appraisal of the value of the total operation and the net earning capabilities of the operator. An appraisal of the operation encompasses the total ranch operation. That portion of the operation dependent upon National Forest lands, called assured lands, is discounted due to the risk of change of number of animals permitted. The amount of discount varies with each operation and is dependent upon several factors, mostly including past history of the operation and the operator. The fact is that the grazing privilege is considered part of the total ranch operation and is, after discounting, considered in determining the total amount of loan to be transacted. Since the recent fees decision in no way alters the grazing privilege itself, the higher fee will have no effect on this portion of the ranch value appraisal. The net-income portion of the appraisal is the area where higher fees may affect the total amount of mortgage. The estimated net income measures the rancher's ability to repay the loan. As fees are increased with no income-compensating factor, this estimated net income will be reduced. From the records available, comments from our field people, and discussions with lending personnel, the fees increase in 1969 has apparently had no measurable effect on the lending industry's willingness to make loans to permittees nor on the amount of such loans.

(e) *Less than 1 percent of all permittees (119 permittees) paid their fees under protest to the new fees system.* Many of these 119 protests, 80 percent of which originated in the Southwest, were declared by the permittee writing on his fee bill the following statement as encouraged by National and State livestock organizations: "This payment is made without waiver of any rights which the permittee may have to seek refund in the event it is eventually determined that the increased grazing fees represented by your statement are invalid." Others simply wrote, "paid under protest." There were no reports of permittees refusing to pay their fees in 1969 for any reason.

used as collateral. The form of record is held in Forest Service files and is called an escrow waiver. Change in number, size, and tenure of loans to Forest Service permittees is an index to the degree to which the new grazing fee system has affected the ability of the rancher to obtain operational and other financing.

(f) *Of all 97 National Forests on which the new fee schedule is effective in 1969, only one reported any decrease in permittee cooperation.* This one occurrence is an isolated case consisting of one permittee. Most Forests reported no noticeable change in cooperation. Several reported an increase in permittee cooperation toward structural and non-structural improvements and maintenance in 1969.

(g) *A review of lease rates charged by States and large corporations showed that in 1969 almost every lease rate was higher than actual Forest Service fees.* Most charges were higher than the \$1.25 fair market value. The lowest lease rates charged include the State of Montana charge of 76 cents per animal unit month and the State of Utah charges ranging from 55 cents to \$1.37 per animal unit month. Most lease rates ranged from \$1.00 to \$2.50 per AUM.

(h) *In the Western States 15 corporations based their lease rates directly on Forest Service fees.* Three of these charged fees determined under the previous Forest Service fee system due to lack of time to change the agreement. The other 12 corporations have land intermingled with or adjacent to National Forest lands and allow their land to be managed by the Forest Service. Fees on these lands in 1969 were the same as on National Forest land. Collectively these corporation lands total 596,000 acres which are managed along with 47 Forest Service management units.

(i) *Although several States are in the process of revising their grazing fee schedules and many plan a fee increase in 1970, only Idaho is planning to increase its fees due to the increase in Forest Service fees.*

(j) *Outside of the corporations in (h) above that use the Forest Service fee as a basis of charge, there is no indication of any other corporations that will adjust their fees in 1970 due to the Forest Service fees increase.* The few corporations which stated that they do intend to increase fees in 1970 also stated the changes are due to factors other than the Forest Service fees change.

(k) *We asked the Farmers Home Administration and the Farm Credit Administration of the U.S. Department of Agriculture if they had denied credit to permittees or modified their credit facilities as a result of the fee system change.* The Farmers Home Administration reports that it has encountered no cases where FHA credit has been denied due to the grazing fees announced January 14, 1969. The Farmers Home Administration further reported that the number of requests for farm purchase loans continues to exceed the funds available for these loans, indicating the demand for loans continues. The amount loaned to date in 1969 in the 11 Western States exceeds the amount loaned in 1968. Responses from James V. Smith, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, and Edwin A. Jaenke, Governor, Farm Credit Administration, are included in the Appendix. (Appendixes E and F).

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The grazing fee system put into effect in 1969 on National Forests in the 11 Western States, South Dakota and Nebraska utilized administrative policies and principles that have their basis in Title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act of 1952 (P.L. 137; 82nd Congress; 65 Stat. 268, 290).

Under a regulation of the Secretary of Agriculture, fees are to attain fair market value level in equal annual increments over a ten-year period. Protests against the new system were made by members of the livestock industry; conservation groups and many individuals supported the new system.

In lawsuits seeking injunctive relief from the fees regulations, the U.S. District Court for New Mexico found that the actions on grazing fees were not beyond the authority delegated by Congress to the Secretaries and that the Secretaries had taken into account the required items as directed by Congress.

³ Farm Real Estate Market Developments, ERS, USDA, CD-73, August 1969.

⁴ The Forest Service has an arrangement with the Farm Credit Administration and Farmers Home Administration, also used by other lenders, by means of which the lender can be advised of Forest Service management decisions that may affect the size of a Forest Service grazing permit issued to the permittee who has an operational or other loan with his permitted livestock or base property

Prices paid in the private forage market are still considerably above those charged for use of the public land resource. The percent of forced sales in the farm real estate market for 1969 has not changed. The number of loans and total amount loaned to agriculture-related industries in the 11 Western States has increased for 1969 and the rancher income has improved over previous years.

FHA loan credit has not been denied due to the new grazing fees. Federal Land Bank System policy in regard to lending on ranches dependent on permits has not been changed as a result of the fees increase in that the capacity provided by the grazing permit is still being recognized. Ranchers using private lands are able to function economically even though paying lease rates much higher than the public lands fee scheduled for 1978.

In our judgment the criteria used in arriving at the new system on the National Forests do, in fact, conform to criteria established by Congress in Title V of Public Law 137, 82d Congress (65 Stat. 268, 290).

A fee system is in effect that will return the Federal Government fair market value for the grazing privilege. It considers public equity. The grazing user, with his tenure of use unaffected by the fees decision, remains essentially in the same position insofar as his ability to secure operational and other loans is concerned. Forest Service grazing permits continue in demand with the rate of transfer essentially the same as in the 5-year period 1961-1965.

Evaluation of extensive information collected from the 97 National Forest areas throughout the 11 Western States and in South Dakota and Nebraska and other sources strongly indicates that the public interest and equity are being served under the new grazing fee system.

APPENDIX A

TITLE V—FEES AND CHARGES

It is the sense of the Congress that any work, service, publication, report, document, benefit, privilege, authority, use, franchise, license, permit, certificate, registration, or similar thing of value or utility performed, furnished, provided, granted, prepared, or issued by any Federal agency (including wholly owned Government corporations as defined in the Government Corporation Control Act of 1945) to or for any person (including groups, associations, organizations, partnerships, corporations, or businesses), except those engaged in the transaction of official business of the Government, shall be self-sustaining to the full extent possible, and the head of each Federal agency is authorized by regulation (which, in the case of agencies in the executive branch, shall be as uniform as practicable and subject to such policies as the President may prescribe) to prescribe therefor such fee, charge, or price, if any, as he shall determine, in case none exists, or redetermine, in case of an existing one, to be fair and equitable taking into consideration direct and indirect cost to the Government, value to the recipient, public policy or interest served, and other pertinent facts, and any amount so determined or redetermined shall be collected and paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prohibiting the collection, fixing the amount, or directing the disposition of any fee, charge or price: *Provided further*, That nothing contained in this title shall repeal or modify existing statutes prescribing bases for calculation of any fee, charge or price, but this proviso shall not restrict the redetermination or recalculation in accordance with the prescribed bases of the amount of any such fee, charge or price.

APPENDIX B

TITLE 36—PARKS, FORESTS, AND MEMORIALS

CHAPTER II—FOREST SERVICE, DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PART 231—GRAZING

Grazing fees

Part 231 of Title 36, Code of Federal Regulations, as revised in the FEDERAL REGISTER, volume 33, No. 56, page 4802, dated March 21, 1968, is further revised as follows:

Section 231.5, *Grazing fees*, is revised to read as follows:

§ 231.5 Fees, payments, and refunds or credits.

(a) *Fees*. (1) Fees will be charged for all livestock grazing upon or crossing National Forest System lands or other lands under Forest Service control except such livestock as may be grazed free of charge under paragraph (b) (6) and (7) of § 231.3. Such fees will be based on general governmental policy as established by Bureau of the Budget Circular A-25 of September 23, 1959, which directs that a fair market value be obtained for all services and resources provided the public through establishment of a system of reasonable fee charges, and that the users be afforded equitable treatment. This policy precludes a monetary consideration in the fee structure for any permit value that may be capitalized into the permit holders' private ranching operations.

(2) Fair market value is defined as the difference between total costs of operating on private leased grazing lands and total nonfee costs of operating on National Forest System lands. These costs include lost animals, veterinary services, moving livestock to and from permitted areas, herding, salt and feeding, travel to and from permitted areas, water, horses, fence and water maintenance, development depreciation, and other miscellaneous costs. In addition the private costs include the private lease rates.

(3) A base fee of \$1.23 per cow month for the National Forests in the six Western Forest Service Regions is derived from the comprehensive survey conducted by the Department of Agriculture's Statistical Reporting Service in 1966. This 1966 base of \$1.23 is a sliding base adjusted annually against an index of private land grazing lease rates as determined by the Economic Research Service for the year preceding the fee year (Annual Forage Value Index). If significant differences in fair market values are determined to exist for various geographical areas or because of differences in the quality of the range environment, these differences will be incorporated into the basic fee structure for National Forest System lands. Fair market value base rates will be developed through similar studies for other National Forests, the National Grasslands, and Land Utilization Projects. Current base rates and procedures will apply for these lands until new base rates are established.

(4) Conversion to the 1966 base rates for

the Western National Forests will be carried out during a 10-year period beginning in 1969. The difference between the fees paid in 1966 and the 1966 base rate of \$1.23 will be made in installments of 10 percent per year for a 10-year period. Increases or decreases in the base rate because of changes in the index of private land grazing leases will be made annually. Changes derived from this index between 1966 and 1968 increase the base by \$0.02 to \$1.25 per cow month in 1969. Fees which have previously been established through appraisals and are currently above the 1966 base rate will be reduced to \$1.25 per cow month in 1969. Fees which have been established by competitive bid will remain unchanged during the period specified in the bid.

(5) The fair market value is based on one (1) animal month of grazing by a mature cow. Five (5) sheep are considered as equivalent to one cow.

(6) No charge will be made for animals under 6 months of age at the time of entering National Forest System lands and other lands under Forest Service control which are the natural increase of the livestock upon which fees are paid or for those born during the season for which the permit is allowed: *Provided*, That the full fee may be charged for all weaned calves and colts regardless of age and for such animals as will become 12 months of age during the permitted period of use.

(7) No additional charge will be made for the privilege of lambing upon National Forest System lands or other lands under Forest Service control.

(8) Pack and saddle animals may be charged for at a special rate, and a minimum permit charge established for such use.

(9) The fees for crossing privileges will conform with the rates established for other livestock under paid permit. Where practicable, crossing fees for permitted livestock will be covered in the regular grazing fee and the crossing period covered in the regular grazing period.

(b) *Payments*. (1) Grazing fees are payable in advance of the opening date of the grazing period unless otherwise authorized by the Chief, Forest Service.

(2) Crossing fees are payable in advance of the livestock entering National Forest System lands or other lands under Forest Service control.

(c) *Refunds or credits*. (1) Refunds or credits may be allowed under justifiable conditions and circumstances as the Chief, Forest Service, may specify.

(Sec. 1, 30 Stat. 35, as amended, sec. 1, 33 Stat. 628; 16 U.S.C. 551, 472; sec. 32, 50 Stat. 525, as amended; 7 U.S.C. 1011)

Effective date. This revision shall become effective on the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

JANUARY 10, 1969.

[F.R. Doc. 69-524; Filed, Jan. 13, 1969;
8:49 a.m.]

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF ESCROW WAIVERS INITIATED JAN. 1, TO OCT. 31, 1969 BY SIZE OF PERMIT AND TOTAL AMOUNT OF MORTGAGE, CATTLE AND SHEEP, NATIONAL FORESTS, REGIONS 1-6

Size of permit	Total amount of mortgage (dollars)						Total
	Less than 25,000	25,000 to 49,999	50,000 to 99,999	100,000 to 249,999	250,000 to 999,999	1,000,000 and over	
Number of head permitted							
Number cattle permittees:							
1 to 40	25	15	7	3	0	0	50
41 to 100	35	28	21	11	8	1	104
101 to 250	15	26	26	19	6	0	92
251 to 1,000	1	5	18	13	13	4	54
1,001 and over	0	0	3	0	3	0	6
Total	76	74	75	46	30	5	306

APPENDIX C

NUMBER OF ESCROW WAIVERS INITIATED JAN. 1, TO OCT. 31, 1969 BY SIZE OF PERMIT AND TOTAL AMOUNT OF MORTGAGE, CATTLE AND SHEEP, NATIONAL FORESTS, REGIONS 1-6

Size of permit	Total amount of mortgage (dollars)						Total
	Less than 25,000	25,000 to 49,999	50,000 to 99,999	100,000 to 249,999	250,000 to 999,999	1,000,000 and over	
Number of head permitted							
Number sheep permittees:							
1 to 200.....	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
201 to 500.....	9	1	0	2	0	0	12
501 to 1,250.....	7	9	2	2	2	0	22
1,251 to 5,000.....	1	4	6	5	9	0	25
5,001 and over.....	0	0	0	0	2	0	2
Total.....	20	14	8	9	13	0	64
Grand total.....	95	88	83	55	43	5	1,370

1 Of the 368 actual escrow waivers filed, 2 did not have the total amount of mortgage shown and 4 were based on both cattle and sheep permits.

APPENDIX D

LOANS TO FOREST SERVICE PERMITTEES AS A MATTER OF RECORD¹ IN 1967 AND NEW LOANS OBTAINED IN 1969, BY LENDER OR LENDER GROUP

(Forest Service permittees on National Forests in the 11 Western States and South Dakota and Nebraska)

Lender	Loans as of 1967 (percent)	Loans obtained in 1969 (percent)
Federal Land Bank.....	38	37
Insurance Companies.....	38	19
Farmers Home Administration.....	3	9
Production Credit Association.....	1	3
Individuals and other non-institutional.....	17	30
Banks, and savings and loan institutions.....	3	2

¹ From escrow waiver records in Forest Service files.

APPENDIX E

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION, Washington, D.C., November 17, 1969.

Subject: Grazing Fees Schedules Review, Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

To: Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service.

We have reviewed the material attached to your memorandum of November 10.

The Farmers Home Administration makes loans to individuals and groups which involve, in many cases, Forest Service grazing permits.

We have encountered no cases to date where FHA credit has been denied due to the grazing fees announced January 14, 1969. In fact, the revised fee schedule may enable family-type farmers a better opportunity to secure grazing permits.

We have not modified our regulations as a result of this increase as each loan, individual or group, must be determined economically feasible before it can be approved. If the increased grazing fees would cause a loan request not to be feasible, then the proposal would have been very marginal anyway.

We have nothing adverse to report.

JAMES V. SMITH,
Administrator.

APPENDIX F

To: Edward P. Cliff, Chief, Forest Service, USDA.

From: E. A. Jaenke, Governor, Farm Credit Administration.

Subject: Senate Committee Grazing Fees Resolution.

This is in reply to your November 10 memorandum in regard to the impact on the ranch lending policies of the Farm Credit System caused by the increased grazing fees on the public lands. We do not have the specific information you requested on denied loan applications, and the question you pose

in light of only one year's experience with the new fee schedule is a difficult one. There are, however, a few general observations that might be helpful. Ranch real estate loans would be the most directly affected so these comments apply to the land banks' lending.

1. There do not seem to be any indications at this time that ranchers are being denied credit due to increased grazing fees or because the permit values have been discounted as collateral for loans. Good livestock prices over the past few years have more than compensated for the increase and it is difficult to say what the effect might have been with lower cattle prices. However, it does not appear that it would have affected any but the most marginal cases.

2. The Land Bank System policy in regard to lending on ranches dependent on permits has not been changed as a result of the fee increase in that the capacity provided by the permit grazing is still being recognized. It should be noted, however, that in our normal value appraisal process the value of the portion of the ranch capacity provided by permit grazing has always been discounted to take care of the additional risk. The present levels of land bank ranch appraisal standards were set in May 1968. These levels were reviewed in the Spring of 1969 and were left essentially the same. Changes that were made were not related to the fee issue. The Farm Credit Administration plans to continue to make an annual review of the land bank ranch lending standards.

3. In lending on ranches dependent on permit grazing, the land banks are just as concerned about the outlook for the tenure and stability of the permits as the fees charged. Any uncertainty in this regard would very likely have as great or greater effect on ranch prices and financing as would the increased fees.

4. On the basis of the information we have, the sales price of ranches heavily dependent on permit grazing has been relatively static for several years and no change in this situation has been noted since the fee schedule was announced. Nearly the same situation exists in completely fee-owned ranches; however, there probably has been more upward movement of prices on these properties especially in the central and northern plains.

Since the process of appraisal and lending is complicated by so many factors, all the way from the applicant's management ability to the organization of his ranch, it is very difficult to isolate the effect of the increased grazing fees. One thing is certain, however, and that is, anything that increases a rancher's expense will eventually affect his ability to repay and the lender's willingness to loan unless he can take up the slack through efficiencies in his operation. This, of course, applies to all other cost factors in a ranch operation as well as grazing fees. For example, real estate tax increases on some ranch properties may be more significant than the increased grazing fees.

As you know we have watched the develop-

ments on the grazing fee issue very carefully and will continue to do so. It will be our policy to make adjustments as they are needed; however, we plan to continue giving consideration to the leasehold benefits of public land grazing permits in our valuation and lending process.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, included in this report is a letter of November 17, from the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration advising the Chief of the Forest Service that they "have encountered no cases to date where FHA credit has been denied due to the grazing fees announced January 14, 1969," and further, "we have nothing adverse to report."

Also included in the report is a memorandum of November 21 from the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration advising the Chief of the Forest Service:

There do not seem to be any indications at this time that ranchers are being denied credit due to increased grazing fees or because the permit values have been discounted as collateral for loans.

The Land and Bank System policy . . . has not been changed as a result of the fee increase.

Any uncertainty (about the outlook for the tenure and stability of the permits) would very likely have as great or greater effect on ranch prices and financing as would the increased fees.

. . . The sales price of ranches heavily dependent on permit grazing has been relatively stable for several years and no change in this situation has been noted since the fee schedule was announced.

In turn, the Chief of the Forest Service observed:

The U.S. District Court for New Mexico found that the actions on grazing fees were not beyond the authority delegated by the Congress to the Secretaries (of Agriculture and Interior) and that the Secretaries had taken into account the required items as directed by the Congress.

Prices paid in the private forage market are still considerably above those charged for use of the public land resource. The percent of forced farm sales in the farm real estate market for 1969 has not changed. The number of loans and total amount lent to agriculture-related industries in the 11 Western States has increased for 1969 and ranch income has improved over previous years.

Ranchers using private lands are able to function economically even though paying lease rates much higher than the public land fee scheduled for 1978.

The grazing user, with his tenure of use unaffected by the fees decisions, remains essentially in the same position insofar as his ability to secure operational and other loans is concerned. Forest Service grazing permits continue in demand with the rate of transfer essentially the same as in the 5 year period 1961-1965.

Evaluation of extensive information collected from the 97 National Forest areas throughout the 11 Western States, South Dakota and Nebraska and other sources strongly indicate that the public intent and equity are being served under the new grazing fee system.

If, on November 25, Secretary of the Interior Hickel had had such a report before him I wonder if he would have concluded that the Interior Department should not continue with the schedule of grazing fees announced January 14, 1969.

On December 7, the Washington Post,

discussing Nixon administration themes for 1970, reports that Secretary Hickel "has also recommended the establishment of a new Cabinet department that would be known as the Department of Natural Resources and Environment."

As a cosponsor of the Moss bill to provide such a department, I believe it might better serve the public interest than what has been demonstrated in this area by the Secretary of the Interior to date.

THE ROLE OF THE ARTS IN OUR COUNTRY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on Thursday Congress received a most thought-provoking message from President Nixon regarding the role of the arts in our country. It requested \$40 million, almost double the current amount, for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities in the next fiscal year. The President noted that few investments we could make would give us so great a return in human understanding, human satisfaction and the essential qualities of spiritual fulfillment.

I particularly wish to commend the President for his appointment of Miss Nancy Hanks as Chairman of the Arts Foundation. It is indeed a distinguished appointment, in keeping with that of her predecessor, the able Roger Stevens.

I fully agree with President Nixon that our Nation has a responsibility to encourage the arts and humanities. The judgment of history is passed not upon a nation's gross national product but upon the quality of its life. Art must be an integral part of our lives.

How many young Americans, whose natural talents and abilities could have led them into long and productive lives in the arts, have been forced to turn to other professions by the economic pressures of our society?

How many hundreds of potentially accomplished singers have grown discouraged and dropped from the ranks of those studying opera because they could not afford the risks of foreign bookings or study?

How many potential poets have we lost to the ranks of business and industry because our publishing houses cannot afford to publish poetry?

And, how do these losses—in talent and in inspiration—affect our lives as a people, and our purpose as a nation?

The effect, I think, is great. We need those who create beauty; we need those men and women who confront the reality of our lives, and tell us the truth as we see it.

The work of a great artist can make us see. It can give man the reflective calm, the inspired reason to change his life, and the lives of others, for the better.

The desire in America to participate in and appreciate the arts will be a strong and enduring force in the coming decade.

Recent studies of the economic problems of the performing arts, conducted for the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the 20th-Century Fund, have done much to clarify the steps we must take if we

wish to encourage the arts and artists in our country. The two reports offer conclusive evidence that massive new support must be found for music, the theater, and the dance.

Almost without exception, the price of admission to such a performance is insufficient to cover the cost of production—the prorated cost, per person, for providing that one performance on that one night. The answer, I have often heard, is simply to raise the price of tickets to cover the total cost of a performance.

It should be obvious that such increases would put the performing arts beyond the reach of an important part of their present audience. The result would be an elite theater or opera, an exclusive symphony orchestra from which many middle-income and all low-income families, young people, and students would be barred. So, quite clearly, raising ticket prices is not the answer.

My own feeling, as that of President Nixon, is that the best answer lies in a combination effort between the private and public sector of our economy.

The President has made it clear that the Federal Government cannot and should not seek to substitute public money for essential private sources of continuing support. Nevertheless, an urgent and growing need exists, as a result of the acute financial crisis in which many privately supported cultural institutions now find themselves, for Federal stimulus and assistance.

The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities plays this role with great skill and diligence. Since its formation in 1965, the Foundation has proved itself to be innovative and productive. Despite limited funding, the two endowments which make up the Foundation have judiciously initiated new programs of great benefit to individual artists and humanists, to performing arts and organizations—and through them to our entire country.

I am well aware of the severe budget restraints imposed by the inflationary climate and other pressing spending priorities. Despite these restraints, the President has called for a renewed impetus to the understanding and appreciation of the arts in America. I fully support him in that goal and I agree that it bears a compelling claim upon our resources.

Now the challenge and responsibility to make the President's goals a reality falls upon Congress. The encouragement of the arts and artists must not be ignored when we draw up our list of national priorities and work on the new budget.

The relatively modest budget request of the President for the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities is an investment in understanding the spirit of man, and encouragement to that spirit to grow and express itself. It is the quality of that expression that measures the quality of our way of life. The commitment the President is asking Congress to make is not a commitment made in the name of luxury but in the name of excellence and, ultimately, of necessity to the good life in America.

IN HONORED GLORY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in former halcyon days, it was our custom, nationally and individually, to devote 1 day a year to reflecting upon the tremendous sacrifice and contribution to our national welfare made by those Americans who have fallen in the service of their country. In these troubled times, however, quite rightfully, those cherished men are seldom out of our thoughts.

With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the Veterans' Day address, given by the Reverend Mr. John F. Steng, pastor of St. James Evangelical Lutheran Church, before the Wheeling, W. Va., Rotary Club on November 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD. This speech, which has been widely acclaimed by those who heard it, gives us further food for thought about those valiant men who have given their all, in the past and in more recent days.

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

IN HONORED GLORY

(By Rotarian John F. Steng, pastor, St. James Lutheran Church)

A grateful nation pauses this day to pay its annual respect to Americans everywhere who served their country and those who gave their life to perpetuate our land of the free and home of the brave! In thousands of city squares, civic centers, and cemeteries, special ceremonies are being observed. This is the day when the militant minority is shamed into silence, and the silent majority proudly pledges allegiance to the flag and the Republic for which it stands! This is the day when for one fleeting hour symbols of sacrifice and valor take precedence over crude banners whose aim is to divide and conquer.

It was an inspired idea to deposit the body of an unrecognized soldier in the hillside memorial in Arlington National Cemetery. Millions have visited the hallowed spot. Several comrades of subsequent combat zones have joined that lonely first Unknown Soldier. To this day the most stirring military pageantry for peace centers not around world-acclaimed heroes whose name everyone reverently repeats, but upon young martyrs whose names are known only to God!

These All-Americans resting from their labors deserve our tribute today. The simple inscription chiseled into the tomb of the Unknown Soldier has inspired millions: "HERE RESTS IN HONORED GLORY AN AMERICAN SOLDIER KNOWN BUT TO GOD!" He was a young man in the prime of life. That gleaming white cenotaph rallied all races and classes to hallow American ideals and integrate PATRIOTISM into one nation, indivisible, under God. Underneath that half-acre lie the crushed remains of men who were burned crisp in the heat and hell of battle instead of burning their draft cards to save their unkempt bearded and beaded bodies for softer living.

The comrades we honor today fought, bled, and many died that equal and exact justice might prevail. Their patriotism is the criterion for peace on earth and goodwill among men. For their service and sacrifice they merit a nation's everlasting tribute within the communion and bivouac of the dead!

From those guarded gravesides, America's eyes will scan the sloping knolls completely immersed in row on row of white crosses and the Star of David. And beyond, in massive orbiting sweep, an international panorama discloses 95 similar military cemeteries and 28 final rest arenas throughout the world.

What a breath-taking array of divisions of muted martyrs hallowing American freedom;

Those memorable mounds were everywhere carved out of the good earth to cradle courageous Crusaders for liberty who remained true to their country above and beyond the call of duty. They have thrown to us the torch that will light the way to a more peaceful tomorrow! Without exception each day continues to record the rhythmic step of military details accompanying creaking caissons rolling past Washington city memorials to the cross-crowned arteries of Arlington adding new mounds at the rate of 110 per week. The unbroken assembly line of heroes perpetuates America's date with destiny!

In muffled cadence this international chorus echoes the stirring requiem of John McCrae: "We are the dead! Short days ago we lived, felt dawn, saw sunset glow; loved and were loved; and now we lie between these crosses row on row! Scarce heard amid the guns below. Take up your quarrel with the foe. To you from falling hands we throw the torch. 'Tis yours to hold it high. If you break faith with us who die, we shall not sleep though popples grow in Flanders Field!" Must America be pre-occupied only with sports, recreation, the cost of living, the stock market? The cost of dying equals all of these and the Word of the Lord in Judgement over miscarriage of justice, plus the handwriting on the world's wall scribbled in tainted blood has a serious message.

These brave heroes changed the course of history and freedom's holy light in our favor. They accepted death in the prime of a promising career. Their patriotism was not hidden behind the 5th amendment, the 5th column, or the 5th dimension. They did not defect in the hour of crisis. They were not midget politicians in a day when giants of the earth were needed. They fomented no turncoat philosophy when the life and breath of their buddies depended upon them! No hero's blood is ever shed in vain! Gallant men never hesitate to secure liberty in hot blood and cold steel.

Nor shall America vacillate NOW as we for the 2nd time in 500 years enter the threshold of new frontiers, this time so vast and inconceivable in space that none but the Almighty Creator of Heaven and earth has the answer.

National problems always rise to the level of the patriotism of the people! Our obligation is to posterity. The character of youth is always moulded by their elder's example! When radical voices in other lands, whose very lives are spared because of American military protection, keep shouting unprintable invectives, and chrousing: "Yankee go home", let us point to the uncounted knolls of heroic Yankees on their soil reminding them why their saviors cannot come home.

Now is the time for all parents, teachers, officials, and good citizens, to make sure that American youth memorizes the pledge of allegiance, the preamble to both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the U.S.A. No philosophy of education is so critical today as to try and strengthen American freedom. Let us cease all this irresponsible dialogue about black and white power. Our constitution is printed in black letters on white paper; it takes both black and white piano keys and musical notes to play the Star Spangled Banner. No one ever questions this! Let us speak only of red, white and blue power, for these colors are guaranteed not to run, not for anybody!

On Gettysburg's colorful countryside burns an eternal flame symbolizing a nation's devotion far beyond triumphal arches and skyscraper shafts. Its warmth inspires all who cluster at its base and read its messages. Not since the Civil War on whose battleground the memorial rises, has the issue of whether this nation or any other nation, conceived in liberty, can long endure, been so in doubt and dissent. When statesmanship is cruci-

fied on the cross of gold and greed and the double-pronged promises of the demagogue are highly exalted, the moral fibre of the nation is afflicted with cancerous fissures of communism and kindred anti-American philosophies.

The problem of patriotism is as old as free man. Let tension be cultivated! America was born in revolution. Tension means 'stretching'. When patriotism is stretched aroused citizens rise in holy wrath to declare their convictions at the public poll, in the press, and on the plaza. Our God-given nation is not ready to fold prematurely because of a few uprisings whose leaders gallop from campus to Congress on borrowed time and talents. History's Paul Reveres have been riding herd since colonial days! Two recent horse-men of another stripe are assuming apocalyptic proportions: James Forman demands 'reparatory' retaliation; and Dennis Banks, full-blooded South Dakota Indian tells a U.S. senate committee: "Our state is the most racist of all where the white man spells 'justice'—'just us'. This two-fold confrontation symbolizes a national trend blending culture and religion in ferment.

Frantic superpatriots plead that we should light candles of conciliation, NOW. That candle has always been lit. They are unaware of the explosive powder kegs of carelessness, apathy, fanaticism and bigotry planted everywhere. The catalog of American martyrs has grown too painful to rehearse. We must not allow moratorium marchers to monopolize the reading of Vietnam heroes. Our city-square honor rolls and scrolls have remembered them in honored glory for years! Fragmented, polarized American citizenship is an import that must not be nourished.

Man's oldest records are blood-stained documents. Memorials are representative of deserved recognition but it takes more than marble and marches to preserve human freedom. It is to the everlasting credit of America's veteran groups and hundred organizations that the true meaning of this day is perpetuated. Representatives of many faiths and cultures today invoke the ancient blessing of the Almighty: "The Lord lift His countenance upon thee and give thee peace!" What does this mean to millions? Veterans day in charge of those under arms in behalf of those who laid down their arms to protect those yet in arms, urges unqualified loyalty and obedience to God and country! Human sacrifice is no statistic. Liberty lies in the hearts of people; if it dies there is no law that can save it. Let those who protest loud and long against yesteryear's time-honored slogans know that this modernized word: "Peace" which they throw around loud and loosely, means nothing unless it is sealed in blood. There has been no time in history when it meant anything else!

In the Arlington Cemetery museum display room is this Rotary International plaque: "To the glorious memory of the gallant deed of the American forces who gave their full measure of devotion and service in the world wars". Our Rotary motto being: "service above self!" dispenses upon us a duty in this area that we must recognize.

Whether we stand amid Arlington's 420-acre solemn stillness where the 130,000th serviceman's body was recently interred; or whether we visit last week's battle hero in some local or nearby cemetery, or visit some paralytic veteran who will never walk again, our tribute is the same resolve, namely: "Peace with honor!" Whether we recall the ancient battle prophecy of Joshua, Israel's venerable military general of long ago when he said: "Let these stones forever be a memorial to you!", or whether we recall the inscription on the Bastogne, Belgium, war memorial: "Seldom has so much American blood been shed in a single action", the call for eternal vigilance is the same. Human blood is the price of liberty in every generation and there is no short cut to freedom.

What is Americanism? It is many dialects blended into one language; many avenues of prosperity converging into one way of life; many types of service forged into one loyalty. It is the sacred assumption that government rests upon the consent of the governed!

Let us boldly, and if necessary, bitterly, meet all carping criticism of our country with restrained loyalty. Who are these self-appointed foreign free-loaders to employ our American free speech privilege to gripe about America? There's nothing wrong with the U.S.A. that a good dose of democracy and old fashioned patriotism cannot cure in a hurry. Alien axe-grinders are welcome to one-way no-return tickets any time they wish apply.

John Stuart Mills said: "A people may prefer free government. But if from indolence, carelessness, or want of public spirit they are unequal to the exertions necessary for preserving it; if they will not fight for it; if they can be induced to lay their liberty at the feet of even a great man and trust him with powers enabling him to subvert their institutions—in all these cases the people are unfit for Liberty!

Jesus of Nazareth, universally acclaimed Prince of Peace, once said: "Greater love had no man that to lay down his life for his friends!" Since currently some militant youth and adults moratorium masses and peace preachers extol LOVE as life's highest aim, let them demonstrate their love by personally defending with their lives, government of the people, by the people, and for the people. "In God we trust" is no mere motto; it is America's confession of her most holy faith!

Let no one mar or minimize the sacred preamble to our Declaration of Independence! It is a hallmark of fame second to none in human history.

May it be your good fortune to walk slowly and solemnly down the verdant lush carpet on Mount Vernon's slopes leading to the cenotaph housing the remains of George and Martha Washington. When the courteous guard permits you to look thru the iron lattice entrance gate you will be awestruck by the simple head inscription carved in perpetual marble: "I am the Resurrection and the Life, saith the Lord; he that believeth in me tho he were dead yet shall he live!" Of this solid eternal moral fibre was our nation born. May we be given courage to sustain it!

STRENGTHENING ELECTIVE ASCS COUNTY COMMITTEES

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, this weekend the National Association of Farmer-Elected Committeemen is holding its 1969 national convention in St. Louis. These elected county ASCS committeemen meet this year under a cloud of concern over a pattern of action by the Washington bureaucrats in ASCS which raises questions about their attitude toward the committee system.

A number of directives and actions taken recently throughout the country give rise to the suspicion that the ASCS Washington officials are seeking to downgrade the autonomy and importance placed in the elective county committees. There may be rational answers to these questions other than the dilution of the committees' role in farm policy.

But I am concerned. Because I believe the county committee system of administration is essential to the confidence and the grassroots support of this program by the farmer. Without this confidence and without this local control,

American agriculture is headed for trouble.

Industrial workers have their unions. Businesses have their trade associations. But the primary involvement by farmers in directing farm programming is the locally elected county committee.

I am concerned. Farmers in my State are concerned. And farmers across the country are concerned when they see the autonomy and importance of this last vestige of local control being chipped away.

In my State, farmers are concerned when they hear that suddenly local committee decisions on adjustments to the conservation reserve must be approved individually by the farm fieldmen. This gives ASCS employees authority to veto the elective committee decisions, removing this important responsibility from local control.

They are alarmed when they learn a majority of the county committees have been informed that they are meeting too regularly. Analyses of workloads have been made and a few men sitting in Indianapolis or Washington are telling the committees how much time they need to work. I do not think they know the local problems well enough to do that. The county committeemen are not getting rich off of their meetings. They are paid \$25 a day when they meet and 9 cents a mile travel expense. If a farm committeeman loses a hog or has some other preventable accident happen while meeting one day, his salary for a few months is lost. Most committeemen work as little time as possible with the office and they lose money doing this public service. They are completely responsible for the activities of the office and the administration of the full time staff. It is pennywise and pound foolish to set stringent limits on their meeting times.

The committeemen are not pleased to learn that they have to secure permission from Washington to meet with other county units outside of their county. There is much need for coordination and the exchange of ideas that take place several times each year. The committees in my State have been getting together on a regional basis with State officials to discuss their mutual problems. These are not holiday excursions. These are working sessions that now require approval all the way from Washington.

My constituent farmers in Indiana have expressed for me their concern over these recent actions and directives and they report hearing similar stories from other States. I express my own concern about this, too. Because we must give the farmer an avenue to express his personal influence over the administration of programs that affect his income. I hope the ASCS is not moving away from a strong, local, elected committee system. I would hope the ASCS would be moving to encourage additional participation.

And I hope the Department of Agriculture will soon provide Congress and the American farmer an inkling of what it proposes for a 1970 program. Too many times in the past the farm programs have been proposed and enacted after the crops are in the fields. It is already late for proper farm planning. I urge the Department to present a program for

1970 promptly, so that it can be properly considered and allow time for the farmer to plan appropriately.

FULL FUNDING OF HEALTH PROGRAMS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, last Thursday I appeared before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee to express my strong conviction about the urgency of providing a level of funding for medical research and health manpower programs which adequately reflects the great need in these areas today. I am deeply concerned that we will find ourselves either standing still or even reducing our efforts in many vital areas if funds are appropriated at the levels requested in the administration budget or the House-passed appropriations bill.

The benefits of past investments in basic and applied health research, as well as the future supply of doctors, nurses, researchers, and teachers, are imperiled by the reductions proposed for seven of our important National Institutes of Health, for the chronic disease and clinical research center programs, and for various programs affecting the education and training of health manpower at all levels.

I have received more than 700 letters, cards, and telegrams from California citizens expressing their deep concern about the effect of the proposed budget requests. In San Marian County, Calif., a number of parents and friends of children who are suffering from cancer have formed an organization called the Candlelighters, in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt, of whom Adlai Stevenson said, "She would rather light a candle than curse the darkness." The Candlelighters have collected about 10,000 names on petitions protesting the proposed cutback in funds for the National Cancer Institute.

One of those who helped organize the Candlelighters is Dr. Richard W. Wolk, a family doctor in San Rafael, whose 9-year-old son, Brian, is stricken with leukemia. Dr. Wolk also testified before the Appropriations Subcommittee last Thursday. His courageous and moving statement was a most effective reminder to all who heard it of the dramatic human dimension of the problems we are discussing.

I would like to read briefly from Dr. Wolk's letter to me:

As you know, bio-medical researchers across the country have already experienced a cut of five to twenty percent of their funds. The administration's economy drive will force the closing of at least nineteen clinical research centers.

At this critical time in cancer research we need an increase in appropriations; yet President Nixon wishes to cut them. You can well imagine the emotional response that this evokes from those of us who have children afflicted with cancer. The hope that a cure is imminent is not a delusion. We trust that you share this hope. The best expression of concern that you and your fellow senators can offer us is legislation providing expanded appropriations for the National Cancer Institute.

Mr. President, how can you respond to the parents of cancer-stricken children?

Or to the young nurse in San Francisco, dying of cancer, who wrote to the President: "We who are afflicted with such diseases as leukemia and cancer live only in the hope that a cure can be found in time, and by cutting off the great Federal allotment to this cause you have greatly jeopardized our hopes of a breakthrough."

How can you explain to a parent whose child is dying of leukemia that this Nation can spend \$100 million to refurbish a battleship for exactly 1 month's use in Vietnam before being returned to the mothball fleet but cannot find \$9.7 million to keep alive the chronic disease control program of HEW's Health Services and Mental Health Administration?

What can you say to those who compare the enormous cost overruns on a single defense contract to the reduced funds available for research in cancer, heart disease, multiple sclerosis, or mongoloidism?

How can you explain that this Nation can find billions of dollars for the controversial ABM but finds it necessary to close down 19 of the 93 clinical research centers supported by the National Institutes of Health?

The administration's priorities are badly out of order when a cutback in vital medical research is authorized at a moment in our history when there has never been greater recognition of the potential for alleviating human misery from disease or a greater opportunity for finding new cures.

The Nixon budget requests an increase of only 9 percent for fiscal year 1970 over the 1969 comparable appropriations for the National Institutes of Health, the Health Services and Mental Health Administration, and the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service. This amount will not enable these agencies to move in any significant way against the vast problems of which I have spoken today. Because of inflation they will not even be able to maintain past momentum in too many cases. Previous gains can be seriously undermined or nullified not only by budget cuts, but also by a static level of appropriations in a time of inflation, when each dollar appropriated has declined in real value.

Furthermore, the extent of real "savings" in Federal outlays which will result from the administration's actions is dubious. Increased health costs and a further decline in the general quality of health care will be the price to be paid, offsetting any temporary savings. The consequences, long range and short range, of postponing the provision of really adequate resources for basic and applied health research, health manpower training and health facilities construction must be fully and carefully evaluated.

President Nixon has warned of an impending "massive health crisis." HEW Secretary Finch and Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs Egeberg, in a joint report last July, said the situation with respect to our already overburdened health care system was becoming increasingly grave and we would be faced with "a breakdown in the delivery of health care unless immediate concerted action is

taken by government and the private sector."

The administration is obviously aware of the vast need for improved health care among all segments of our population. The recognition and the rhetoric is there, but the money is not forthcoming. There are grave inconsistencies between the administration's public statements and the budget requests for the agencies and institutes which must meet these needs. The budget requests for all programs of the National Institutes of Health—which call for an increase of only 5 percent over 1969—are hardly an appropriate response to the administration's own call for "immediate concerted action—by the Government and the private sector."

And in the vital research area, the administration has proposed a cut of \$30 million from the fiscal year 1969 Research Institutes appropriation.

In stark contrast, Dr. William McElroy, Director of the National Science Foundation, estimates that inflation in research amounts to about 15 percent a year: About 5 percent from normal inflation costs; 5 percent from the increased sophistication and complexity of research, which demand more expensive equipment and methods; and another 5 percent from increasing salaries because so many of the researchers are young scientists. In this context, a simple 5-percent increase is virtually a step backward.

The Nixon administration has requested appropriations below the 1969 level for eight major programs of the National Institutes of Health: The National Cancer Institute, National Heart Institute, National Institute of Dental Research, National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke, National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institute of General Medical Sciences, and the General Research and Services program. Research projects which have involved many years of preliminary work may now have to be halted because of this foolhardy move. For example:

The Los Angeles Children's Hospital Clinical Research Center provides vital services to some 200 children and is the primary research resource for the University of Southern California's Department of Pediatrics. In other words, not only will the children and parents suffer as a result of this closing, but a major hospital and a university medical school will be deprived of its major research funds and facilities in this vital area.

Clinical research centers play a major role in the crucial final stage of medical research, the phase in which new ideas, drugs, and devices which have been tested in the laboratory are applied to the improvement of actual patient care. Yet, 20 percent of the 93 centers operated under grants from the Division of Research Resources of NIH are to be phased out at the end of this year.

Almost 400 primates which have been under experimental study in the virus program of the National Cancer Institute during the past 5 years are scheduled to be destroyed just as researchers

are isolating certain viruses that may cause cancer in man.

The Framingham heart study, in Framingham, Mass., is to be phased out at the end of the current fiscal year because of lack of funds. The data accumulated over the past 20 years in this internationally known project represent an unparalleled source of information on not only heart disease but also on a wide variety of other conditions, such as stroke, arthritis, high blood pressure, diabetes, lung disease, and blood cholesterol.

In Washington, D.C., the pioneering work of Dr. Mary Coleman, a pediatric neurologist at Children's Hospital, with young victims of Down's Syndrome, or mongoloidism, may be curtailed by cut-backs in research funds.

However, not only human lives are directly at stake in these NIH cuts. The future of medical education itself is also very much involved, for research and education are inextricably linked in our medical colleges.

I would like at this point to quote from a speech given recently by Dr. Daniel Steinberg, professor of medicine in the Division of Metabolic Disease at the University of California, San Diego. Dr. Steinberg is chairman of the Council on Arteriosclerosis of the American Heart Association, and in his chairman's address given at the American Heart Association meeting on November 12 he has excellently illustrated this close relationship between medical research and education:

The last point I want to make is one I had to leave the NIH to appreciate. Having recently immersed myself deeply in the complexities of developing and operating a medical school, I can see with perhaps a fresh eye something fundamentally important about the structure of the academic center of medicine. This is probably familiar to most of you and yet it is something the legislator may not easily understand. And that is the absolute interdependence of the several functions—at least 7—of a modern medical center: (1) medical student training; (2) house staff training; (3) continuing education for physicians; (4) delivery of medical care; (5) graduate student training; (6) postgraduate research and specialty training; and, finally, (7) research. Secretary Egeberg called for in their July report, which said in part: "we will ask and challenge the deans and faculties of the medical schools and all who are involved in the education and training of professional manpower to find new ways to expand the number of persons they are training. . . ."

This enormous need for expanded training of health personnel will not be met by the administration's proposed budget for NIH health manpower programs for fiscal year 1970. President Nixon requested \$25 million for health profession student loans in fiscal year 1970, less than half the authorized amount of \$55 million and 50-percent lower than was expended in fiscal 1969. This will have an especially detrimental effect on the ability of medical schools to admit students from minority and disadvantaged groups. Entering medical students, for example, must buy approximately \$1,500 worth of books and equipment; without adequate student loans

medical schools may have little option but to admit only the wealthier students.

Some medical schools already have announced they will not be able to increase the number of their students because of the cuts in the NIH student loan program. And this comes at a time when this Nation is still so short of doctors it must rely on the importation each year of more than 2,000 doctors from foreign countries—which can ill afford to lose physicians—in order to avoid a complete breakdown of the medical care system.

In other actions affecting the training of health personnel:

Health manpower scholarship funds were cut back to the 1969 level of \$17,719,000 by the House from the Nixon request level of \$28 million, a commendable \$10 million increase over fiscal year 1969, but still \$17.7 million below the fiscal year 1970 authorization figure.

Fiscal year 1969 funding levels were barely maintained in the 1970 request for NIH programs of institutional aid for schools of public health and for health manpower traineeships. And in spite of an extremely critical shortage of nurses, in addition to the inadequate levels requested for loans and scholarships, no increase has been requested for NIH programs of institutional aid to schools of nursing or for construction of health, education, research, and library facilities for nursing. In these areas, we are, at best, standing still.

Moreover, we cannot measure our health needs by the fiscal year 1969 level of appropriations, for the pattern of substantial underfunding of all health programs over the past 5 years has brought us to a critical juncture. Authorization levels approved by the Congress provide a more accurate reflection of existing needs than past appropriations.

For example, in those NIH programs for which specific authorization levels were established by Congress, 1970 authorizations total \$523 million, of which less than 60 percent, or \$305 million, has been requested by the administration. This amount is clearly inadequate in the context of the impending "massive health crisis."

And not only NIH, but also the Health Services and Mental Health Administration is faced with 1970 appropriations requests equal to or below the 1969 levels as a result of either the Nixon budget request or cuts by the House. These include training grants for mental health manpower, new institutional support for community mental health center staffing, and project grants for comprehensive health planning and services.

Also cut below the 1969 comparable appropriation level are the important programs of migrant health services, regional medical programs, communicable disease control, and hospital construction under the Hill-Burton act.

Those programs of the Health Services and Mental Health Administration for which specific 1970 authorizations are set would, if fully funded, require appropriations of \$834 million. The Nixon budget request for these programs was \$468 million, or only slightly more than 50 percent.

The United States ranks behind 19

other nations in male life expectancy at birth, and we are sixth in the world in deaths among males aged 40-60 who die of the major category of killer diseases known as heart-cancer-stroke. Is this a reason to virtually eliminate the applied research efforts of the regional medical program's chronic disease control program, which includes the heart-cancer-stroke projects?

Yet, HEW requested \$130 million for RMP for fiscal year 1970, the Nixon budget reduced that to \$100 million, and the House reduced it again to \$76 million.

Other RMP chronic disease control programs, in addition to the heart-cancer-stroke projects, which will be phased out are those in arthritis and diabetes; neurologic and sensory disease, such as Parkinson's disease and multiple sclerosis; and respiratory disease, such as pulmonary emphysema.

The Nation's top scientists, including the President's own science adviser, Dr. Lee A. DeBridg, have warned that our country's future is endangered unless we increase research into disease, pollution, and other problems involving our highly technical society. For although we have conquered space and seen visions of worlds beyond this world, we are at the same time witnessing the destruction of this planet through the pollution of our atmosphere, streams, soil, and oceans. We are threatening the lives of millions with this reckless assault on our environment, but the administration has actually requested an overall increase for environmental health services of only \$217,000, or less than 1 percent. This is ironic at a time when we are beginning to learn of the close and deadly relationship between air pollution and serious diseases, such as emphysema.

Can anyone really doubt the enormous dimensions of the need for medical research, training, and construction and for environmental health services? Then how can we also accept this administration's ill-considered response to these vital needs?

I plead with all of you. I plead with our President, to pause for a moment and think about the future of this Nation, and indeed, this planet. I ask you and I ask our President to again review our budget and our priorities and see whether we are doing enough to insure the physical and mental health of our Nation. I do not believe we are. We can and must do more if we are to respond effectively to the "massive health crisis" which has been predicted.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Wolk's eloquent statement of December 4 and several representative letters I have received from concerned constituents be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF DR. RICHARD WOLK

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to testify before this committee today.

Shortly before I left San Francisco, one of my medical colleagues said to me, "Give 'em hell, Dick!" Well, I have no intention of doing that. You gentlemen receive enough hell as it is!

Since our children have no lobby to re-

resent them, it is my responsibility to inform you of the needs of cancer stricken children and their families. It is your responsibility to appropriate the funds necessary to satisfy those needs.

Although I will confine my remarks to the problems of childhood cancer, much of what I have to say can also apply to the million Americans now under treatment for cancer.

I have taken the liberty of providing you with copies of a letter sent to President Nixon by the Candlelighters. This letter contains statistical data that you may find useful.

I am also circulating among you, a photograph album of our children, some of whom are already dead. This is to illustrate that we are talking about human beings, not just abstract figures.

I claim no expertise in the field of biomedical research, and I know very little about financing this research. That is your job.

I am a practicing family physician in San Rafael, California. In the course of my practice, I have had my share of experience with the calamity and suffering that cancer inflicts upon families. For it is true that when cancer strikes a family member, the entire family has it.

Since last February, I have become especially qualified to attest to this tragedy, because it was then that my nine year old son, Brian, was afflicted with acute leukemia.

Because the reactions of other Candlelighters have been similar to ours, I will tell you about our initial experience with this situation.

When we first learned that Brian had what the doctor termed "a fatal illness," my wife and I went through all the grief that people usually feel when they have lost a loved one. Perhaps this feeling was more intense, since, in this case, it was a bright child who so reveled in the joys of life that we knew his future would certainly be a happy one.

Our initial grief was tempered by the fact that our son's life could be prolonged with various drugs.

It is at this point that parents of such children must make a very basic decision: to treat or not to treat.

Some parents have felt that no treatment was more merciful than prolonging the life of a doomed child. Most parents elect treatment on the basis that some additional life is better than none at all.

Without treatment, we knew that Brian would die within two months. With treatment he could live two or three years. We elected treatment.

Once this decision is made, we parents commit ourselves and our children to what is often a very difficult road. For when the children are not suffering from their disease, they are frequently suffering from the untoward side effects of their therapy.

Their medications, though usually life-sustaining, reduce their natural resistance to ever-lurking infections, which sometimes end the child's life before their disease does.

In leukemia, the children undergo countless blood tests, bone marrow taps, injections, transfusions, and spinal taps. Somehow, these brave little people withstand all this better than the parents do.

In other forms of childhood malignancy, such as brain cancer, the course is usually more horrifying; and these children and their families suffer agonies that few people will ever experience in a whole lifetime.

So why, as parents, do we try to prolong our children's lives? What gives us the strength to fight this miserable disease?

Well, it is an uncanny mixture of faith, hope, and love. Our children's trusting love gives us the power to nurture them, to comfort them, and to protect them. Our children's hope, that they can be as healthy as their playmates, gives us energy to work toward that goal. And we parents have faith that this nation's biomedical technology will

soon produce more effective control for childhood cancer. If not for our children, perhaps intensive research can provide help for those five thousand other American school children who might otherwise die in 1970.

More intensive biomedical research costs more money! We have learned that federally funded research is being seriously held back by budgetary cuts. In considering H.R. 13111, you gentlemen have heard plenty of testimony substantiating this.

As you consider this bill, I want you to think of how these cuts affect those of us who are intimately involved in a life or death struggle with childhood cancer.

We Candlelighters find little assurance from the present level of federal funding for cancer research.

At the present time, one-third of the approved research projects are lacking funds altogether. The remaining two-thirds are laboring under a ten to twenty percent cut in funds.

The reduction of research capability is further compounded by a ten percent inflationary bite.

As a result, some projects are seriously crippled, others abandoned, and some research teams are economically forced to disperse.

An appropriation at the 180 million level will perpetuate this crisis.

Ironically, the budget cuts come at a time when our researchers are at the threshold of important breakthroughs in the medical treatment and control of cancer.

We are all concerned with the staggering news that we have sustained 300,000 American casualties in Vietnam. Fifty thousand of these died.

During the course of this war, this country has lost four million of its citizens from cancer; and 35,000 of these were school children.

Look at this costly war here at home! Yet, the House recently passed H.R. 13111, calling for a reduction in cancer research expenditures, as the Nixon administration requested. Gentlemen, I ask that in fiscal 1970 Congress satisfy the demands for expenditure control and tax relief in an area of lower national priority.

Placed before you are petitions bearing thousands of signatures of ordinary people who are concerned with the fact that cancer is killing more American school children annually than any other disease.

They know that until effective prevention and control is achieved by biomedical research, one out of four Americans will eventually develop cancer.

They endorse the Candlelighters' plea that the funds for cancer research be increased by at least twenty percent in fiscal 1970.

Some felt that the cost of medical weaponry was a bargain compared to the cost of our nation's military weaponry. Others felt that they would rather see the money spent for medical research than for going to the moon.

These petitions are but a sampling of public opinion obtained by our group over a two-week period. Please heed their message!

In closing, I'd like to relate what my boy told me on Thanksgiving when I asked him what he was most thankful for. He replied, "I am thankful for being myself, I am thankful for my parents and for my friends. I am thankful for my health."

Gentlemen, our children have a right to no less! It is up to you to assure that right.

Thank you. I welcome questions at this time.

DEAR ALAN: Thank you much for your letter of Oct. 13, relative to cuts in medical research. It will be too late for Doug, as you see by the enclosed. But concerned action may help prevent deaths of thousands of others.

Perhaps you would consider entering the letter in the Congressional Record? We are sending out 300 to organizations, medical auxiliaries, churches, etc., hoping some may take appropriate action. To be more moved by budget pleas for instruments of destruction than by humanitarian pursuits is horribly inhuman. What has become of "promote the general welfare?"

KAY BLACK.

URGENT: THE ISSUE IS SAVING LIVES

Millions of Americans face premature death if the budget cut proposed by President Nixon in health research funds is allowed to pass. Programs now underway in various divisions of the National Institute of Health will be halted or seriously crippled.

Affected will be studies of vital importance in these NIH departments: Cancer; Heart; Arthritis & Metabolic Diseases; Strokes & Neurological Diseases; Allergy & Infectious Diseases; Dental Research, and General Medical Sciences.

In the last fiscal year, the sum of \$634 million was allocated for all NIH health research grants. Of this, less than \$186 million went for cancer studies. Yet it is proposed to whittle this trivial amount (less than \$1 per citizen) though inflation already reduces it by about 10 percent.

In 1938, 320,000 Americans died of cancer. To date for 1969, it is estimated 940,000 persons are under care for this affliction.

We are informed that concerned citizens should notify the President and Secretary Robert Finch, Dept. of Health-Education-Welfare, that we object to such flagrant indifference to the welfare of the nation; and that we want NIH appropriations set at a level allowing concerted attack upon major human afflictions.

The time factor is critical. The Senate Appropriations Committee is expected to present a bill early in November. Even should it provide better funding, unless the administration chooses to spend the money there would be no benefit. Thus, postcards, letters, telegrams should go to Washington immediately.

What possible question of priority can be argued in weighing the conquest of disease against such frivolous non-essentials as the supersonic transport, going to Mars and the stockpiling of biological warfare agents?

Our son, Douglas, died October 18 of a type of cancer which often attacks young people. We ask you, in the name of humanity, in the hope you may help prevent such grief among your own family and friends, to join us in informing our leaders of the real values the American people wish our government to represent. We believe that at the top of the list would be compassion and sensitivity to the preservation and enhancement of life.

Mr. and Mrs. C. W. BLACK.

MODESTO, CALIF.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER,
San Francisco, Calif., November 7, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am writing to bring to your attention my growing concern regarding the reduction in federal funds to support health professions education and medical research in California. I am attaching a copy of the recent Los Angeles Times article by Mr. Harry Nelson, which describes the situation in the Los Angeles area. Equally serious problems exist in the Bay Area and in other parts of the state where medical research is being conducted.

While I was in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare we found it necessary to restrict the growth of support for biomedical research in fiscal year 1968 and again in fiscal year 1969. This is the third year that

funds for research have not been increased and inflation has increased the cost of research by at least 5 percent per year. This means a decreasing research base. I believe the consequences of these reductions are becoming increasingly serious.

I am also deeply concerned, as I know you are, with the problems of health manpower in California. The present authorizations, under the Health Manpower Act of 1968, for health manpower development need to be fully funded if we are to begin to meet the rising demand for more physicians, dentists and other key health personnel. This is most critical because of the growing demand for health care and the shortages which exist everywhere. Our physicians are overworked and in many areas hospitals and other health care institutions are forced to limit their services because of shortages of nurses and other critical health personnel.

The funds appropriated by the House of Representatives under the Health Manpower Act have been far below the authorized levels. The House action has, I believe, been essentially as follows:

Institutional support: authorized \$192 million, approved by the House \$128.9 million;

Traineeships (public health, allied health, nursing): authorized \$30 million, approved by the House, \$20.7 million;

Student loans: authorized \$55 million, approved by the House \$34.9 million;

Construction of health professions schools: authorized \$205 million, approved by the House, \$126.1 million;

Health research facilities construction: authorized \$20 million, approved by the House, zero;

Medical libraries construction: authorized \$10 million, approved by the House, zero.

It is not only the House action, however, but rather the priorities reflected in the expenditure controls imposed by the Bureau of the Budget that are creating very serious problems, particularly in the student loan area. I am attaching a detailed list of the extent of medical school student loan cutbacks and their impact on California schools and other institutions. The impact on our dental students has been even more severe than on our medical students and we have been able to meet only a limited amount of their needs through student loans and grants. The loan shortage is the most critical one in the whole health manpower area and I hope it will be corrected by the Senate. An additional problem related to loans under the Health Manpower Act and those under the federally guaranteed private loans is the limit on these loans (\$1,500 per academic year) and the high rate of interest that must be paid beginning one year after graduation.

I am attaching materials related directly to our campus and the financial needs here. These are, however, typical of the other institutions in California and other health professions schools through the country. I hope this material will be helpful in your considerations of these serious problems.

I am well aware of your deep interest in these matters and of your special concern for the problems of the veteran. I would be very pleased to have you visit us here at the Medical Center or at the Fort Miley Veterans Administration Hospital, where we have joined with the VA in developing outstanding programs of patient care, education and research.

In addition to the attachments noted above, I am including a brief article on the recent statement by Dr. Roger Egeberg on the problems of alcoholism. I hope we might also discuss this during your visit.

With best personal wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP R. LEE, M.D.,
Chancellor.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL-CIO,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 27, 1969.
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you to express our concern with the cutting off of funds from the Clinical Research Center of the Children's Hospital Center in Los Angeles and to ask that steps be taken to restore the full appropriation voted by Congress.

This Center, one of the nineteen Research Centers, has been doing outstanding work in the field of combating children's diseases. Its closure would cause great harm to this important area of research because, as far as we are aware, no other agency is equipped to pick up the activity. Many children who just a few years ago were doomed to lifelong invalidism or an early place in the vital statistics tables can now look forward to healthy and productive lives as a result of the work done in these research institutes.

I feel very strongly that our young people constitute a resource which we must cherish, and that funds to insure their well-being continue to be expended.

Respectfully yours,

SIGMUND ARYWITZ,
Executive Secretary.

GLENDALE, CALIF., CHAPTER OF THE
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RETIRED PERSONS,
Burbank, Calif., November 7, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CRANSTON: As one of a group of retired persons, I would like to urge you to use your influence to have the Senate Appropriations Committee, and the entire Senate, approve the measure to provide funds to finance the Health Research Facilities Construction Program. I understand that \$20 million for the current fiscal year (1970) was authorized by Congress, but it still requires favorable action in the appropriation of the money.

I am particularly interested in the Federal matching funds for the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center planned for construction at the University of Southern California at Los Angeles. This project would not be a 100% Federal "give-away", since private citizens and organizations such as ours are engaged in raising \$2 million toward the cost of this particular research facility.

While there are many demands for Federal funds, all the way from SST to Outer Space Exploration, I feel the approval of funds for the Health Research Facilities Construction Program would be a worthwhile investment of government money for the health of all the citizens of the country.

Thank you for your consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

J. HENRY NIEBANCK,
President, Glendale Chapter No. 258,
American Association of Retired Persons.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY
FEDERATION OF LABOR, AFL-CIO,
Los Angeles, Calif., October 27, 1969.

HON. ALAN B. CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to President Nixon regarding restoration of funds for the Children's Hospital Clinical Research Center in Los Angeles.

I would appreciate your taking what steps are possible to support this position.

Sincerely yours,

SIGMUND ARYWITZ,
Executive Secretary.

ROHNERT PARK, CALIF.,
November 6, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This letter is being sent to you with a dual purpose. Firstly, you are to be commended for the action you so swiftly took in having the letter written by Mr. Sheldon Rosenthal of San Francisco, regarding the H.E.W. cut backs on Disease Research Projects, read on the floor and made part of the Congressional Record on October 14, 1969. Your introductory speech before you read the letter was full of compassion and understanding to the fullest extent. I have shown a copy of this Congressional Record to many people, and they have all been greatly impressed. Compliments are due you, and my sincere, deep gratitude is extended to you.

Secondly, I would like not only to confirm all that Mr. Rosenthal so eloquently stated in his letter, but I would like to enter my own plea for not only a reversal of the decision to cut back funds for such worthy Research Projects, but to try to make more funds available to the Medical Scientists who are so diligently trying to forge ahead in seeking causes and remedies for some of the maladies that have been cutting short the productive lives of so many who are afflicted. It doesn't seem fair that the lives of so many human beings are being jeopardized by cut backs or curtailment of any kind of Federal funds to carry on research by the Medical Scientists who are dedicated to try their utmost to procure a break through on some of these dread diseases. They cannot continue this difficult task without the necessary funds being made available to them.

Tho I know a great many people who feel just as keenly about this situation as Mr. Rosenthal and I do, somehow people become complacent and lax when it comes to actually writing to the people we elect to office, about vital matters, especially when they or members of their families are not personally afflicted.

Since Mr. Rosenthal's wife is my only daughter, it is natural that I would feel the need for research funds more keenly than an unconcerned person, but every human being's life is worth saving, so please, use all the pressure at your command to see that the situation is rectified and funds be made available for Medical Research.

It is heart rending to stand by and watch a dearly loved one's strength and capabilities ebb away after having been such an active, productive, capable individual. People who know my daughter Sylvia marvel at her fortitude and cheerful attitude, in spite of her adverse state of health. With every fiber of her mind and body she tries to keep abreast of current happenings and to do things for herself, which at times is a herculean task. She hasn't been as fortunate as some to have a remission in her illness.

The one redeeming feature in my situation is that my daughter Sylvia is blessed with such a steadfast, devoted, and concerned husband as Sheldon Rosenthal. One could not ask for a finer human being, nor a more devoted father to his wonderful two children. I could not love him more if he were my own son.

May all your efforts in this endeavor for more medical research funds be fruitful. In my estimation, it is a more worth while project than sending men to the Moon, and much less expensive.

Bless you for your kind consideration, and thank you for taking time to read this.

Gratefully yours,

EVELYN KAMNIN.

NEWHALL, CALIF.

Senator ALAN CRANSTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: This is an appeal to you to help save my child's life and the lives of untold children and adults.

My son is a victim of a fatal brain disease; however, the disease will not be fatal for long. Biochemists at UCLA think they have found a cure; all that is needed is more testing before it can be used in humans. My child will very possibly be the first to be saved from this disease.

The breakthrough in a cure has come just this past year; had there been no research last year my family would have no medical hope at all.

If research clinics are closed around the United States our story will be told over and over again. Because of the cutback in funds to the National Institute of Health, nineteen research centers in the country will be closed; including UCLA and Children's Hospital in the Southland.

I beg of you to bring the situation to the attention of your peers. Snuffing out millions of lives is a tall price to pay for the sake of economy. Surely there is a better way.

Sincerely,

Mrs. THOMAS RAYBURN.

MILL VALLEY, CALIF.,
November 8, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: I am the mother of a beautiful and bright four year old girl—she has leukemia. She has been ill for two years now and according to statistics, she may have another year of life. So far her tiny body has had to tolerate blood transfusions, 11 spinal taps and injections, excruciating headaches, 2 bone marrow tests, 208 intermuscular injections, ulcers, baldness, vomiting and numerous infections. All of these problems and many more are experienced by all leukemic children in the course of trying to keep them alive in hopes of a research breakthrough.

During the past two years of my daughter's treatment, I have seen six children die from leukemia. I have witnessed the devastation wrought by these illnesses and deaths. Can you imagine how we feel when we hear that our government plans to cut research funds? Or that such things as moon exploration, wars and supersonic jets take priority?

In a nation such as ours, the health and welfare of the people has to come first! As one of our nation's leaders, you have the power to help. Cancer research is making great strides forward—it cannot be slowed down at this crucial time. Therefore, I urge you to give your full support to the restoration and expansion of National Cancer Institute research funds for fiscal 1970.

Very Respectfully,

NANCY K. ROACH.

LOCKHEED AIRCRAFT CORP.,
Burbank, Calif., October 29, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: As President of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society, I was very much impressed with your expression of concern for the decline of federal support for scientific and medical research as reported in the Congressional Record for October 14, 1969.

I share the concern expressed by Mr. Sheldon Rosenthal of San Francisco in his letter to you about our failure to find a cure for multiple sclerosis. My wife also is a multiple sclerosis patient.

The human loss from multiple sclerosis is very real. Two out of every three multiple sclerosis patients come from the nation's work force. Multiple sclerosis creates a two billion dollar annual economic loss to the nation.

Prospects for meaningful advances in the fight against M. S. have recently improved abruptly and dramatically. For this reason, the National Multiple Sclerosis Society has set forth this year on a campaign which will enable us to invest \$10 million over a five year period to speed up the search for an answer to multiple sclerosis.

Our Society feels that research is the key to the solution to this and other health diseases, but we cannot do it alone. Our present fund raising campaign for research was predicated upon the plans of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to expend considerable amounts of money on multiple sclerosis research. Although the Society will continue its efforts, I was disappointed to hear that this government research might be reduced.

Sincerely,

D. J. HAUGHTON.

SAN MATEO, CALIF.,
December 4, 1969.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CRANSTON: I am writing this letter in the hopes you can do something in Congress toward getting more money spent on research, rather than the cut-back that is planned, for cancer and more specifically for leukemia. I read in the paper this evening that you have already heard from Dr. Wolk from San Rafael and I'd like to reaffirm his plea from the bottom of my heart.

Six weeks ago, my child died of leukemia and during our two-year ordeal we were clinging to the knowledge that thousands of dollars were being poured into research for this dreaded disease and that our child would be the lucky one for which the cure was found. I know this is the hope of all such parents and somehow it seems inhuman for the Government to cut back this much-needed expenditure when unlimited funds are available to go to the moon.

Our seven year old is at peace now and that cure can't help her, but I plead with our representatives in Washington to give careful thought to their priorities—5,000 children will die of leukemia in 1970—allow the parents of these children hope. Polio was conquered through one big effort in research, surely the same effort is needed for leukemia?

Please do all you can to push a bill through that will allow these dedicated researchers to continue their important task.

Sincerely,

BRENDA COMERFORD.

HON. ALAN CRANSTON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: My name is Martin Monica and I am 14. I had a kidney transplant October 14, 1969. I was lucky to have it because there has been a cut in the money. Now a lot of people will die who need a transplant or need to go on the kidney machine.

What can you do to increase the money? Dr. Samuel Kovntz, the transplant doctor at University of California, San Francisco only has money for a few this year. There isn't enough money for kidney machines for everyone who needs it either.

It's sad to suffer from a renal disease and to know there's no hope, no help because there is no money.

Your Friend,

MARTIN MONICA.

SEGREGATION IN THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, California, according to the HEW's IBM statistics based on the 1968 national school survey, has 4,284,304 students in elementary and secondary schools. Of these, 3,172,686, or 74.1 percent, are white; 613,074, or 14.3 percent, are Spanish American; 382,525, or 8.9 percent, are Negro students; 103,547, or 2.4 percent, are classified as Orientals; and 12,472, or 0.3 percent, are American Indians.

This is the first State on which I have presented HEW's IBM data where there are two minority groups—Spanish Americans and Negroes—which appear in numerous school districts throughout the State that have one or more schools with minority group enrollment of 80 percent or above.

There are 57 cities, or school districts, in the State of California which have one or more schools with minority group student enrollment of 80 percent or above. Some are relatively small districts, and others involve large cities. In these 57 school districts, there are 413 schools where the minority group enrollment is 80 percent or above.

There are 19 of these 57 districts where the schools having from 80 to 100 percent minority enrollment are predominantly Negro and 26 districts where schools which exceed 80 percent minority enrollment are predominantly Spanish American. There are only 12 districts of the 57 where there is a substantial percentage of both Negroes and Spanish Americans in the schools with 30 percent and above minority group enrollment.

However, whether these districts have been following the concept of neighborhood schools; whether they have vestiges of a dual system; whether they have been gerrymandered; or whether the composition of the racial makeup is entirely accidental—there are a great many of them that are highly segregated.

Of the 382,525 Negro students in California, 8.9 percent of total enrollment; 321,383, or 84.5 percent of total Negro enrollment, are in 57 school districts which have one or more schools with a minority enrollment of 80 percent or above, and 239,009, or 62.5 percent of all Negro students in California, are actually in schools in these 57 districts that are 80 percent to 100 percent minority segregated; 321,383, or 52.4 percent, of the total Spanish American enrollment in the State of California are in these same 57 school districts that have one or more schools with a total minority enrollment of 80 percent or above. However, only 120,595, or 19.6 percent, of the total State enrollment of Spanish Americans, are actually in schools that are 80 percent to 100 percent minority segregated.

Let us analyze Los Angeles, the largest city in California, where the numbers of Spanish Americans and Negroes are about equal.

According to HEW's IBM data for 1968, there was a total enrollment of 653,549 students in 591 schools. The total white student enrollment was 350,909, or 53.7 percent of total enrollment, and there were 147,738 Negro students, or 22.6 per-

cent of the total; 130,450, or 20 percent, Spanish-American students; and a total of other minorities of 24,452, or 3.8 percent.

There are 22 schools with total enrollment of 23,493 which are 100 percent minority segregated. In these 22 schools there are 22,717 Negroes, or 15.3 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment; 737, or 0.5 percent of the total Spanish American enrollment; 36 students of other minorities; and two white students.

There are 48 schools with a total enrollment of 65,877, which are 99 percent to 99.9 percent minority segregated; 54,330 Negro students, or 36.7 percent of the city's total Negro student enrollment, attend these 48 schools along with 10,321 Spanish-American students, 7.9 percent of the city's total Spanish-American enrollment; 831, or 3.6 percent of the city's total of other minority group students; and 345 white students, or 0.098 percent of the city's total white student enrollment. There are another 26 schools with a total enrollment of 34,725, which are 98 percent to 98.9 percent minority segregated. This enrollment consists of 23,995 Negro students, or 16.2 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment; 9,169 Spanish-American students, or 7 percent of the city's total Spanish-American enrollment; 1,048 students of other minority groups, or 4.2 percent of the city's total of other minority group enrollment; and 511 white students, or 0.1 percent of the city's total white student enrollment.

To recap, there are 96 schools in Los Angeles where the minority enrollment is 98 percent to 100 percent of the total enrollment in these schools—124,095—which is 19 percent of the total enrollment of all the city's schools. In these 96 schools that are 98 percent to 100 percent minority segregated, there are 101,043 Negro students, or 68 percent of all Negro students enrolled in the city's schools; 20,228, or 15.5 percent, of the city's total enrollment of Spanish-American students; 1,965 students of other minority groups, or 8.3 percent of the total enrollment of students of other minority groups; and 860 white students, or 0.2 percent of the city's total white student enrollment.

There are another 54 schools with an enrollment of 62,604, which are 90 percent to 98 percent minority segregated, and which are attended by: 21,636 Negro students, or 14.6 percent of the city's total Negro student enrollment; 26 percent of the city's total Spanish American enrollment; 16.6 percent of the city's total enrollment of other minority group students; and 0.8 percent of the city's total white enrollment. In other words, there are 150 schools that are 90 percent to 100 percent minority segregated, where 122,678 Negroes, or 83 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment, attend. There are another 29 schools with 80 percent to 90 percent minority enrollment, where the total enrollment of 29,433 is made up of 7,594 Negroes, 14,871 Spanish Americans, 2,572 students of other minority groups, and 4,396 white students.

To recap, there are 179 schools in Los Angeles that are 80 percent to 100 per-

cent minority segregated, with an aggregate enrollment of 216,132, or 33 percent of the city's total enrollment, composed of 130,272 Negro students, or 88.1 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment; 69,088, or 52.9 percent, of the city's total Spanish American enrollment; 8,608 students of other minority groups, or 35 percent of the city's total enrollment of other minority groups, and 8,164 white students, or 2.3 percent of the city's total white student enrollment.

Of the city's total white student enrollment, only 27,037, or 7.7 percent of the city's total white enrollment, are attending schools that have 50 percent to 100 percent minority student enrollment. The total Spanish American students in the 50 percent to 100 percent minority student enrollment schools is 87,750, or 67.2 percent of the city's total Spanish American enrollment, and 69,088 of these are in schools from 80 percent to 100 percent minority segregated, and 18,662 are in schools where the minority enrollment is 50 percent to 80 percent.

In taking a look at the white majority schools, there are 77 such schools that have no Negroes at all enrolled and another 82 which have either one or two Negroes enrolled in each school.

A similar analysis could be made in any number of other school districts in California. For example:

In Oakland, which has a total enrollment of 64,105, 30.9 percent of which are white; 8.2 percent are Spanish American; and 55.2 percent, or 35,386, are Negro, there are 39 schools with 27,292 Negro students, or 77.1 percent of the city's total Negro student enrollment, which are minority segregated between 80 and 100 percent. Three of these schools are 100-percent minority segregated; 10 are from 99- to 99.7-percent minority; 16 are 90- to 99-percent minority; and 10 are 80- to 90-percent minority segregated.

In Fresno, where the Negro student enrollment of 5,251 is only 9 percent of the city's total enrollment, 4,023, or 76.6 percent, of the city's total Negro enrollment are in eight schools along with 1,261 Spanish Americans, that are 93.9- to 100-percent minority segregated.

San Francisco, with a total school enrollment of 94,154, of which 41.2 percent are white; 27.5 percent are Negro; 18.1 percent are oriental; and 13 percent are Spanish American, has seven schools where the Negro enrollment is 99 to 100 percent, and 29 schools where the minority enrollment is 90 to 100 percent.

Richmond, Calif., which has a total enrollment of 43,123, of which 67.6 percent are white; 24.2 percent are Negro; 5.2 percent are Spanish American; and 2.9 percent are oriental, and 0.1 percent are American Indians, has five schools with a total enrollment of 3,856, which are attended by 3,627 Negroes, or 34.8 percent of the city's total Negro enrollment, and which are 95- to 100-percent minority segregated.

I ask unanimous consent that information relating to California be printed in the RECORD.

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

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL

[Number of districts: 511. Representing: 725. Number of schools: 6,098. Representing: 6,600]

	American Indian	Negro	Oriental	Spanish American	Minority total	Others	Total
Students	12,472	382,525	103,547	613,074	1,111,618	3,172,696	4,284,304
Representing	13,986	387,978	105,656	646,282	1,153,903	3,323,478	4,477,381
Teachers	182	7,684	3,499	3,585	14,950	149,444	164,394
Representing	192	7,798	3,567	3,769	15,325	156,948	172,263

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT

DISTRICT: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 156. REPRESENTING: 156. CITY: SAN FRANCISCO. COUNTY: 38. ASSURANCE: 441

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Other	To
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total			
Number	171	25,923	17,019	12,217	55,330	38,824	94,154	0	322	267	80	669	3,553	4,222		
Percent	0.2	27.5	18.1	13.0	58.8	41.2	100.0	0.0	7.6	6.3	1.9	15.8	84.2	100.0		
Northridge Childrens Center (23)	0	26	0	0	26	0	26 (100.0)	0	5	0	0	5	1	6		
Hunters Point 2 Annex (101)	0	44	0	0	44	0	44 (100.0)	0	1	0	0	1	1	2		
Westside Childrens Center (29)	0	40	0	0	40	0	40 (100.0)	0	2	1	0	3	2	5		
Burnett (65)	5	495	11	28	539	4	543 (99.3)	0	6	0	0	6	16	22		
Golden Gate (93)	0	608	19	0	627	5	632 (99.2)	0	7	4	1	12	25	37		
I. M. Scott (103)	2	104	2	16	124	1	125 (99.2)	0	4	0	0	4	2	6		
Hunters Point (102)	0	259	0	2	261	3	264 (98.9)	0	1	1	0	2	9	11		
Commodore Stockton Annex 2 (73)	0	2	282	0	284	5	289 (98.3)	0	1	2	0	3	4	7		
Benjamin Franklin Junior High (43)	0	781	49	10	840	15	855 (98.2)	0	11	0	1	12	48	60		
Commodore Stockton (72)	0	7	865	1	873	18	891 (98.0)	0	8	0	8	8	27	35		
Jean Parker (104)	0	2	588	10	600	13	613 (97.9)	0	0	7	0	7	14	21		
Sir Francis Drake and Sir Francis Drake Annex (141)	0	744	0	11	755	21	776 (97.3)	0	3	7	1	11	25	36		
Jedediah Smith (105)	0	432	5	3	440	13	453 (97.1)	0	8	3	0	11	22	24		
Ortega (128)	0	518	16	11	545	17	562 (97.0)	0	3	1	0	4	20	24		
Raphael Weill Children's Center (26)	0	26	0	1	27	1	28 (96.4)	0	3	0	1	4	4	8		
Jedediah Smith Annex (106)	1	237	0	4	242	10	252 (96.0)	0	2	1	0	3	9	12		
Anza (59)	2	420	21	3	446	20	466 (95.7)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20		
Bay View (61)	0	530	24	12	566	28	594 (95.3)	0	6	1	0	7	18	25		
Sheridan (139)	0	545	14	26	585	31	616 (95.0)	0	2	0	0	2	22	24		
Pelton Junior High (52)	1	1,000	12	41	1,054	60	1,114 (94.6)	0	8	4	2	14	57	71		
John Muir (109)	4	740	17	22	783	45	828 (94.6)	0	9	4	0	13	28	41		
Brale Harte (63)	0	500	15	16	531	31	562 (94.5)	0	5	2	1	8	15	23		
Spring Valley (142)	0	4	618	4	626	39	665 (94.1)	0	0	5	0	5	20	25		
Hunters Point 1 (100)	3	131	0	0	134	9	143 (93.7)	0	0	2	0	2	2	4		
John Swett (110)	1	326	14	7	348	29	377 (92.3)	0	3	3	0	6	11	17		
Commodore Stockton Children's Center (14)	0	1	33	0	34	3	37 (91.9)	0	2	2	0	4	7	11		
Emerson (82)	0	320	16	6	342	32	374 (91.4)	0	2	1	0	3	14	17		
Laguna-Golden Gate Children's Center (21)	0	20	0	0	20	2	22 (90.9)	0	1	0	0	1	5	6		
Gough-Page Children's Center (19)	0	42	1	6	49	5	54 (90.7)	0	3	1	0	4	6	10		
Andrew Jackson (58)	1	336	47	14	398	45	443 (89.8)	0	3	1	0	4	11	15		
Fremont (88)	0	342	20	33	395	50	445 (88.8)	0	4	3	0	7	12	19		
Guidance Service Centers (9)	0	73	1	3	77	11	88 (87.5)	0	1	2	0	3	12	15		
Starr King (143)	0	432	5	69	506	73	579 (87.4)	0	3	4	0	7	19	26		
Farragut (85)	0	384	38	23	445	75	520 (85.6)	0	1	0	1	2	16	18		
Garfield (89)	0	0	419	7	426	72	498 (85.5)	0	2	5	0	7	14	21		
Raphael Weill (135)	2	506	81	5	594	117	711 (83.5)	0	9	1	0	10	25	35		
Dudley Stone (78)	10	492	50	23	575	120	695 (82.7)	0	3	1	0	4	24	28		
Hawthorne (98)	3	34	38	547	622	140	762 (81.6)	0	1	1	1	3	29	32		
Sunnydale Children's Center (28)	0	22	0	0	22	5	27 (81.5)	0	3	0	0	3	5	8		
McKinley (124)	0	412	82	64	558	127	685 (81.5)	0	3	4	0	7	18	25		
Bessie Carmichael (62)	0	95	153	106	354	85	439 (80.6)	0	4	3	1	8	13	21		
Francisco Junior High (45)	1	47	793	30	871	210	1,081 (80.6)	0	2	10	3	15	46	61		
Hidden Valley (5)	0	44	2	3	49	13	62 (79.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4		
Lincoln (118)	0	68	29	5	102	28	130 (78.5)	0	1	0	0	1	5	6		
Samuel Compers High School	0	127	163	158	448	123	571 (78.5)	0	2	4	2	8	30	38		
Marshall Annex (123)	1	72	47	237	357	101	458 (77.9)	0	2	2	0	4	17	21		
Marshall (122)	3	94	53	234	384	109	493 (77.9)	0	1	0	3	4	19	23		
Washington Irving (152)	2	10	236	5	253	76	329 (76.9)	0	0	5	0	5	10	15		
Corbett (74)	0	71	40	52	163	49	212 (76.9)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6		
Everett Junior High (44)	3	742	156	419	1,320	398	1,718 (76.8)	0	8	1	3	12	77	89		
Galiled High (33)	0	346	1,627	130	2,103	644	2,747 (76.6)	0	4	7	2	13	114	127		
Hancock (97)	1	73	205	27	306	97	403 (75.9)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15		
Commodore Stockton Annex, Childrens Center (15)	0	0	22	0	22	7	29 (75.9)	0	2	1	0	3	1	4		
Horace Mann Junior High (47)	5	220	61	704	990	333	1,323 (74.8)	0	2	2	3	7	14	19		
Potrero Terrace Childrens Center (25)	0	22	1	0	23	8	31 (74.2)	0	3	0	0	3	4	7		
Paul Revere (131)	0	175	89	192	456	167	623 (73.2)	0	2	1	1	4	15	19		
Bryant (64)	4	54	23	285	366	136	502 (72.9)	0	1	1	0	2	17	19		
Candlestick Cover (67)	0	157	21	25	203	80	283 (71.7)	0	0	1	0	1	11	12		
Marina Junior High (51)	1	71	1,130	39	1,241	493	1,734 (71.6)	0	2	6	1	9	78	87		
John McLaren (108)	15	446	38	85	584	239	823 (71.0)	0	3	2	2	7	26	33		
Daniel Webster (75)	2	247	30	73	352	147	499 (70.5)	0	4	3	1	8	15	23		
Gough (1)	0	16	6	10	32	14	46 (69.6)	0	0	0	1	1	5	6		
Youth Guidance Center (6)	1	118	7	30	156	70	226 (69.0)	0	1	1	0	2	11	13		
Log Cabin (4)	0	46	3	8	57	26	83 (68.7)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4		
Polytechnic High (37)	1	938	75	140	1,154	540	1,694 (68.1)	0	5	3	1	9	74	83		
S. B. Cooper (138)	0	35	210	11	256	120	376 (68.1)	0	0	4	0	4	11	15		
Portola Junior High (53)	0	536	92	137	765	362	1,127 (67.9)	0	13	6	0	19	45	64		
James Denman Junior High (48)	0	688	56	166	910	437	1,347 (67.6)	0	6	3	0	9	55	64		
Visitation Valley Annex (151)	0	82	25	19	126	61	187 (67.4)	0	1	1	0	2	4	6		
Development Center for Handicapped Children (8)	0	20	3	14	37	18	55 (67.3)	0	2	1	0	3	4	7		
San Miguel (137)	1	344	46	96	487	237	724 (67.3)	0	4	1	0	5	17	22		
Visitation Valley Junior High (56)	0	148	24	52	224	113	337 (66.5)	0	1	2	1	4	17	21		
Le Conte (117)	2	120	77	373	572	290	862 (66.4)	0	2	3	0	5	23	28		
Mission High (36)	5	487	176	784	1,452	755	2,207 (65.8)	0	6	10	4	20	95	115		
Woodrow Wilson High (38)	0	973	62	235	1,270	695	1,965 (64.6)	0	3	4	0	7	83	90		

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 156. REPRESENTING: 156. CITY: SAN FRANCISCO. COUNTY: 38. ASSURANCE: 441—Con.

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—							Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			
Page-Broderick Children's Center (24)	0	39	0	1	40	22	62	(64.5)	0	3	0	0	3	6	9		
Candlestick Cove Children's Center (13)	0	14	0	0	14	8	22	(63.6)	0	1	0	1	2	3	5		
Roosevelt Junior High (55)	2	299	282	42	625	387	1,012	(61.8)	0	3	3	0	6	44	50		
Sanchez (136)	2	62	118	342	524	331	855	(61.3)	0	3	4	2	9	23	32		
Frank McCoppin (87)	2	53	253	22	330	211	541	(61.0)	0	0	2	0	2	15	17		
Mission Children's Center (22)	1	8	2	21	32	21	53	(60.4)	0	0	1	1	2	8	10		
Grattan (95)	1	231	40	22	294	195	489	(60.1)	0	2	3	1	6	10	16		
Redding (134)	3	46	186	22	257	173	430	(59.8)	0	0	4	0	4	12	16		
Junipero Serra (111)	0	65	43	208	316	215	531	(59.5)	0	2	2	0	4	14	18		
Homebound (10)	0	124	20	17	161	112	273	(59.0)	0	4	0	1	5	34	39		
Sunshine-Orthopedic (3)	0	50	29	20	99	71	170	(58.2)	0	2	2	0	2	20	22		
Excelsior (83)	0	29	26	147	202	146	348	(58.0)	0	1	0	0	1	11	12		
Sherman (140)	0	52	294	109	455	334	789	(57.7)	0	0	3	0	3	26	29		
Argonne (60)	0	22	284	21	327	247	574	(57.0)	0	1	3	0	4	15	19		
El Dorado (81)	1	58	20	34	112	86	198	(56.6)	0	1	0	0	1	5	6		
Fairmount (84)	1	60	86	327	474	366	840	(56.4)	0	0	4	0	4	27	31		
Longfellow (119)	2	43	109	213	367	297	664	(55.3)	0	1	1	0	2	18	20		
Excelsior Children's Center (17)	0	8	1	4	13	11	24	(54.2)	0	4	0	0	4	5	9		
Louise M. Lombard (2)	0	23	26	24	73	66	139	(52.5)	0	1	0	1	2	12	14		
Cabrillo (66)	0	15	198	20	233	211	444	(52.5)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13		
Sarah B. Cooper (27)	0	2	7	3	12	11	23	(52.2)	0	1	1	0	2	6	8		
Visitation Valley (150)	3	226	132	116	477	447	924	(51.6)	0	4	2	0	6	26	32		
George Peabody (91)	0	46	117	31	194	189	383	(50.7)	0	1	0	2	3	11	14		
Balboa High (32)	1	655	108	441	1,205	1,189	2,394	(50.3)	0	4	3	2	9	101	110		
Diamond Heights (76)	0	102	90	109	301	303	604	(49.8)	0	1	0	1	2	18	20		
George Washington High (34)	3	389	883	120	1,395	1,421	2,816	(49.5)	0	0	3	2	5	122	127		
Patrick Henry (130)	5	46	18	172	241	256	497	(48.5)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17		
Sunnyside (144)	4	91	52	107	251	268	519	(48.4)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18		
Geary (90)	3	29	48	11	91	100	191	(47.6)	0	0	1	1	2	5	7		
Luther Burbank Junior High (50)	2	349	153	359	863	956	1,819	(47.4)	0	8	2	3	13	70	83		
Lafayette (113)	0	56	300	29	385	436	821	(46.9)	0	1	3	0	4	24	28		
Hillcrest (99)	4	54	98	136	292	334	626	(46.6)	0	1	1	0	2	21	23		
James Lick Junior High (49)	2	61	74	416	553	671	1,224	(45.2)	0	3	1	5	9	50	59		
Presidio Junior High (54)	0	109	556	68	733	902	1,635	(44.8)	0	4	3	0	7	62	71		
Edison (79)	5	33	81	312	431	537	968	(44.5)	0	0	5	0	5	27	32		
Monroe (126)	1	47	74	221	342	432	774	(44.2)	0	1	2	0	3	23	26		
Sutro Annex (146)	0	3	39	3	46	61	107	(43.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4		
E. R. Taylor (80)	0	182	68	123	373	496	869	(42.9)	0	0	2	0	2	27	29		
Aguna Honda (114)	0	55	77	39	171	231	402	(42.5)	0	1	0	1	2	12	14		
John O'Connell High (40)	2	68	10	140	220	300	520	(42.3)	0	3	1	0	4	48	52		
Cleveland (69)	2	41	58	110	218	319	537	(40.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17		
Lowell High (35)	9	99	745	110	956	1,512	2,468	(38.7)	0	3	0	4	7	98	105		
Aptos Junior High (42)	1	364	72	70	507	857	1,364	(37.2)	0	4	3	1	8	54	62		
Glen Park (92)	1	40	50	104	195	333	528	(36.9)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19		
Guadalupe (96)	4	17	56	124	201	372	573	(35.1)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18		
Mark Twain (121)	0	37	70	30	137	257	394	(34.8)	0	1	1	0	2	11	13		
Kate Kennedy (112)	2	20	9	91	122	229	351	(34.8)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12		
Sutro (145)	1	28	96	4	129	245	374	(34.5)	0	0	1	0	1	13	14		
Columbus (70)	3	10	78	38	129	248	377	(34.2)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13		
Alamo (156)	0	54	156	39	249	504	753	(33.1)	0	0	5	2	7	17	24		
Residential Centers (11)	2	24	4	19	49	104	153	(32.0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Alvarado (57)	4	42	26	132	223	485	708	(31.5)	0	1	0	0	1	27	28		
Yerba Buena (155)	0	64	26	11	101	222	323	(31.3)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11		
Jefferson (107)	0	49	101	17	167	382	549	(30.4)	0	1	0	0	2	16	18		
Lakeshore (115)	0	18	24	74	117	270	387	(30.2)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21		
Noriega Home (127)	0	24	31	12	67	157	224	(29.5)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8		
Twin Peaks (148)	0	31	23	10	64	151	215	(29.8)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8		
Lawton (116)	1	84	81	15	181	428	609	(29.7)	0	1	3	0	4	22	26		
Douglas (77)	0	9	23	61	93	222	315	(29.5)	0	1	2	1	4	7	11		
R. L. Stevenson (135)	0	9	45	88	142	344	486	(29.2)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18		
Commodore Sloat (71)	0	170	34	30	234	590	824	(28.4)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29		
Francis Scott Key (86)	1	49	101	45	196	506	702	(27.9)	0	1	0	0	1	25	26		
Herbert Hoover Junior High (46)	0	211	164	60	435	1,137	1,572	(27.7)	0	2	2	3	7	65	72		
Winfield Scott (154)	3	95	25	12	135	355	490	(27.6)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16		
Grant (94)	1	91	27	14	133	380	513	(25.9)	0	0	1	0	1	18	19		
Ulloa (149)	1	34	70	36	141	404	545	(25.9)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18		
A. P. Giannini Junior High (41)	2	176	133	79	390	1,146	1,536	(25.4)	0	3	3	2	8	66	74		
Miraloma (125)	0	71	46	18	135	400	535	(25.2)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18		
Parkside (129)	0	6	58	74	138	425	563	(24.5)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19		
Yerba Buena Children's Center (30)	0	5	3	1	9	28	37	(24.3)	0	3	1	0	4	6	10		
Madison (120)	0	30	82	1	113	365	478	(23.6)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17		
Argonne Children's Center (12)	0	2	0	3	5	18	23	(21.7)	0	0	2	0	2	3	5		
Abraham Lincoln High (31)	3	284	145	96	528	2,117	2,645	(20.0)	0	4	3	2	9	112	121		

DISTRICT: LODI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 27. REPRESENTING: 27. CITY: LODI. COUNTY: 39. SAN JOAQUIN

Number	22	18	381	1,251	1,672	10,180	11,852	0	1	2	4	7	455	462
Percent	0.2	0.2	3.2	10.6	14.1	85.9	100.0	0.0	0.2	0.4	0.9	1.5	98.5	100.0
J. A. Terminus (22)	0	0	0	39	39	6	45	(86.7)	0	0	0	0	2	2
Venice-Mandeville (25)	0	0	0	19	19	7	26	(73.1)	0	0	0	0	2	2
Houston (9)	0	0	34	186	220	205	425	(51.8)	0	0	0	0	15	15
Turner-Ray (23)	0	0	6	55	61	118	179	(34.1)	0	0	0	0	7	7
Alpine-Bruella-Victor (1)	0	0	10	90	100	184	284	(34.0)	0	0	0	0	9	9
Edison Children's Center (16)	0	3	1	6	10	41	51	(19.6)	0	2	0	0	2	7
Francis Scott Key Children's Center (18)	0	3	1	2	6	25	31	(19.4)	0	1	0	0	1	9
Jefferson Children's Center (20)	0	3	1	2	6	26	32	(18.8)	0	0	1	0	1	5
Treasure Isl & Treasure Island Annex (147)	0	28	20	26	84	367	451	(18.6)	0	0	1	0	15	16
Clarendon (68)	0	12	38	31	81	355	436	(18.6)	0	0	3	0	13	1

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LODI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 27. REPRESENTING: 27. CITY: LODI. COUNTY: 39. SAN JOAQUIN—Continued

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—							Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			
Lincoln Elementary (12)	2	0	10	23	35	208	243	(14.4)	0	0	0	0	0	7	6		
Lakewood Elementary (10)	1	0	13	46	60	436	496	(12.1)	0	0	0	0	0	16	13		
North Campus Continuation (21)	0	0	0	2	2	15	17	(11.8)	0	0	0	0	0	3	9		
Leroy Nichols (14)	0	1	14	47	62	466	528	(11.7)	0	0	0	0	0	19	16		
Needham Elementary (20)	6	0	23	54	62	419	473	(11.4)	0	0	1	0	1	15	19		
Lodi Senior Elementary (18)	0	0	49	62	111	872	983	(11.3)	0	0	0	0	0	39	31		
Locketford-Clements (15)	0	0	0	34	34	285	319	(10.7)	0	0	0	0	0	11	14		
Lodi High, East Campus (16)	0	3	63	84	150	1,449	1,599	(9.4)	0	1	0	0	1	83	81		
George Washington (5)	9	0	14	29	52	548	600	(8.7)	0	0	0	0	0	11	18		
Garfield Elementary (5)	4	0	6	20	30	331	361	(8.3)	0	0	0	0	0	11	18		
Davis Elementary (2)	0	1	16	28	45	530	575	(7.8)	0	0	0	0	0	18	16		
Lodi High, west campus (17)	0	3	48	52	103	1,735	1,838	(5.6)	0	0	1	2	3	83	87		
Erma B. Reese (4)	0	0	16	11	27	513	540	(5.0)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17		
Lawrence (11)	0	0	7	7	7	145	152	(4.6)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7		
Vinewood Elementary (26)	0	0	8	2	10	300	310	(3.2)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10		

DISTRICT: STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 43. REPRESENTING: 43. CITY: STOCKTON. COUNTY: 39

Number	67	4,512	1,299	6,663	12,541	19,555	32,096		0	73	47	50	170	1,155	1,325
Percent	0.2	14.1	4.0	20.8	39.1	60.9	100.0		0.0	5.5	3.5	3.8	12.8	87.2	100.0
Van Buren (30)	0	446	1	207	654	55	709	(92.2)	0	6	2	2	10	19	29
Taft (27)	1	161	2	124	288	47	335	(86.0)	0	3	3	1	7	8	15
Lafayette (18)	0	29	72	95	196	45	241	(81.3)	0	1	1	0	2	8	10
Garfield (9)	1	315	4	176	496	122	618	(80.3)	0	2	1	0	3	26	29
Washington (32)	1	148	7	160	316	79	395	(80.0)	0	1	0	4	5	6	11
Edison Senior High (41)	2	603	194	638	1,437	367	1,804	(79.7)	0	5	2	4	11	77	88
Fair Oaks (7)	1	211	3	252	467	123	590	(79.2)	0	2	2	1	5	20	25
Burbank (3)	0	90	0	137	227	60	287	(79.1)	0	2	0	0	2	10	12
Jackson (15)	0	90	120	229	439	119	558	(78.7)	0	1	3	0	4	21	25
McKinley (20)	1	194	17	270	482	165	647	(74.5)	0	3	1	1	5	25	30
Marshall Junior High (36)	2	360	115	445	922	327	1,249	(73.8)	0	7	1	1	9	47	56
Monroe (21)	1	175	7	160	343	125	468	(73.3)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Taylor (28)	2	236	9	382	629	239	868	(72.5)	0	3	2	1	6	32	38
Nightingale (23)	0	138	1	102	241	108	349	(69.1)	0	3	2	0	5	13	18
Grant (10)	2	43	13	111	169	91	260	(65.0)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Hamilton Junior High (35)	0	534	70	334	938	573	1,511	(62.1)	0	5	2	3	10	56	66
Hazelton (13)	0	45	28	173	245	154	400	(61.5)	0	0	2	2	4	10	14
Continuation High (39)	0	29	1	30	80	70	150	(53.3)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Oxford Street (24)	0	24	4	30	58	64	122	(47.5)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
Roosevelt (26)	6	86	8	195	295	375	670	(44.0)	0	5	2	1	8	17	25
Jefferson (16)	2	16	3	158	179	257	436	(41.1)	0	2	1	0	3	19	22
Franklin Senior High (42)	5	261	24	458	748	1,158	1,906	(39.2)	0	2	0	5	7	72	79
Fremont Junior High (34)	4	128	17	332	481	922	1,403	(34.3)	0	3	0	7	10	54	64
Schneider Vocational (40)	0	20	7	58	85	214	299	(28.4)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
August (2)	0	0	2	130	132	447	579	(22.8)	0	0	1	1	2	20	22
Fillmore (8)	2	9	6	87	104	374	478	(21.8)	0	1	2	1	4	15	19
Grunsky (11)	1	0	1	65	67	288	355	(18.9)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Harrison (12)	0	2	7	42	51	253	304	(16.8)	0	1	2	0	3	8	11
Montezuma (22)	2	14	6	83	105	524	629	(16.7)	0	1	1	1	3	17	20
El Dorado (5)	4	15	38	92	149	765	914	(16.3)	0	0	1	0	1	28	29
Tyler (29)	1	4	30	68	103	542	645	(16.0)	0	0	1	0	1	21	22
Victory (31)	1	3	38	50	92	526	618	(14.9)	0	0	1	0	1	21	22
Wilson (33)	0	4	34	43	81	469	550	(14.7)	0	0	0	1	1	16	17
Adams (1)	1	2	26	48	77	454	531	(14.5)	0	0	2	0	2	21	23
Elmwood (6)	3	2	1	103	109	664	773	(14.1)	0	2	1	0	3	28	31
Hoover (14)	5	11	40	64	120	769	889	(13.5)	0	1	2	0	3	31	34
Pulliam (25)	0	7	14	35	56	386	442	(12.7)	0	2	1	1	4	14	18
Stockton Junior High (37)	2	20	57	115	194	1,425	1,619	(12.0)	0	1	0	8	9	59	68
Stagg Senior High (43)	11	13	135	164	323	2,849	3,249	(11.3)	0	3	1	4	8	109	117
Madison (13)	0	3	32	35	70	550	620	(11.3)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Cleveland (4)	0	4	9	39	52	422	474	(11.0)	0	1	2	0	3	17	20
Webster Junior High (38)	0	7	81	79	167	1,407	1,574	(10.6)	0	0	1	0	1	61	62
Kennedy (17)	3	10	15	45	73	905	978	(7.5)	0	1	1	0	2	27	29

DISTRICT: RAVENSWOOD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 12. REPRESENTING: 12. CITY: PALO ALTO. COUNTY: 41. SAN MATEO

Number	2	4,196	104	215	4,517	978	5,495		0	58	3	0	61	163	224
Percent	0.0	76.4	1.9	3.9	82.2	17.8	100.0		0.0	25.9	1.3	0.0	27.2	72.8	100.0
Belle Haven (1)	0	790	1	12	803	3	806	(99.6)	0	9	0	0	9	21	30
Garden Oaks (4)	0	337	8	20	365	13	378	(99.6)	0	9	0	0	9	11	20
Runnymede (11)	0	291	23	38	352	26	378	(93.1)	0	3	0	0	3	11	14
Brentwood (2)	0	553	33	38	624	48	672	(92.9)	0	6	0	0	6	21	27
Costano (3)	0	552	10	21	583	45	628	(92.8)	0	4	0	0	4	21	25
Green Oaks (5)	1	337	4	20	362	39	401	(90.3)	0	8	0	0	8	12	20
Kavanaugh (7)	0	675	2	26	703	78	781	(90.0)	0	10	0	0	10	18	28
Ravenswood (10)	0	65	2	0	67	19	86	(77.9)	0	1	1	0	2	4	7
Menlo Oaks (8)	0	157	3	14	174	91	265	(65.7)	0	2	0	0	3	10	13
O'Connor (9)	1	174	4	10	189	116	305	(62.0)	0	3	0	0	3	8	11
Willow (12)	0	185	10	4	199	214	413	(48.2)	0	1	1	0	2	16	18
James Flood (6)	0	80	4	12	96	286	382	(25.1)	0	2	0	0	2	12	14

DISTRICT: SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 7. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: REDWOOD CITY. COUNTY: 41.

Number	9	1,351	182	475	2,017	10,326	12,343		0	17	7	9	33	547	580
Percent	0.1	10.9	1.5	3.8	16.3	83.7	100.0		0.0	2.9	1.2	1.6	5.7	94.3	100.0
Redwood High (3)	0	871	30	28	929	68	997	(93.2)	0	8	1	1	10	53	63
Redwood Continuation High (4)	0	32	0	1	33	58	91	(36.3)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Menlo-Atherton High (2)	3	325	34	91	453	1,498	1,951	(23.2)	0	7	2	3	12	84	96
Sequoia High (5)	3	111	41	219	374	2,097	2,471	(15.1)	0	0	3	0	3	101	104
Carlimont High (1)	0	2	34	76	112	2,185	2,297	(4.9)	0	0	1	1	2	101	103
Woodside High (7)	0	1	25	34	60	2,227	2,287	(2.6)	0	1	0	2	3	96	99
San Carlos High (5)	3	9	18	26	56	2,193	2,249	(2.5)	0	1	0	2	3	105	108

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: GUADALUPE UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 2. REPRESENTING: 4. CITY: GUADALUPE. COUNTY: 42. SANTA BARBARA

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	
Number	0	8	79	639	726	133	859		0	0	0	0	0	31	31	
Percent	0.0	0.9	9.2	74.4	84.5	15.5	100.0		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100.0	
Main Street School (1)	0	1	18	190	209	24	233	(89.7)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	
Guadalupe School (2)	0	7	61	449	517	109	626	(82.6)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	

DISTRICT: SANTA BARBARA SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 21. REPRESENTING: 21. CITY: SANTA BARBARA. COUNTY: 42.

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	
Number	20	677	202	3,741	4,640	12,852	17,492		1	7	5	30	43	738	781	
Percent	0.1	3.9	1.2	21.4	26.5	73.5	100.0		0.1	0.9	0.6	3.8	5.5	94.5	100.0	
Franklin (3)	0	167	9	494	670	82	752	(89.1)	0	2	0	1	3	26	29	
Lincoln (7)	0	40	6	195	241	32	273	(88.3)	0	0	0	2	2	10	12	
Wilson Elementary (13)	2	29	5	173	209	147	356	(58.7)	0	0	0	1	1	13	14	
Cleveland Elementary (2)	2	55	9	131	197	198	395	(49.9)	0	0	0	1	1	15	16	
Harding (5)	1	16	11	288	316	376	692	(45.7)	0	0	1	2	3	24	27	
Santa Barbara Junior High (18)	0	98	15	419	532	688	1,220	(43.6)	1	2	1	11	15	50	65	
McKinley (8)	0	24	4	186	214	325	539	(39.7)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18	
Santa Barbara High (19)	5	115	33	600	753	1,677	2,430	(31.0)	0	1	1	4	6	107	113	
La Cuesta High (17)	0	6	0	23	29	65	94	(30.9)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	
Garfield Elementary (4)	3	18	0	77	99	249	348	(28.4)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	
Monroe Elementary (9)	1	33	8	116	158	442	600	(28.3)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22	
La Cumbre Junior High (20)	1	31	19	282	333	1,032	1,365	(24.4)	0	0	0	3	3	66	69	
Washington (12)	0	15	8	55	78	396	474	(16.5)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	
Jefferson Elementary (6)	2	0	0	49	51	278	329	(15.5)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	
Goleta Valley Junior High (14)	0	3	15	160	178	1,083	1,261	(14.1)	0	0	0	3	3	61	64	
Adams Elementary (1)	3	13	6	48	70	440	510	(13.7)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24	
Peabody (10)	0	5	2	38	45	391	436	(10.3)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	
Dos Pueblos High (16)	0	7	17	156	180	1,673	1,853	(9.7)	0	1	1	1	3	75	78	
Roosevelt Elementary (11)	0	0	3	39	42	394	436	(9.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	
La Colina Junior High (21)	0	1	15	95	111	1,272	1,383	(8.0)	0	0	0	1	1	65	66	
San Marcos Senior High (15)	0	1	16	117	134	1,612	1,746	(7.7)	0	0	1	0	1	79	80	

DISTRICT: ALUM ROCK UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 24. REPRESENTING: 24. CITY: SAN JOSE. COUNTY: 43. SANTA CLARA

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	
Number	50	1,341	260	6,721	8,372	7,190	15,562		0	42	39	17	98	477	575	
Percent	0.3	8.6	1.7	43.2	53.8	46.2	100.0		0.0	7.3	6.8	3.0	17.0	83.0	100.0	
San Antonio (18)	4	46	1	393	444	45	489	(90.8)	0	3	0	0	3	16	19	
Mayfair (13)	0	125	0	436	561	118	679	(82.6)	0	3	2	0	8	18	26	
Mildred Goss (7)	6	117	10	357	490	191	681	(72.0)	0	3	1	2	6	17	23	
Richard E. Conniff (3)	0	9	1	312	322	133	455	(70.8)	0	1	0	1	2	14	16	
Lee Mathson (12)	3	110	10	503	626	281	907	(69.0)	0	7	3	2	12	28	40	
Grandin H. Miller (11)	2	67	5	330	404	205	609	(66.3)	0	3	1	0	4	17	21	
Clyde Arbuckle (1)	3	114	7	285	409	220	629	(65.0)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22	
Ben Painter (22)	2	24	25	182	233	129	362	(64.4)	0	1	1	0	2	10	12	
O. S. Hubbard (8)	6	85	7	313	411	250	661	(62.2)	0	2	1	0	3	20	23	
Harry E. Slonaker (21)	2	114	5	233	354	236	590	(60.0)	0	3	2	0	5	18	23	
A. J. Dorsa (5)	2	53	9	355	419	362	781	(53.6)	0	1	2	0	3	23	26	
Lester Shields (19)	3	28	24	273	328	292	620	(52.9)	0	3	2	2	5	17	22	
C. L. Fischer (6)	2	102	17	500	621	577	1,198	(51.8)	0	3	5	3	11	41	52	
Pala (23)	3	44	2	198	247	240	487	(50.7)	0	3	0	0	3	18	21	
Lyndale (10)	1	24	5	252	282	307	589	(47.9)	0	1	1	1	3	21	24	
Sylvia Cassell (2)	0	54	12	253	319	392	711	(44.9)	0	0	1	0	1	22	23	
Horace Cureton (4)	0	14	10	266	290	360	650	(44.6)	0	1	1	0	2	19	21	
William L. Sheppard (20)	2	22	38	338	400	515	915	(43.7)	0	1	3	2	6	36	42	
Donald J. Meyer (15)	3	76	18	273	370	477	847	(43.7)	0	1	3	0	4	22	26	
William R. Rogers (16)	4	52	14	162	232	354	586	(39.6)	0	2	3	0	5	16	21	
Thomas P. Ryan (17)	0	30	10	216	256	517	773	(33.1)	0	0	1	1	2	11	13	
Millard E. McWilliam (14)	0	8	14	173	195	440	635	(30.7)	0	0	0	4	4	19	23	
Linda Vista (9)	2	23	16	118	159	542	701	(22.7)	0	0	2	0	2	23	25	
ML Hamilton (24)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	

DISTRICT: SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 51. REPRESENTING: 51. CITY: SAN JOSE. COUNTY: 43. SANTA CLARA

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	
Number	57	534	831	9,954	11,376	24,041	35,417		2	26	44	40	112	1,290	1,402	
Percent	0.2	1.5	2.3	28.1	32.1	67.9	100.0		0.1	1.9	3.1	2.9	8.0	92.0	100.0	
Longfellow (23)	0	0	0	146	146	10	156	(93.6)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Gardner (15)	0	13	2	601	616	81	697	(88.4)	0	0	1	0	1	24	25	
Mann, Horace (25)	1	33	22	383	439	121	560	(78.4)	0	1	2	0	3	17	20	
Grant (14)	5	42	41	586	674	199	873	(77.2)	0	1	4	1	6	27	33	
Selma Olinder (26)	0	21	2	525	548	163	711	(77.1)	0	3	3	1	7	20	27	
Washington (34)	0	7	4	709	720	220	940	(76.6)	1	2	3	0	6	26	32	
Anne Darling (11)	0	58	5	473	536	165	701	(76.5)	0	1	2	3	6	18	24	
Belden (5)	2	16	52	254	324	100	424	(76.4)	0	0	2	0	2	11	13	
Woodrow Wilson (43)	1	10	7	517	535	175	710	(75.4)	0	3	0	6	9	35	44	
Peter Burnett (37)	0	31	59	427	517	198	715	(72.3)	0	1	2	2	5	35	40	
Jefferson (20)	3	18	14	291	326	127	453	(72.0)	0	0	1	0	1	12	13	
Theodore Roosevelt (42)	3	45	36	618	702	275	977	(71.9)	0	3	2	5	10	44	54	
San Jose (48)	5	62	81	908	1,056	434	1,490	(70.9)	0	1	1	2	4	63	67	
Empire Gardens (12)	3	6	14	166	189	130	319	(59.2)	0	1	0	0	0	10	11	
College Park (9)	0	7	6	161	174	145	319	(54.5)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	
Lowell (24)	0	9	7	230	246	210	456	(53.9)	0	0	0	1	1	14	15	
YWCA Special Class for Physically Handicapped Girls (51)	0	2	0	7	9	8	17	(52.9)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	
Hester (19)	0	4	7	222	233	231	464	(50.2)	0	0	2	1	3	16	19	
Bascom (4)	2	2	0	115	119	142	261	(45.6)	0	0	1	1	2	6	8	
Edison (44)	1	0	1	13	15	18	33	(45.5)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	
Walter L. Bachroot (3)	1	1	43	54	99	127	226	(43.8)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9	
Broadway (7)	0	0	6	219	225	310	535	(42.1)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16	
Abraham Lincoln (46)	3	11	40	424	478	767	1,245	(38.4)	0	1	0	1	2	51	53	
Merritt Trace (32)	4	11	19	94	128	297	425	(30.1)	0	0						

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 51. REPRESENTING: 51. CITY: SAN JOSE. COUNTY: 43. SANTA CLARA—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Hacienda (16)	8	4	7	35	54	203	257	(21.0)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Glen River (28)	0	1	13	86	100	376	476	(21.0)	0	0	1	0	1	13	14
Willow Glen Elementary (36)	0	5	11	99	115	508	623	(18.5)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Canos (8)	0	1	0	30	31	158	189	(16.4)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Willow Glen (50)	0	12	26	263	301	1,597	1,898	(15.9)	1	0	0	1	2	79	81
Benjamin Cory (10)	0	0	9	59	68	442	510	(13.3)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Almaden (2)	0	3	9	83	95	627	722	(13.2)	0	1	0	1	2	21	23
Allen (1)	0	0	16	47	63	455	518	(12.2)	0	0	3	0	3	14	17
Hammer (17)	2	1	10	66	79	606	685	(11.5)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Erikson (13)	0	1	6	35	42	300	372	(11.3)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
John Muir (41)	4	7	32	138	181	1,424	1,615	(11.2)	0	0	0	5	5	72	77
Booksin (6)	0	8	29	69	106	923	1,029	(10.3)	0	0	1	1	2	30	32
Kirk (21)	1	18	20	80	119	1,052	1,171	(10.2)	0	0	2	0	2	34	36
Edwin Markham (41)	1	16	23	123	163	1,514	1,677	(9.7)	0	0	1	0	1	84	85
Pioneer (47)	3	5	34	81	123	1,340	1,463	(8.4)	0	2	0	0	2	54	56
Glen Lincoln (22)	1	5	3	21	30	336	366	(8.2)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Bret Harte (38)	0	5	16	75	96	1,143	1,239	(7.7)	0	2	4	2	8	51	59
Valley View (33)	2	6	16	52	76	920	996	(7.6)	0	0	3	0	3	28	31
Reed (27)	1	11	31	55	98	1,191	1,289	(7.6)	0	0	0	0	0	41	41
Terrell (31)	0	4	11	7	22	359	381	(5.8)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Williams (35)	0	0	13	9	22	382	404	(5.4)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Leland (45)	0	1	1	36	38	754	792	(4.8)	0	0	0	1	1	34	35
Henderson (18)	0	2	9	10	21	539	560	(3.8)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Schallenger (29)	0	3	4	11	18	570	588	(3.1)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Simonds (30)	0	1	5	27	33	1,077	1,110	(3.0)	0	1	1	0	2	32	34
San Jose Regional Vocational Center (49)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.0)	0	0	0	3	3	17	20

DISTRICT: PAJARO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 22. REPRESENTING: 22. CITY: WATSONVILLE. COUNTY: 44. SANTA CRUZ

Number	16	46	548	3,519	4,129	7,997	12,126	1	0	10	11	22	429	451	
Percent	0.1	0.4	4.5	29.0	34.1	65.9	100.0	0.2	0.0	2.2	2.4	4.9	95.1	100.0	
J. W. Linscott (10)	0	10	20	129	159	24	183	(86.9)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
W. R. Radcliff (16)	0	1	13	205	219	75	294	(74.5)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Pajaro Annex (15)	0	1	10	158	169	84	253	(66.8)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Pajaro (14)	2	0	17	163	182	126	308	(59.1)	0	0	1	1	1	11	12
Mintie White (13)	0	2	32	228	262	216	478	(54.8)	0	0	0	1	1	14	15
E. A. Hall (7)	0	3	52	307	362	310	672	(53.9)	0	2	0	2	2	23	25
Calabasas (5)	4	0	29	137	170	171	341	(49.9)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
T. S. MacQuiddy (11)	0	6	36	158	200	265	465	(43.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
H. A. Hyde (9)	2	0	28	151	181	244	425	(42.6)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Hall District (8)	0	0	13	245	258	354	612	(42.2)	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
Freedom (6)	1	1	37	236	275	392	667	(41.2)	0	0	1	1	2	21	23
Salsipuedes (19)	0	2	23	196	221	439	660	(33.5)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Amesti (1)	2	0	13	129	146	339	485	(30.1)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Rolling Hills (18)	0	0	26	125	151	359	510	(29.6)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Watsonville High (21)	2	16	169	739	926	2,308	3,235	(28.6)	0	0	5	4	9	125	134
Continuation High (22)	0	0	1	89	90	300	390	(24.3)	1	0	2	0	0	3	3
Bradley (4)	2	0	12	65	79	269	348	(22.7)	0	0	0	1	1	11	14
Aromas (3)	0	2	10	13	25	402	427	(5.9)	0	0	0	1	1	17	18
Aptos (2)	0	0	2	12	14	308	322	(4.3)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Valencia (20)	0	0	3	19	22	512	534	(4.1)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Mar Vista (12)	1	0	2	6	9	471	480	(1.9)	0	0	0	1	1	17	18
Rio Del Mar (17)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

DISTRICT: PATTERSON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 6. REPRESENTING: 8. CITY: PATTERSON. COUNTY: 50. STANISLAUS COUNTY

Number	1	23	21	1,086	1,131	1,020	2,151	0	0	0	3	3	84	87	
Percent	0.0	1.1	1.0	50.5	52.6	47.4	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.4	3.4	96.6	100.0	
Grayson (4)	0	9	0	271	280	26	306	(91.5)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Rising Sun (3)	0	1	3	189	193	43	236	(81.8)	0	0	0	1	1	7	8
Northmead (1)	0	3	6	195	204	239	443	(46.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Las Palmas (2)	1	1	8	275	285	372	657	(43.4)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
Patterson High (6)	0	5	4	156	165	329	494	(33.4)	0	0	0	2	2	23	25
Harney (5)	0	4	0	0	4	11	15	(26.7)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

DISTRICT: TULARE CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 8. REPRESENTING: 8. CITY: TULARE. COUNTY: 54. TULARE

Number	12	403	28	1,223	1,666	2,887	4,553	0	8	2	15	25	141	166	
Percent	0.3	8.9	0.6	26.9	36.6	63.4	100.0	0.0	4.8	1.2	9.0	15.1	84.9	100.0	
Lincoln Elementary (4)	1	125	4	189	319	34	353	(90.4)	0	2	1	3	6	12	18
Wilson Elementary (2)	3	51	0	104	158	183	341	(46.3)	0	1	0	2	3	10	13
Roosevelt Elementary (6)	2	77	1	243	323	384	707	(45.7)	0	1	0	4	5	19	24
Alice G. Mulcahy (7)	3	52	1	203	259	373	632	(41.0)	0	1	0	0	1	21	22
Maple Avenue Elementary (8)	2	49	0	230	281	416	697	(40.3)	0	2	0	2	4	22	26
Cherry Avenue School (5)	1	28	8	91	128	398	526	(24.3)	0	1	0	2	3	16	19
Frank Kohn (1)	0	15	7	110	132	561	693	(19.0)	0	0	1	2	3	19	22
Garden Avenue Elementary (3)	0	6	7	53	66	538	604	(10.9)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22

DISTRICT: VISALIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 24. REPRESENTING: 24. CITY: VISALIA. COUNTY: 54. TULARE COUNTY

Number	40	116	116	2,540	2,812	9,434	12,246	0	1	5	15	21	472	493	
Percent	0.3	0.9	0.9	20.7	23.0	77.0	100.0	0.0	0.2	1.0	3.0	4.3	95.7	100.0	
Crowley Elementary (2)	0	6	5	275	286	30	316	(90.5)	0	1	0	3	4	9	13
Webster Elementary (18)	2	25	0	169	196	31	227	(86.3)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Goshen Elementary (6)	0	16	0	250	266	220	486	(54.7)	0	0	0	2	2	16	18
Highland Elementary (7)	2	3	0	109	114	132	246	(46.3)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: VISALIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 24. REPRESENTING: 24. CITY: VISALIA. COUNTY: 54. TULARE COUNTY—Continued

School	Students—							Teachers—							
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Green Acres Intermediate (21)	3	6	7	195	211	290	501	(42.1)	0	0	0	1	1	20	21
Houston Elementary (8)	0	11	5	166	182	260	442	(41.2)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Redwood High (22)	3	26	15	604	648	1,109	1,757	(36.9)	0	0	3	4	7	72	79
Visalia Continuation High (24)	0	0	0	16	16	36	52	(30.8)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Fairview Elementary (5)	0	7	3	125	135	370	505	(26.7)	0	0	1	1	2	15	17
Elbow Elementary (3)	1	1	0	25	27	78	105	(25.7)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Elbow Creek—Taurus Chatham Elementary (4)	2	0	1	71	74	231	305	(24.3)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Union Elementary (15)	7	0	1	53	61	258	319	(19.1)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Washington Elementary (17)	6	3	5	36	50	256	306	(16.3)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Mineral King Elementary (10)	1	1	5	105	112	624	736	(15.2)	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
Ivanhoe Elementary (9)	6	0	11	47	64	499	563	(11.4)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Packwood Elementary (12)	0	0	0	10	10	80	90	(11.1)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Willow Glen Elementary (19)	0	0	7	24	31	270	301	(10.3)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Veva Blunt-Linwood (16)	0	0	7	41	48	435	483	(9.9)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Mountain View (11)	1	2	4	50	57	596	653	(8.7)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Conyer Elementary (1)	0	1	4	28	33	499	532	(6.2)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Southwest Elementary (14)	1	5	0	7	13	198	211	(6.2)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Mount Whitney High (23)	2	3	13	87	105	1,707	1,812	(5.8)	0	0	0	2	2	83	85
Royal Oaks Elementary (13)	1	0	14	15	30	501	531	(5.6)	0	0	1	0	1	19	20
Divisadero Intermediate (20)	2	0	9	32	43	724	767	(5.6)	0	0	0	2	2	34	36

DISTRICT: OXNARD SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 14. CITY: OXNARD. COUNTY: 56. VENTURA

Number	11	1,144	202	3,839	5,196	3,943	9,139	1	22	9	9	41	303	344
Percent	0.1	12.5	2.2	42.0	56.9	43.1	100.0	0.3	6.4	2.6	2.6	11.9	88.1	100.0
Ramona (9)	0	74	1	519	594	10	604	(98.3)	0	2	1	0	3	20
Juanita (8)	0	82	0	490	572	10	582	(98.3)	1	3	0	2	6	22
Rose Avenue (13)	0	244	0	465	710	78	788	(90.1)	0	3	1	1	5	28
Drift (7)	0	85	15	396	496	246	742	(66.8)	0	3	2	0	5	19
McKinna (5)	0	205	4	184	393	196	589	(66.7)	0	4	1	0	5	22
John C. Fremont (1)	0	106	34	484	624	395	1,019	(61.2)	0	1	0	1	2	40
Elm Street (3)	0	13	10	198	221	192	413	(53.5)	0	0	1	1	2	12
Haydock (2)	0	92	23	302	417	381	798	(52.3)	0	2	0	2	4	31
Kamala (14)	0	140	8	172	320	429	749	(42.7)	0	2	0	0	2	24
Harrington (6)	0	25	4	169	198	298	496	(39.9)	0	0	0	0	0	18
Brittall (12)	4	4	16	140	164	247	411	(39.9)	0	0	0	0	0	14
Marina West (11)	8	48	16	144	214	514	728	(29.4)	0	1	1	0	2	24
Sierra Linda (4)	1	20	17	86	144	491	635	(22.7)	0	0	0	2	2	24
Curren (10)	0	6	34	89	129	456	585	(22.1)	0	1	2	0	3	18

DISTRICT: BERKELEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 33. REPRESENTING: 33. CITY: BERKELEY. COUNTY: 1. ALAMEDA

Number	19	6,917	1,193	540	8,669	7,535	16,204	2	119	32	19	172	602	774
Percent	0.1	42.7	7.4	3.3	53.5	46.5	100.0	0.3	15.4	4.1	2.5	22.2	77.8	100.0
St. Mark's Class for Pregnant Girls (22)	0	15	0	0	15	0	15	(100.0)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Washington Elementary (15)	0	286	54	32	372	208	580	(64.1)	0	3	3	0	6	15
Jefferson Elementary (8)	0	255	122	46	423	247	670	(63.1)	0	3	3	0	6	21
Edison Parent Nursery (25)	0	23	4	1	28	17	45	(62.2)	0	0	0	0	0	2
East Campus-Berkeley High (21)	0	197	1	6	204	125	329	(62.0)	0	4	0	0	4	15
Grove Parent Nursery (27)	0	21	4	1	26	16	42	(61.9)	0	1	0	0	1	2
Franklin Elementary (5)	0	371	126	57	554	352	906	(61.1)	0	9	0	0	9	27
Le Conte Elementary (10)	3	197	21	9	230	169	399	(57.6)	0	4	1	0	5	17
Longfellow Elementary (12)	1	486	69	18	574	425	999	(57.5)	0	5	1	0	6	34
West Campus-Berkeley High (19)	2	480	90	34	606	459	1,065	(56.9)	0	10	3	4	17	42
Whittier Elementary (16)	0	236	31	13	280	220	500	(56.0)	0	3	1	0	4	15
Whittier Children's Center (32)	0	20	0	0	20	16	36	(55.6)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Willard Junior High (18)	2	430	39	25	496	410	906	(54.7)	1	11	2	1	15	45
West Berkeley Children's Center (31)	0	26	2	2	30	25	55	(54.5)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Martin Luther King, Jr., Children's Center (28)	0	18	1	0	19	16	35	(54.3)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Berkeley High (20)	1	1,252	325	95	1,673	1,498	3,171	(52.8)	0	15	4	5	24	163
Emerson Elementary (4)	1	167	12	2	182	166	348	(52.3)	0	3	3	0	6	7
Martin Luther King Junior High (17)	0	548	97	66	711	662	1,373	(51.8)	0	13	0	7	20	67
Hillside Primary (7)	0	87	6	0	93	87	180	(51.7)	1	0	0	0	1	5
Lincoln Elementary (11)	2	353	42	9	406	382	788	(51.5)	0	5	3	2	10	19
Franklin Parent Nursery (26)	0	68	4	4	76	72	148	(51.4)	0	4	1	0	5	3
Thousand Oaks Elementary (14)	2	274	25	37	338	340	678	(49.9)	0	5	3	0	8	16
Trainable Mentally Retarded Classes (23)	0	24	0	1	25	26	51	(49.0)	0	2	0	0	2	3
Cragmont Elementary (2)	4	281	31	27	343	359	702	(48.9)	0	6	1	0	7	19
Cragmont Primary (3)	0	43	8	4	55	60	115	(47.8)	0	1	1	0	2	3
Hillside Elementary (6)	0	170	16	7	193	221	414	(46.6)	0	5	0	0	5	10
Columbus Elementary (1)	1	258	34	23	316	375	691	(45.7)	0	2	2	0	4	21
U. C. Child Study Center Parent Nursery (30)	0	27	5	1	33	41	74	(44.6)	0	0	0	0	0	3
Oxford Elementary (13)	0	113	8	16	137	173	310	(44.2)	0	3	0	0	3	10
John Muir Elementary (9)	0	181	10	1	192	245	437	(43.9)	0	2	0	0	2	14
East Campus Parent Nursery (24)	0	4	1	0	5	18	23	(21.7)	0	0	0	0	0	1
Martin Luther King, Jr., Parent Nursery (29)	0	4	4	3	11	68	79	(13.9)	0	0	0	0	0	3
Willard Parent Nursery (33)	0	2	1	0	3	37	40	(7.5)	0	0	0	0	0	2

DISTRICT: OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 89. REPRESENTING: 89. CITY: OAKLAND. COUNTY: 1. ALAMEDA

Number	314	35,386	3,326	5,241	44,267	19,835	64,102	0	574	96	50	720	1,917	2,637
Percent	0.5	55.2	5.2	8.2	69.1	30.9	100.0	0.0	21.8	3.6	1.9	27.3	72.7	100.0
McClymonds High (3)	0	1,041	0	10	1,051	0	1,051	(100.0)	0	26	2	10	38	18
Willow Manor Elementary (68)	0	229	2	3	234	0	234	(100.0)	0	5	0	0	5	4
Ralph Bunche (27)	0	391	0	13	404	0	404	(100.0)	0	10	1	0	11	8

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 89. REPRESENTING: 89. CITY: OAKLAND. COUNTY: 1. ALAMEDA—Continued

School	Students—							Teachers—							
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Santa Fe (75)	0	905	12	4	921	3	924	(99.7)	0	10	1	0	11	20	31
Lowell Junior High (17)	2	792	0	5	799	3	802	(99.6)	0	13	0	1	14	30	44
Herbert Hoover Junior High (15)	1	616	1	1	619	3	622	(99.5)	0	17	1	0	18	16	34
Prescott Elementary (72)	0	759	2	25	786	4	790	(99.5)	0	16	0	0	16	23	39
Woodland Elementary (89)	0	531	5	47	583	3	586	(99.5)	0	11	0	2	13	15	28
Golden Gate Elementary (44)	0	697	2	7	708	4	712	(99.4)	0	12	0	0	12	22	34
Cole Elementary (32)	0	434	0	7	443	3	446	(99.3)	0	25	1	0	23	10	23
James Madison Junior High (18)	0	873	0	10	883	6	889	(99.3)	0	25	0	0	15	12	37
Durant (37)	1	794	7	4	806	6	812	(99.0)	0	13	3	0	16	18	34
Lafayette Elementary (53)	1	647	3	26	677	7	684	(99.0)	0	14	2	0	16	21	31
Clawson (31)	0	615	7	6	628	7	635	(98.9)	0	9	1	0	10	12	22
Longfellow (59)	0	557	5	10	572	7	579	(98.8)	0	9	1	0	10	12	22
Brookfield (26)	0	998	4	21	1,023	13	1,036	(98.7)	0	8	0	0	8	28	36
Highland Elementary (48)	0	956	0	65	1,021	14	1,035	(98.6)	0	19	2	0	21	27	48
Woodrow Wilson Junior High (23)	2	663	10	3	678	13	691	(98.1)	0	14	0	0	14	21	35
Lockwood (84)	0	648	15	3	666	14	680	(97.9)	0	8	2	1	11	15	26
Lockwood Elementary (58)	3	1,260	13	120	1,396	36	1,432	(97.5)	0	27	5	0	32	35	67
Dag Hammarskjold (46)	0	397	0	6	403	11	414	(97.3)	0	10	0	0	10	7	17
Havenscourt Junior High (14)	2	979	8	96	1,085	41	1,126	(96.4)	0	26	1	1	28	27	55
Elmhurst Junior High (10)	2	822	24	93	941	49	990	(95.1)	0	10	1	1	12	34	46
Stonehurst Elementary (79)	2	866	8	103	979	60	1,039	(94.2)	0	12	3	0	15	24	39
Roosevelt Junior High (21)	15	534	51	203	803	53	856	(93.8)	0	10	0	4	14	34	48
Castlemont High (1)	0	2,291	34	78	2,403	170	2,573	(93.4)	0	31	3	2	36	80	116
Webster (85)	1	1,044	5	91	1,141	86	1,227	(93.0)	0	7	1	0	8	30	38
Edwin Markham (62)	3	581	7	43	634	60	694	(91.4)	0	6	3	0	9	16	25
Garfield (42)	21	532	46	178	777	77	854	(91.0)	0	7	5	1	13	20	33
Sobranite Park Elementary (78)	0	640	8	40	688	77	765	(89.9)	0	8	0	0	8	21	29
Lincoln (57)	1	20	203	66	290	35	325	(89.2)	0	3	3	0	6	9	15
Whittier (86)	9	558	13	170	750	93	843	(89.0)	0	9	0	0	9	23	32
Manzanita Elementary (61)	3	731	48	148	930	132	1,062	(87.6)	0	11	4	0	15	25	40
Oakland Technical High (5)	3	1,234	239	116	1,692	323	2,015	(84.0)	0	15	2	2	19	69	88
Franklin (40)	19	381	67	161	628	138	766	(82.0)	0	3	2	0	5	25	30
Lazear Elementary (56)	16	161	1	184	362	83	445	(81.3)	0	5	2	5	12	10	22
Melrose (65)	2	221	4	60	287	68	355	(80.8)	0	3	1	0	4	13	17
E. Morris Cox (34)	2	744	32	199	977	236	1,213	(80.5)	0	10	1	0	11	42	53
Dewey High (7)	5	150	1	44	200	49	249	(80.3)	0	4	0	1	5	10	15
Frick Junior High (11)	4	674	34	78	790	224	1,014	(77.9)	0	5	2	0	7	35	42
Bella Vista (25)	17	576	129	96	818	253	1,071	(76.4)	0	7	1	0	8	30	38
Peralta Elementary (70)	0	203	12	12	227	72	299	(75.9)	0	2	1	0	3	8	11
Toler Heights Elementary (83)	0	92	4	3	99	35	134	(73.9)	0	1	0	0	1	2	3
Terrace Park (81)	0	83	7	22	112	40	152	(73.7)	0	0	2	0	2	13	15
Parker (69)	7	383	21	46	457	181	638	(71.6)	0	3	0	0	3	17	20
Emerson (39)	9	326	25	59	419	215	634	(66.1)	0	2	1	0	3	21	24
Westlake Junior High (22)	3	261	174	103	541	283	824	(65.7)	0	6	1	1	8	29	37
John Marshall (63)	0	169	17	28	214	117	331	(64.7)	0	1	2	0	3	8	11
Fremont High (2)	17	737	95	314	1,163	663	1,826	(63.7)	0	9	0	0	9	72	81
Oakland High (4)	1	736	433	205	1,375	809	2,184	(63.0)	0	9	6	4	19	75	94
Grant High (8)	0	134	1	37	172	103	275	(62.5)	0	3	0	1	4	13	17
Development Center for Handicapped Minors (36)	0	28	2	2	32	21	53	(60.4)	0	2	0	0	2	4	6
Claremont Junior (9)	0	401	16	11	428	297	725	(59.0)	0	2	1	0	3	29	32
Hawthorne (47)	23	144	21	136	324	239	563	(57.5)	0	2	2	1	5	20	25
Alexander Hamilton Junior High (12)	14	344	56	300	714	560	1,274	(56.0)	0	7	1	2	10	45	55
Horace Mann (60)	15	186	25	100	326	270	596	(54.7)	0	1	1	0	2	17	19
McChesney Junior High (19)	2	264	218	78	562	527	1,089	(51.6)	0	3	1	4	8	39	47
Charles P. Howard (50)	2	227	27	24	290	273	563	(51.5)	0	1	2	0	3	16	19
Jefferson (51)	30	150	45	225	458	455	913	(50.2)	0	1	2	0	3	31	34
Crocker Highlands (35)	0	233	58	2	293	296	589	(49.7)	0	2	1	0	3	17	20
Cleveland Elementary (33)	9	18	152	19	198	203	401	(49.4)	0	2	1	0	3	11	14
Edison Elementary (38)	8	59	35	45	147	155	302	(48.7)	0	1	0	0	1	9	10
Charles A. Whitton (87)	0	34	6	12	52	57	109	(47.7)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
King Junior High (16)	3	358	22	27	410	456	866	(47.3)	0	5	0	0	5	30	35
Maxwell Park (64)	1	129	41	31	202	275	477	(42.3)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Burckhalter Elementary (29)	0	104	9	37	150	217	367	(40.9)	0	3	0	0	3	10	13
Luther Burbank (28)	0	57	10	33	100	180	280	(35.7)	0	1	1	0	2	8	10
Sherman Elementary (77)	6	54	4	36	100	195	295	(33.9)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Lakeview (54)	1	57	87	23	168	355	523	(32.1)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17
Allendale (24)	7	48	38	63	156	385	541	(28.8)	0	2	3	1	6	11	17
Fruitvale Elementary (41)	7	29	40	100	176	513	689	(25.5)	0	2	0	0	2	23	25
Sequoia (76)	0	55	32	39	126	376	502	(25.1)	0	1	1	0	2	12	14
Henry J. Kaiser, Jr. Elementary (52)	0	36	5	7	48	166	214	(22.4)	0	1	0	0	1	6	7
Glenview (43)	2	41	66	45	154	541	695	(22.2)	0	1	0	0	1	21	22
Skyline High (6)	0	256	118	98	472	1,928	2,400	(19.7)	0	3	2	3	8	86	94
Bret Harte Junior High (13)	1	58	74	52	185	829	1,014	(18.2)	0	0	1	0	1	36	37
Laurel (55)	7	8	36	28	79	383	462	(17.1)	0	1	2	0	3	13	16
Redwood Heights (73)	0	34	25	6	65	330	395	(16.5)	0	0	1	0	1	12	13
Piedmont Avenue (71)	0	11	17	23	51	269	320	(15.9)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Grass Valley Elementary (45)	0	29	15	8	52	283	335	(15.5)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
Monterey Junior High (20)	0	135	35	13	183	1,016	1,199	(15.3)	0	4	2	0	6	36	42
John Swett (80)	0	6	11	16	33	190	223	(14.8)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8
Anthony Chabot (30)	1	26	16	6	49	313	362	(13.5)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Rockridge Elementary (74)	0	21	4	13	38	249	287	(13.2)	0	0	0	1	2	8	10
Carl Muncie (68)	0	11	34	6	51	365	416	(12.3)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13
Joaquin Miller (66)	0	28	24	2	54	474	528	(10.2)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Thornhill Elementary (82)	0	9	23	1	33	427	460	(7.2)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Montclair (67)	0	10	33	0	43	564	607	(7.1)	0	1	0	1	2	18	20
Hillcrest Elementary (49)	0	4	5	1	10	221	231	(4.3)	0	1	0	0	1	5	6

DISTRICT: PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 13. REPRESENTING: 13. CITY: PITTSBURG. COUNTY: 7. CONTRA COSTA

Number	13	1,827	249	1,409	3,498	3,498	6,996	0	16	7	14	37	313	350
Percent	0.2	26.1	3.6	20.1	50.0	50.0	100.0	0.0	4.6	2.0	4.0	10.6	89.4	100.0
El Pueblo—closed and spread out in Sept. (1)	0	266	0	0	266	3	269	(98.9)	0	2	1	1	4	9
Continuation (10)	0	22	0	8	30	4	34	(88.2)	0	0	0	0	3	3

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: PITTSBURG UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 13. REPRESENTING: 13. CITY: PITTSBURG. COUNTY: 7. CONTRA COSTA—Continued

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—							Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			
Central Junior High (8)	1	357	3	179	540	122	662	(81.6)	0	1	0	2	3	36	39		
Marina Elementary (5)	0	345	12	212	569	145	714	(79.7)	0	4	0	0	4	26	30		
Village Elementary (7)	0	133	1	76	210	120	330	(63.6)	0	2	0	1	3	16	19		
Pittsburg Senior High (13)	1	241	34	184	460	364	824	(55.8)	0	1	1	1	3	48	51		
Pittsburg Senior High-South Campus (12)	0	101	20	99	220	199	419	(52.5)	0	1	0	1	2	24	26		
Parkside Elementary (6)	8	42	85	135	270	275	545	(49.5)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22		
Los Medanos Elementary (4)	0	104	37	88	229	322	551	(41.6)	0	0	0	2	2	18	20		
Pittsburg Evening High (11)	3	121	12	116	252	501	753	(33.5)	0	1	2	2	5	43	48		
Hillview Junior High (9)	0	57	36	155	248	528	776	(32.0)	0	1	0	3	4	33	37		
Highlands Elementary (3)	0	20	9	87	116	510	626	(18.5)	0	0	3	1	4	18	22		
Heights Elementary (2)	0	18	0	70	88	405	493	(17.8)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20		

DISTRICT: RICHMOND UNIFIED. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 62. REPRESENTING: 62. CITY: RICHMOND. COUNTY: 7. CONTRA COSTA

Number	59	10,424	1,231	2,253	13,967	29,156	43,123	-----	3	172	78	11	264	1,404	1,668
Percent	0.1	24.2	2.9	5.2	32.4	67.6	100.0	-----	0.2	10.3	4.7	0.7	15.8	84.2	100.0
Verde Elementary (44)	0	534	0	18	552	0	552	(100.0)	0	9	0	0	9	12	21
Coronado Elementary (8)	0	609	2	10	621	2	623	(99.7)	0	11	1	0	12	17	29
Peres Elementary (31)	0	891	0	75	966	11	977	(98.9)	0	16	3	0	19	20	39
Pullman Elementary (33)	3	785	5	20	813	25	838	(97.0)	0	8	2	0	10	29	39
Nystrom Elementary (29)	1	808	0	13	822	44	866	(94.9)	0	16	1	0	17	23	40
Cortez Elementary (9)	0	427	5	18	450	55	505	(89.1)	0	5	1	0	6	17	23
Roosevelt Junior High (61)	2	468	4	50	524	102	626	(83.7)	0	6	2	0	8	27	35
Steger Elementary (40)	0	466	19	10	495	136	631	(78.4)	0	7	2	0	9	14	23
Lincoln Elementary (24)	4	240	3	131	378	129	507	(74.6)	0	5	0	0	5	16	21
Kennedy High (55)	3	1,150	85	78	1,316	942	2,258	(58.3)	0	10	3	0	13	85	98
Balboa Elementary (2)	0	40	0	23	103	103	206	(50.0)	0	1	1	0	2	5	7
Lake Elementary (23)	0	211	7	26	244	320	564	(43.3)	0	8	0	0	8	14	22
Washington Elementary (46)	12	159	2	3	176	256	432	(40.7)	0	7	4	1	4	10	14
Downer Junior High (52)	2	304	11	122	439	656	1,095	(40.1)	0	3	4	1	12	36	48
Alvarado Elementary (1)	0	75	42	60	177	285	462	(40.0)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Richmond Senior High-North Campus (59)	0	292	18	115	425	642	1,067	(39.8)	0	4	3	0	7	35	42
Portola Junior High (58)	0	454	116	52	622	1,039	1,661	(37.4)	0	5	3	1	9	42	49
Adams Junior High (49)	2	322	59	20	403	706	1,109	(36.3)	0	5	2	0	7	42	49
Helms Junior High (54)	3	377	31	90	501	885	1,386	(36.1)	0	5	5	0	10	54	64
Richmond Senior High-South Campus (60)	2	361	30	122	515	1,005	1,520	(33.9)	0	5	2	2	9	54	63
El Monte Elementary (13)	0	57	55	2	114	226	340	(33.5)	0	1	1	0	2	10	12
Cameron Elementary (6)	0	8	1	5	14	28	42	(33.3)	0	1	0	0	1	3	4
Bayview Elementary (3)	4	146	3	76	229	522	751	(30.5)	0	2	5	0	7	24	31
Madera Elementary (25)	0	71	32	6	109	263	372	(29.3)	0	1	1	1	3	9	12
Ford Elementary (17)	0	101	10	36	147	363	510	(28.8)	0	1	1	0	2	13	15
Vista Hills (45)	0	26	19	11	56	139	195	(28.7)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Grant Elementary (18)	0	112	2	47	161	426	587	(27.4)	1	0	0	0	1	18	19
Castro Elementary (7)	0	11	95	38	144	414	558	(25.8)	0	1	1	0	2	16	18
Woods Elementary (48)	2	23	3	56	84	250	334	(25.1)	0	0	1	0	1	9	10
Fairmont Elementary (16)	0	15	47	46	108	367	475	(22.7)	0	0	2	0	2	14	16
El Portal Elementary (14)	0	42	29	66	137	487	624	(22.0)	0	2	1	0	3	18	21
El Cerrito Senior High (53)	0	228	95	43	366	1,379	1,745	(21.0)	0	4	1	0	5	64	69
Mira Vista Elementary (26)	0	72	80	33	185	707	892	(20.7)	0	2	1	0	3	26	29
Fairmeade Elementary (15)	0	67	38	40	145	563	708	(20.5)	0	2	1	0	3	21	24
Belding Elementary (4)	2	32	6	82	122	551	673	(18.1)	0	0	3	0	3	22	25
Del Mar Elementary (10)	0	25	36	3	64	316	380	(16.8)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Broadway Elementary (5)	0	0	13	63	76	380	456	(16.7)	0	2	2	0	4	12	16
Dover Elementary (1)	0	14	5	79	98	538	636	(15.4)	0	2	2	0	4	19	23
Murphy Elementary (28)	2	53	4	25	84	465	549	(15.3)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Wilson Elementary (47)	0	49	10	21	80	448	528	(15.2)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Serra Elementary (36)	0	7	13	18	38	221	259	(14.7)	0	0	1	0	1	7	8
Riverside Elementary (35)	2	45	14	11	72	492	564	(12.8)	0	1	1	0	2	16	18
Sheldon Elementary (37)	1	36	2	7	46	369	415	(11.1)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Pincel Valley High (57)	0	110	14	76	200	1,606	1,806	(11.1)	0	3	3	1	7	63	70
Harding Elementary (19)	0	15	19	3	37	318	355	(10.4)	0	1	1	0	2	12	14
Crespi Junior High (50)	0	39	12	57	108	1,114	1,222	(8.8)	0	1	2	1	4	50	54
Collins Elementary (32)	4	0	7	24	35	551	586	(6.0)	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
Kensington Elementary (21)	0	8	24	0	32	542	574	(5.6)	0	0	0	1	1	17	18
Kerry Hills Elementary (22)	4	0	1	39	44	767	811	(5.4)	0	1	3	0	4	23	27
Pinole Junior High (56)	3	2	4	29	38	664	702	(5.4)	0	1	1	0	2	25	27
De Anza Senior High (51)	0	21	13	46	80	1,503	1,583	(5.1)	0	0	3	0	3	57	60
Shannon Elementary (38)	1	2	11	12	26	528	554	(4.7)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17
Rancho Elementary (34)	0	0	2	16	18	376	394	(4.6)	0	1	0	0	1	11	12
Montalvin Manor Elementary (27)	0	3	3	21	27	657	684	(3.9)	0	0	0	1	1	24	25
Stewart Elementary (41)	0	2	3	11	16	440	456	(3.5)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Ellerhorst Elementary (12)	0	3	7	12	22	665	687	(3.2)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Hillview Elementary (20)	0	3	3	8	14	254	262	(3.1)	0	1	0	0	1	7	8
El Sobrante Elementary (39)	0	0	5	11	16	511	527	(3.0)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Tara Hills Elementary (42)	0	2	9	15	26	835	861	(2.9)	0	0	2	0	2	25	27
Oilinda Elementary (30)	0	1	2	5	8	270	278	(2.9)	0	0	1	0	2	7	9
Valley View Elementary (43)	0	0	2	3	5	318	323	(1.5)	0	1	1	0	2	8	10
Gompers Senior High (62)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.0)	2	0	0	0	2	10	12

DISTRICT: FRESNO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 74. REPRESENTING: 74. CITY: FRESNO COUNTY: 10. FRESNO

Number	140	5,251	947	11,148	17,486	40,748	58,234	-----	1	32	28	52	113	2,092	2,295
Percent	0.2	9.0	1.6	19.1	30.0	79.0	100.0	-----	0.0	1.5	1.3	2.4	5.1	94.9	100.0
George Washington Carver (50)	0	593	0	5	598	0	598	(100.0)	0	1	1	4	6	22	28
Franklin (61)	0	530	2	191	723	2	725	(99.7)	0	3	0	1	4	27	31
Kirk (69)	0	548	4	89	641	4	645	(99.4)	0	1	1	0	2	29	31
Irwin Junior High (3)	0	493	2	103	598	4	602	(99.3)	0	2	1	1	5	21	26
Columbia (52)	0	411	0	101	512	5	517	(99.0)	0	2	1	0	3	20	23
Lincoln Elementary (73)	0	355	47	385	787	9	796	(98.9)	0	3	2	2	7	29	36
Thomas A. Edison High (12)	0	878	1	203	1,082	14	1,096	(98.							

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: FRESNO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 74. REPRESENTING: 74. CITY: FRESNO COUNTY: 10. FRESNO—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Emerson (57)	1	40	0	132	173	58	231	(74.9)	0	0	1	0	1	9	10
Calwa Elementary (49)	4	4	1	582	591	219	810	(73.0)	0	0	1	1	2	27	29
Aynesworth Elementary (44)	0	5	3	227	235	95	330	(71.2)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Winchell Elementary (21)	0	26	3	602	631	352	983	(64.2)	0	1	0	0	1	26	37
Jefferson (68)	9	28	3	390	430	260	690	(62.3)	0	0	0	1	1	27	28
Sequoia Junior High (5)	4	112	13	613	742	470	1,212	(61.2)	1	1	0	2	4	37	41
Lowell Elementary (74)	2	48	4	218	272	186	458	(59.4)	0	1	0	1	2	17	19
Frank N. Lane Elementary (72)	7	117	14	407	545	516	1,061	(51.4)	0	0	1	1	2	36	38
Chester Rowell (38)	11	7	2	370	400	399	799	(50.1)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Figarden Elementary (60)	0	0	0	60	60	60	120	(50.0)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Webster Elementary (19)	0	18	3	291	312	325	637	(49.0)	0	0	0	1	1	21	22
Dailey Annex (54)	1	2	0	21	24	34	58	(41.4)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Jane Addams Elementary-Junior High (43)	2	25	11	227	265	376	641	(41.3)	0	0	2	2	4	20	24
Sunshine (24)	0	8	0	15	23	33	58	(41.1)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Cooper Junior High #70 (26)	2	61	20	312	395	600	995	(39.7)	0	1	1	0	2	33	35
Dewolf High (2)	0	19	1	50	70	110	180	(38.9)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Theodore Roosevelt High (15)	2	50	24	794	870	1,617	2,487	(35.0)	0	1	0	2	3	100	103
Jackson (67)	0	10	3	157	170	321	491	(34.6)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
John Muir (32)	0	4	6	198	208	435	643	(32.3)	0	0	1	1	2	17	19
Yosemite Junior High (10)	4	12	15	382	413	913	1,326	(31.1)	0	0	0	1	1	43	44
Fort Miller Junior High (27)	19	98	56	150	323	767	1,090	(29.6)	0	0	0	1	1	37	38
John Burroughs (48)	0	4	6	228	238	578	816	(29.2)	0	0	1	0	1	29	30
Mayfair (31)	6	4	9	156	175	449	624	(28.0)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Wawona Junior High (9)	1	41	5	146	193	592	785	(24.6)	0	2	0	1	3	25	28
T. L. Heaton (64)	1	24	0	117	142	448	590	(24.1)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Fresno High (1)	3	79	68	453	603	1,930	2,533	(23.8)	0	0	0	2	2	103	105
Lafayette Elementary (71)	0	2	7	105	114	404	518	(22.0)	0	2	0	1	3	15	18
Frank Homan Elementary (66)	3	0	40	86	128	463	591	(21.7)	0	0	1	1	2	19	21
John C. Fremont (62)	3	4	14	79	100	366	465	(21.5)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Alice Birney (46)	0	10	10	100	120	490	610	(19.7)	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Alexander Hamilton Junior High (28)	1	28	29	141	199	898	1,097	(18.1)	0	0	0	1	1	38	39
Woodrow Wilson (20)	4	13	12	171	200	903	1,103	(18.1)	0	0	0	0	0	40	40
Roeding (37)	0	0	13	87	100	490	590	(16.9)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
George W. Turner Elementary (42)	0	4	16	62	82	404	486	(16.9)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Norseman (33)	6	5	12	85	109	547	656	(16.6)	0	0	0	1	1	25	26
A. G. Wishon (22)	1	4	11	55	71	363	434	(16.4)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16
Holland (65)	15	14	3	121	153	853	1,006	(15.2)	0	0	1	0	1	33	34
A. D. Ewing (59)	0	11	7	103	121	716	837	(14.5)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31
Ernie Pyle Elementary (35)	1	4	22	61	88	566	654	(13.5)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Home Instruction—Individual Instruction (16)	0	2	0	5	7	47	54	(13.0)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kings Canyon Junior High (4)	4	15	22	101	142	960	1,102	(12.9)	0	0	0	2	2	39	41
Tenaya Junior High (7)	1	27	25	64	117	926	1,043	(11.2)	0	0	1	0	1	33	34
Scandinavian (39)	0	0	14	53	67	532	599	(11.2)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22
Lucius Powers Elementary (34)	0	2	0	48	50	404	454	(11.0)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Morris E. Dailey (53)	4	1	5	56	66	534	600	(11.0)	0	0	1	0	1	19	20
Easterby Elementary (56)	0	3	18	60	81	667	748	(10.8)	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Robinson Elementary (36)	2	6	9	72	89	754	843	(10.6)	0	0	0	0	0	30	30
Manchester Elementary (30)	0	8	12	27	47	422	469	(10.0)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
McLane High (14)	0	55	67	153	275	2,491	2,766	(9.9)	0	0	1	2	3	109	112
Edwin C. Kratt (70)	0	0	5	37	42	382	424	(9.9)	0	0	2	0	2	12	14
Del Mar (55)	0	4	1	38	43	392	435	(9.9)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Vinland (18)	0	12	10	48	70	643	713	(9.8)	0	0	0	1	1	25	26
Centennial (51)	3	6	28	43	80	738	818	(9.8)	0	0	0	1	2	26	28
Sierra Junior High (6)	5	12	18	98	133	1,231	1,364	(9.8)	0	0	0	3	3	45	48
Frank W. Thomas Elementary (41)	4	6	11	45	66	983	1,049	(6.5)	0	0	0	0	0	37	37
Ruth Gibson (63)	0	5	27	6	38	571	609	(6.2)	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
Carroll Baird (45)	0	0	13	20	33	520	553	(6.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
James M. Malloch (29)	0	0	7	9	16	267	283	(5.7)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Bullard High (11)	0	20	25	37	82	1,372	1,454	(5.6)	0	0	1	1	2	54	56
Bullard Elementary (47)	0	9	10	11	30	502	532	(5.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Walters Elementary (23)	2	3	22	25	52	975	1,027	(5.1)	0	0	1	2	3	35	38
Tioga Junior High (8)	1	11	13	88	113	1,108	1,221	(9.3)	0	0	0	2	2	40	42
Ahwahnee Junior High (25)	1	20	18	37	76	748	824	(9.2)	0	0	0	1	1	30	31
Hoover High (13)	0	36	34	90	160	1,735	1,895	(8.4)	0	2	0	0	2	76	78
Lief Ericson (58)	0	0	8	20	28	404	432	(6.5)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Viking (17)	1	5	6	41	53	770	823	(6.4)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28

DISTRICT: MENDOTA UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOL: 3. REPRESENTING: 4. CITY: MENDOTA. COUNTY: 10. FRESNO

Number	4	34	5	1,121	1,164	279	1,443	0	0	0	2	2	53	55
Percent	0.3	2.4	0.3	77.7	80.7	19.3	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.6	3.6	96.4	100.0
McCabe Sr Elementary (3)	2	3	0	253	258	52	310	(83.2)	0	0	0	0	16	16
Washington (1)	1	18	1	432	452	101	553	(81.7)	0	0	0	1	18	19
McCabe Elementary (2)	1	13	1	436	545	126	580	(78.3)	0	0	0	1	19	20

DISTRICT: SANGER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 13. REPRESENTING: 13. CITY: SANGER. COUNTY: 10. FRESNO COUNTY

Number	16	4	197	3,449	3,666	2,711	6,377	0	0	3	11	14	217	231
Percent	0.3	0.1	3.1	54.1	57.5	42.5	100.0	0.0	0.0	1.3	4.8	6.1	93.9	100.0
Wilson Elementary (12)	7	0	9	392	408	63	471	(86.6)	0	0	0	1	14	15
Jefferson Elementary (6)	0	0	4	306	310	50	360	(86.1)	0	0	0	0	13	13
Del Rey Elementary (3)	0	1	11	357	369	61	430	(85.8)	0	0	0	1	13	14
Lincoln (7)	0	0	1	336	337	107	444	(75.9)	0	0	0	1	14	15
Madison (9)	0	0	19	300	319	135	454	(70.3)	0	0	0	0	14	14
Washington (13)	0	0	14	375	389	192	581	(67.0)	0	0	1	2	21	24
Taft Elementary (10)	0	0	4	102	106	87	193	(54.9)	0	0	0	0	6	6
Sanger High (2)	4	0	72	781	857	87	1,705	(50.3)	0	0	2	5	65	72
Lone Star (8)	0	0	23	138	161	216	377	(42.7)	0	0	0	0	14	14
Jackson Elementary (5)	0	0	21	132	153	211	364	(42.0)	0	0	0	0	11	11
Centerville Elementary (1)	1	0	8	124	133	203	336	(39.6)	0	0	0	0	11	11
Fairmont (4)	4	3	5	80	92	338	430	(21.4)	0	0	0	1	13	14
John S. Wash (11)	0	0	6	26	32	200	232	(13.8)	0	0	0	0	8	8

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SELMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 14. REPRESENTING: 19. CITY: SELMA. COUNTY: 10. FRESNO COUNTY

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	6	67	120	2,161	2,354	1,715	4,069	0	0	1	9	10	149	159	
Percent	0.1	1.6	2.9	53.1	57.9	42.1	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.6	5.7	6.3	93.7	100.0	
Edgecomb Center Kindergarten (1)	0	2	0	48	50	4	54	(92.6)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Selma Continuation High (13)	0	0	0	11	11	1	12	(91.7)	0	0	0	0	3	3	
Washington (5)	2	2	2	227	233	27	260	(89.6)	0	0	0	1	1	8	9
Eric White (12)	0	11	11	293	315	62	377	(83.6)	0	0	0	1	1	12	13
Thomas Jefferson (11)	0	11	1	118	130	29	159	(81.8)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Indianola (7)	0	5	22	214	241	141	382	(63.1)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Roosevelt (6)	1	11	13	302	327	218	545	(60.0)	0	0	0	3	3	20	23
Franklin (9)	0	0	1	34	35	26	61	(57.4)	0	0	0	1	1	2	3
Selma High (4)	0	20	32	518	570	567	1,137	(50.1)	0	0	1	3	4	46	50
Garfield (2)	2	0	2	110	114	129	243	(46.9)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Terry (14)	0	0	27	67	94	117	211	(44.5)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8
Andrew Jackson (8)	1	5	4	128	138	190	328	(42.1)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Woodrow Wilson (10)	0	0	5	87	92	183	275	(33.5)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Lincoln Park Kindergarten (3)	0	0	0	4	4	21	25	(16.0)	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

DISTRICT: BRAWLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 7. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: BRAWLEY. COUNTY: 13. IMPERIAL

School	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	6	164	27	2,128	2,325	1,454	3,779	0	1	6	14	21	122	143	
Percent	0.2	4.3	0.7	56.3	61.5	38.5	100.0	0.0	0.7	4.2	9.8	14.7	85.3	100.0	
Miguel Hidalgo (2)	0	54	0	624	678	15	693	(97.8)	0	0	3	4	7	21	28
J. W. Oakley (1)	1	58	1	519	579	50	629	(92.1)	0	1	1	3	5	20	25
Soroptimist (4)	0	1	1	6	8	4	12	(66.7)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Barbara Worth (3)	2	31	4	410	447	294	741	(60.3)	0	0	0	5	5	22	27
Ruth Reid (5)	1	9	8	272	290	209	499	(58.1)	0	0	1	0	1	18	19
Phil Swing (7)	0	11	3	208	222	442	664	(33.4)	0	0	1	1	2	22	24
Myron D. Witter (6)	2	0	10	89	101	440	541	(18.7)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19

DISTRICT: CALEXICO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 8. REPRESENTING: 8. CITY: CALEXICO. COUNTY: 13. IMPERIAL

School	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	0	21	52	3,427	3,500	420	3,920	0	2	0	23	25	138	163	
Percent	0.0	0.5	1.3	87.4	89.3	10.7	100.0	0.0	1.2	0.0	14.1	15.3	84.7	100.0	
Continuation High (1)	0	0	0	12	12	0	12	(100.0)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Sheridan Elementary (8)	0	1	0	220	221	8	229	(96.5)	0	0	0	1	1	9	10
Jefferson Elementary (6)	0	3	11	600	614	38	652	(94.2)	0	1	0	4	5	20	25
Hoffman Elementary (4)	0	0	1	119	120	8	128	(93.8)	0	0	0	1	1	3	4
De Anza Junior High (5)	0	4	3	586	593	68	661	(89.7)	0	0	0	4	4	26	30
Calexico High (2)	0	7	18	989	1,014	118	1,132	(89.6)	0	0	0	7	7	41	48
Dool (3)	0	2	14	474	490	87	577	(84.9)	0	1	0	2	3	20	23
Rockwood (7)	0	4	5	427	436	93	529	(82.4)	0	0	0	4	4	17	21

DISTRICT: EL CENTRO SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 9. REPRESENTING: 9. CITY: EL CENTRO. COUNTY: 13. IMPERIAL

School	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	6	330	68	1,401	1,805	2,412	4,217	0	19	3	6	28	120	148	
Percent	0.1	7.8	1.6	33.2	42.8	57.2	100.0	0.0	12.8	2.0	4.1	18.9	81.1	100.0	
Washington (8)	0	197	17	317	531	4	535	(99.3)	0	12	0	0	12	9	21
Lincoln (6)	2	1	13	191	207	183	390	(53.1)	0	1	0	1	2	13	15
Harding (3)	0	15	9	188	212	217	429	(49.4)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16
McKinley (7)	0	14	0	210	224	275	499	(44.9)	0	2	1	0	3	16	19
Kennedy Jr. High (5)	1	5	3	109	118	149	267	(44.2)	0	0	0	3	3	7	10
Wilson Jr. High (9)	3	86	6	198	293	431	724	(40.5)	0	1	1	2	4	15	19
Desert Garden (2)	0	6	4	93	103	420	523	(19.7)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
De Anza (1)	0	2	3	41	46	275	321	(14.3)	0	1	1	0	2	9	11
Hedrick (4)	0	4	13	54	71	458	529	(13.4)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18

DISTRICT: BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 34. REPRESENTING: 34. CITY: BAKERSFIELD. COUNTY: 15. KERN

School	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total	Weight: 1.0	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number	42	3,639	149	5,326	9,156	15,165	24,321	0	1	26	5	19	51	775	826
Percent	0.2	15.0	0.6	21.9	37.6	62.4	100.0	0.1	3.1	0.6	2.3	6.2	93.8	100.0	
Potomac (22)	2	630	0	346	978	0	978	(100.0)	0	5	0	0	5	26	31
Lincoln Junior High (32)	0	363	0	295	658	2	660	(99.7)	0	3	0	2	5	25	30
Fremont (7)	0	496	0	298	794	3	797	(99.6)	0	5	0	0	5	21	26
Colonel Baker (1)	1	400	0	447	848	15	863	(98.3)	1	3	1	1	6	26	32
Casa Loma (2)	0	550	1	55	606	52	658	(92.1)	0	2	0	0	2	23	25
McKinley (14)	0	578	15	209	802	130	932	(86.1)	0	2	0	1	3	28	31
Mount Vernon (15)	0	71	0	853	924	233	1,157	(79.9)	0	2	0	1	3	32	35
Jefferson (11)	0	0	0	442	442	149	591	(74.8)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Williams (27)	3	9	0	452	464	353	817	(56.8)	0	0	1	0	1	24	25
Emerson Junior High (30)	1	213	8	84	306	346	652	(46.9)	0	0	1	0	1	26	27
Peter Pan (19)	0	25	1	15	41	51	92	(44.6)	0	0	1	0	1	7	8
Sierra Junior High (33)	0	19	0	272	291	458	749	(38.9)	0	0	0	1	1	23	24
Golden State Junior High (31)	4	163	6	65	238	416	654	(36.4)	0	0	0	2	2	24	26
Washington Junior High (34)	1	4	6	291	302	541	843	(35.8)	0	0	0	2	2	30	32
Noble (18)	1	3	3	284	291	632	923	(31.5)	0	0	1	0	1	29	30
College Heights (4)	0	2	3	99	104	451	555	(18.7)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Franklin (6)	3	16	22	67	108	495	603	(17.9)	0	1	0	0	1	21	22
Wayside (25)	0	59	5	105	169	895	1,064	(15.9)	0	1	0	0	1	20	21
Pioneer Drive (21)	2	5	4	101	112	691	803	(13.9)	0	0	0	1	1	30	32
Horace Mann (13)	3	0	0	107	115	763	878	(13.1)	0	0	0	0	1	23	24
William Penn (20)	0	10	5	41	56	400	456	(12.3)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Longfellow (12)	0	9	3	76	88	665	753	(11.7)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
Voorhies (24)	4	0	0	32	36	309	345	(10.4)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Roosevelt (23)	1	6	12	39	58	651	709	(8.2)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Hort (10)	0	0	0	34	34	423	457	(7.4)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 34. REPRESENTING: 34. CITY: BAKERSFIELD. COUNTY: 15. KERN—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Harding (8)	3	4	14	32	53	680	733	(7.2)	0	0	0	1	1	24	25
Frank West (26)	0	0	9	46	55	839	894	(6.2)	0	1	0	0	1	26	27
Castro Lane (3)	0	0	1	30	31	584	615	(5.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Munsey (16)	5	0	11	20	36	720	756	(4.8)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Compton Junior High (28)	2	0	5	30	37	922	959	(3.9)	0	0	0	2	2	38	40
Nichols (17)	0	2	5	29	36	920	956	(3.8)	0	0	0	2	2	30	32
Curran Junior High (29)	1	0	4	16	21	573	594	(3.5)	0	0	0	1	1	23	24
Eissler (5)	0	2	4	8	14	436	450	(3.1)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Harris (9)	0	0	2	6	8	367	375	(2.1)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12

DISTRICT: DELANO UNION ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 6. REPRESENTING: 6. CITY: DELANO. COUNTY: 15. KERN

Number	3	170	26	1,598	1,797	1,441	3,238		0	4	1	3	8	109	117
Percent	0.1	5.3	0.8	49.4	55.5	44.5	100.0		0.0	3.4	0.9	2.6	6.8	93.2	100.0
Valle Vista (6)	0	39	0	246	285	11	296	(96.3)	0	1	0	1	2	7	9
Fremont (3)	0	91	0	668	759	96	855	(88.8)	0	2	0	1	3	33	36
Albany Park (5)	0	20	0	141	161	72	233	(69.1)	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Del Vista (2)	0	8	8	181	197	395	592	(33.3)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Cecil Avenue (1)	3	8	14	232	257	561	818	(31.4)	0	1	0	1	2	29	31
Terrace (4)	0	4	4	130	138	306	444	(31.1)	0	0	1	0	1	13	14

DISTRICT: COMPTON CITY ELEMENTARY. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. REPRESENTING: 20. CITY: COMPTON. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	44	11,725	50	2,245	14,064	2,343	16,407		0	368	13	4	385	208	593
Percent	0.3	71.5	0.3	13.7	85.7	14.3	100.0		0.0	62.1	2.2	0.7	64.9	35.1	100.0
George Washington (19)	0	955	0	95	1,050	0	1,050	(100.0)	0	36	0	0	36	4	40
Caldwell Street (2)	0	937	3	9	949	0	949	(100.0)	0	24	0	2	26	5	31
General Rosecrans (17)	0	387	0	233	620	0	620	(100.0)	0	16	1	1	18	14	32
Ardella B. Tibby (18)	0	1,054	0	45	1,099	1	1,100	(99.9)	0	24	4	0	28	9	37
Charles W. Bursch (1)	0	826	0	0	826	1	827	(99.9)	0	23	0	0	23	5	28
Clarence A. Dickson (3)	0	853	0	136	989	6	95	(99.4)	0	21	0	0	21	12	33
El Segundo (4)	0	1,009	0	6	1,015	10	1,025	(99.0)	0	29	0	0	29	12	41
139th Street (14)	0	239	1	9	249	3	252	(98.8)	0	10	0	0	10	1	11
Henry W. Longfellow (12)	0	1,093	0	16	1,109	20	1,129	(98.2)	0	32	3	0	35	5	40
Thomas Jefferson (7)	0	170	0	444	614	15	629	(97.6)	0	14	1	0	15	4	19
Laurel Street (10)	0	460	6	31	497	13	510	(97.5)	0	11	0	0	11	6	17
Abraham Lincoln (11)	1	628	5	116	750	30	780	(96.2)	0	15	1	0	16	11	27
Ralph W. Emerson (5)	3	677	8	158	846	62	908	(93.2)	0	17	2	0	19	12	31
Park Village (15)	0	496	0	26	522	39	561	(93.0)	0	13	0	0	13	7	20
Robert F. Kennedy (9)	0	774	2	100	876	81	957	(91.5)	0	27	0	1	28	11	39
Augusta A. Mayo (13)	0	432	9	169	610	108	718	(85.0)	0	12	0	0	12	12	24
Frances Willard (20)	16	218	0	187	421	133	554	(76.0)	0	11	0	0	11	9	20
Colin P. Kelly (8)	8	310	7	198	523	703	1,226	(42.7)	0	11	1	0	12	30	42
Theodore Roosevelt (16)	16	152	9	183	360	681	1,041	(34.6)	0	14	0	0	14	28	42
Stephen C. Foster (6)	0	55	0	84	139	437	576	(24.1)	0	8	0	0	8	11	19

DISTRICT: COMPTON UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 11. REPRESENTING: 11. CITY: COMPTON. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	20	12,439	68	1,656	14,183	1,518	15,701		1	280	13	17	311	346	657
Percent	0.1	79.2	0.4	10.5	90.3	9.7	100.0		0.2	2.6	2.0	2.6	47.3	52.7	100.0
Willowbrook Junior High (11)	0	1,129	2	35	1,166	0	1,166	(100.0)	0	30	0	1	31	23	54
Centennial Senior High (1)	0	2,034	2	36	2,072	0	2,072	(100.0)	0	42	2	3	47	40	87
Vanguard Junior High (8)	0	1,299	5	33	1,337	1	1,338	(99.9)	0	30	2	1	33	22	55
Bunche Junior High (5)	0	827	2	276	1,106	3	1,109	(99.7)	0	29	2	2	33	15	48
Compton Senior High (2)	1	2,615	21	121	2,758	12	2,770	(99.6)	1	47	3	5	56	68	124
Enterprise Junior High (6)	0	1,297	3	68	1,368	7	1,375	(99.5)	0	29	3	1	33	22	55
Walton Junior High (9)	0	1,228	6	49	1,283	10	1,293	(99.2)	0	27	0	0	27	26	53
Roosevelt Junior High (7)	0	973	8	213	1,194	132	1,326	(90.0)	0	24	0	1	25	28	53
Compton Senior High (3)	0	44	0	10	54	21	75	(72.0)	0	3	0	0	3	1	4
Dominguez Senior High (4)	11	736	12	539	1,298	712	2,010	(64.6)	0	11	0	2	13	68	81
Whaley Junior High (10)	7	257	7	276	547	620	1,167	(46.9)	0	8	1	1	10	33	43

DISTRICT: ENTERPRISE CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 4. REPRESENTING: 5. CITY: COMPTON. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	1	2,660	4	261	2,926	54	2,980		0	93	1	1	95	16	111
Percent	0.0	89.3	0.1	8.8	98.2	1.8	100.0		0.0	83.8	0.9	0.9	85.6	14.4	100.0
Ralph Bunche (4)	0	822	0	16	838	5	843	(99.4)	0	24	1	0	25	5	30
Mark Twain (2)	0	684	1	80	765	5	770	(99.4)	0	23	0	0	23	4	27
Mc Kinley (1)	0	588	1	33	622	12	634	(98.1)	0	25	0	1	26	2	28
Pioneer Elementary (3)	1	566	2	132	701	32	733	(95.6)	0	21	0	0	21	5	26

DISTRICT: INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. REPRESENTING: 20. CITY: INGLEWOOD COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	56	1,881	253	1,173	3,363	10,162	13,525		0	16	14	11	41	491	532
Percent	0.4	13.9	1.9	8.7	24.9	75.1	100.0		0.0	3.0	2.6	2.1	7.7	92.3	100.0
Daniel Freeman (5)	2	358	12	11	383	74	457	(83.8)	0	2	0	0	2	16	18
Warren Lane Elementary (11)	0	365	9	21	395	189	584	(67.6)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20
Clyde Woodworth (20)	4	327	16	193	540	501	1,041	(51.9)	0	1	1	0	2	27	29
Monroe Junior High (13)	3	315	17	82	417	556	973	(42.9)	0	1	1	2	4	40	44
Morningside High (14)	9	425	29	139	602	1,246	1,848	(32.6)	0	5	3	6	14	75	89
Opportunity High (16)	1	6	0	5	12	42	54	(22.2)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Oak Street (15)	7	5	11	75	98	432	530	(18.5)	0	2	1	0	3	17	20

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: INGLEWOOD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. CITY: INGLEWOOD. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES—Continued

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other		
W. Claude Hudnall (7)	0	0		5	28	33	150	183	(18.0)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Center Park (3)	7	1	23	147	178	855	1,033	(17.2)	0	2	2	3	7	27	34	
James Kew (10)	1	15	1	15	32	156	188	(17.0)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	
Centinela (1)	1	18	15	102	136	716	852	(16.0)	0	0	2	0	2	25	27	
Andrew Bennett (2)	1	20	10	18	49	270	319	(15.4)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Highland Elementary (6)	4	0	10	47	61	376	437	(14.0)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16	
Wm. H. Kelso (9)	0	2	6	28	36	310	346	(10.4)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14	
Beulah Payne (19)	7	0	2	17	26	233	259	(10.0)	0	1	0	0	1	8	6	
Crozier Junior High (4)	2	4	27	70	103	947	1,050	(9.8)	0	0	1	0	1	43	44	
Orthopedic (17)	2	1		3	7	70	77	(9.1)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Inglewood High (8)	5	8	41	157	211	2,113	2,324	(9.1)	0	0	0	0	0	98	98	
La Tijera (12)	0	7	4	14	25	324	349	(7.2)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	
Frank D. Parent (18)	0	4	14	1	19	602	621	(3.1)	0	0	2	0	2	19	21	

DISTRICT: LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 78. REPRESENTING: 78. CITY: LONG BEACH. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	60	5,489	1,222	3,840	10,611	61,454	72,065	1	86	34	28	149	2,506	2,655
Percent	0.1	7.6	1.7	5.3	14.7	85.3	100.0	0.0	3.2	1.3	1.1	5.6	94.4	100.0
Theodore Roosevelt (69)	3	679	7	37	726	174	900	(80.7)	0	7	0	1	8	22
Peter H. Burnett (32)	0	568	6	41	615	165	780	(78.8)	0	2	0	0	2	21
John G. Whittier (77)	1	587	1	62	651	199	850	(76.6)	0	10	1	0	11	22
Abraham Lincoln (54)	0	424	1	94	519	253	772	(67.2)	0	4	1	0	5	25
Benjamin Franklin (3)	0	414	7	45	466	253	719	(64.8)	0	5	0	1	6	30
James A. Garfield (42)	0	419	264	183	866	773	1,639	(52.8)	0	6	5	1	12	43
Elizabeth A. Hudson (48)	0	97	14	63	174	156	330	(52.7)	0	2	0	0	2	9
John Muir (63)	1	290	157	215	663	598	1,261	(52.6)	0	2	2	0	4	38
William Logan Stephens (13)	1	238	140	175	554	646	1,200	(46.2)	0	2	1	1	4	44
Signal Hill (70)	0	141	0	42	183	261	444	(41.2)	0	2	0	1	3	18
Robert Louis Stevenson (71)	1	106	5	60	172	317	489	(35.2)	0	2	1	0	3	12
Eugene Field (39)	0	97	38	50	185	343	528	(35.0)	0	3	1	0	4	12
Polytechnic (20)	1	614	153	256	1,024	1,905	2,929	(35.0)	0	6	2	2	10	108
Daniel Webster (76)	4	53	42	122	221	431	652	(33.9)	0	0	1	0	1	24
George Washington (14)	0	163	11	105	279	602	881	(31.7)	0	2	0	0	2	39
Avalon (24)	0	0	2	86	88	338	426	(20.7)	0	0	0	1	1	20
William Cullen Bryant (28)	7	2	1	52	62	263	325	(19.1)	0	0	0	0	0	11
Florence Nightingale (66)	1	11	3	7	22	95	117	(18.8)	0	0	0	1	1	10
Long Beach Evening High (15)	0	27	4	21	52	236	288	(18.1)	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clara Barton (25)	1	90	0	99	190	864	1,054	(18.0)	0	1	0	0	1	42
Walter H. Boyd (16)	0	29	0	6	35	165	200	(17.5)	0	0	0	0	0	13
Charles Evans Hughes (7)	0	156	8	18	182	918	1,100	(16.5)	0	2	1	1	4	44
Thomas A. Edison (37)	1	28	9	68	106	576	682	(15.5)	0	3	0	0	3	25
Will J. Reid (21)	0	32	0	2	34	194	228	(14.9)	0	1	0	0	1	12
Benjamin F. Tucker (74)	0	8	3	4	15	92	107	(14.0)	0	0	1	0	1	9
Robert E. Lee (53)	4	4	4	82	94	584	678	(13.9)	0	0	0	0	0	26
Charles A. Lindbergh (9)	5	27	5	63	100	924	1,024	(9.8)	0	1	0	0	1	44
John A. Sutter (72)	0	0	3	53	56	529	585	(9.6)	0	0	0	0	0	19
Frances E. Willard (78)	0	7	8	35	45	433	478	(9.4)	0	0	1	0	0	16
Jane Addams (23)	0	2	3	72	87	842	929	(9.4)	0	2	1	0	3	28
Ulysses S. Grant (44)	3	11	16	89	119	1,158	1,277	(9.3)	0	1	0	0	1	39
William McKinley (61)	0	18	12	49	79	791	870	(9.1)	0	1	0	0	1	28
Charles A. Buford (29)	0	7	4	27	38	386	424	(9.0)	0	0	0	0	0	16
Alice M. Birney (26)	0	3	13	31	47	478	525	(9.0)	0	0	0	0	0	17
Lafayette (52)	0	10	12	24	46	480	526	(8.7)	0	0	0	0	0	19
Thomas Starr King (51)	2	5	13	40	60	796	856	(7.0)	0	1	0	0	1	26
Oliver Wendell Holmes (47)	2	0	17	33	52	700	752	(6.9)	0	0	0	0	0	25
Luther Burbank (30)	2	2	6	31	41	598	639	(6.4)	0	1	0	0	1	25
James Monroe (62)	0	0	7	41	48	770	818	(5.9)	0	0	1	0	1	26
Douglas MacArthur (58)	3	1	7	39	50	817	867	(5.8)	0	0	1	0	1	26
John Marshall (10)	1	3	3	70	77	1,262	1,339	(5.8)	0	2	0	0	2	49
John Burroughs (33)	0	5	6	4	15	249	264	(5.7)	0	1	0	1	2	8
Hubert H. Bancroft (1)	0	1	5	73	79	1,321	1,400	(5.6)	0	0	0	0	0	53
Los Cerritos (56)	0	0	8	12	20	364	384	(5.2)	0	0	0	0	0	12
Alexander Hamilton (4)	0	10	6	49	65	1,188	1,253	(5.2)	0	0	1	1	2	47
Mark Twain (75)	0	11	8	26	45	835	880	(5.1)	0	0	0	0	0	29
James Whitcomb Riley (68)	0	0	4	36	40	761	801	(5.0)	0	0	1	0	1	27
Thomas Jefferson (8)	2	4	7	47	60	1,171	1,231	(4.9)	0	2	0	0	2	44
George Washington Carver (34)	1	0	1	31	33	654	687	(4.8)	0	0	0	1	1	20
Eugene Titcher (73)	1	6	11	38	56	1,158	1,214	(4.6)	0	1	1	0	2	37
John C. Fremont (40)	4	5	2	19	28	393	412	(4.6)	0	0	0	0	0	13
James Madison (59)	0	0	6	28	34	720	754	(4.5)	0	0	0	0	0	27
Cecil B. De Mille (2)	0	1	2	64	67	1,419	1,486	(4.5)	0	1	1	2	4	57
Henry W. Longfellow (55)	1	7	15	5	28	604	632	(4.4)	1	2	2	0	5	25
Grover Cleveland (35)	0	0	7	38	45	973	1,018	(4.4)	0	0	0	0	0	34
Ellwood P. Cubberley (36)	0	2	3	42	47	1,031	1,078	(4.4)	0	0	0	0	0	34
David Starr Jordan (17)	1	17	11	71	100	2,242	2,342	(4.3)	0	1	2	1	4	86
Leland Stanford (12)	0	0	5	59	64	1,479	1,543	(4.1)	0	0	0	1	1	58
Lakewood (18)	1	0	6	138	145	3,713	3,858	(3.8)	0	1	0	4	5	134
David Burcham (31)	0	2	2	20	24	644	668	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	22
Charles F. Kettering (50)	0	6	5	16	24	430	446	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	16
Florence Bixby (27)	0	5	1	14	20	573	593	(3.4)	0	2	0	0	2	20
Bret Harte (45)	0	1	2	21	24	690	714	(3.4)	0	0	0	0	0	23
William F. Prisk (67)	0	0	6	15	21	634	655	(3.2)	0	0	0	0	0	21
Woodrow Wilson (22)	1	16	13	67	97	2,938	3,035	(3.2)	0	1	1	2	4	112
Walter B. Hill (5)	0	6	4	23	33	1,040	1,073	(3.1)	0	0	0	0	0	45
Herbert Hoover (6)	1	0	4	29	34	1,129	1,163	(2.9)	0	0	0	0	0	44
Horace Mann (60)	0	0	3	10	14	466	480	(2.9)	0	0	0	0	0	15
Samuel Gompers (43)	0	0	3	25	28	960	988	(2.8)	0	0	1	0	1	32
Minnie Gant (4)	1	3	2	11	17	600	617	(2.8)	0	1	0	1	2	18
Douglas A. Newcomb (65)	0	0	17	7	24	917	941	(2.6)	0	0	0	0	0	32
Robert A. Millikan (19)	0	2	12	81	95	3,839	3,934	(2.4)	0	2	0	3	5	142
Helen Keller (49)	0	1	0	17	18	730	748	(2.4)	0	0	0	0	0	24
Patrick Henry (46)	0	2	4	13	19	790	809	(2.3)	0	0	1	0	1	26
Ralph Waldo Emerson (38)	1	0	6	13	13	636	649							

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total
Number.....	1,204	147,738	23,248	130,450	302,640	350,909	653,549		13	3,435	989	646	5,083	18,746	23,829
Percent.....	0.2	22.6	3.6	20.0	46.3	53.7	100.0		0.1	14.4	4.2	2.7	21.3	78.7	100.0
109th Street Elementary (354)	0	715	3	17	735	0	735	(100.0)	0	23	0	0	23	7	30
South Park Elementary (370)	1	1,212	4	20	1,237	0	1,237	(100.0)	0	33	0	1	34	10	44
South Health Center Branch Class of Widney High (153)	0	74	0	0	74	0	74	(100.0)	0	0	1	0	1	3	4
Jordan Senior High (26)	0	1,866	1	50	1,917	0	1,917	(100.0)	0	50	2	5	57	35	92
Trinity Street Elementary (313)	0	930	2	24	956	0	956	(100.0)	0	26	0	1	27	10	37
52d Street Elementary (282)	2	1,467	2	33	1,504	0	1,504	(100.0)	0	30	2	0	32	16	48
96th Street Elementary (351)	0	953	0	6	959	0	959	(100.0)	0	35	0	0	35	5	40
Carver Junior High (37)	0	2,102	0	12	2,114	0	2,114	(100.0)	0	51	3	4	58	37	95
Holmes Avenue Elementary (288)	0	685	0	11	696	0	696	(100.0)	0	16	1	8	25	0	25
Compton Avenue Elementary (324)	0	685	0	10	695	0	695	(100.0)	0	14	0	0	14	11	25
93d Street Elementary (352)	0	1,431	2	59	1,492	0	1,492	(100.0)	0	30	0	0	30	18	48
116th Street School Elementary (196)	0	772	0	11	783	0	783	(100.0)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
SE Health Ctr Brch Class of Widney High (154)	0	42	0	0	42	0	42	(100.0)	0	1	0	0	1	1	2
Garden Gate Senior High (49)	0	53	0	0	53	0	53	(100.0)	0	7	0	0	7	2	9
Weigand Ave. Elementary (376)	0	626	0	82	708	0	708	(100.0)	0	26	0	0	26	7	33
Budlong Ave. Elementary (275)	1	1,497	10	68	1,576	0	1,576	(100.0)	0	28	3	0	31	23	54
Nevin Ave. Elementary (301)	0	533	0	65	598	0	598	(100.0)	0	24	0	0	24	1	25
102nd Street Elementary (355)	1	1,316	2	80	1,399	0	1,399	(100.0)	1	42	2	0	45	6	51
92nd Street Elementary (349)	0	1,159	1	78	1,238	0	1,238	(100.0)	0	30	1	2	33	23	56
Marengo Health Center Branch Class of Widney High (152)	0	0	0	21	21	0	21	(100.0)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Markham Junior High (12)	2	2,312	0	68	2,382	1	2,383	(100.0)	0	54	4	7	65	28	93
Locke Senior High (27)	0	2,287	2	23	2,312	1	2,313	(100.0)	0	53	2	1	56	61	117
Western Ave. Elementary (320)	0	1,274	5	30	1,309	1	1,310	(99.9)	0	29	3	0	32	16	48
111th Street Elementary (353)	0	1,121	0	11	1,132	1	1,133	(99.9)	0	30	0	0	30	11	41
112th Street Elementary (357)	0	1,042	0	0	1,042	1	1,043	(99.9)	0	36	1	0	37	9	46
Fremont Senior High (23)	0	2,985	2	88	3,075	3	3,078	(99.9)	0	36	4	3	43	86	129
Drew Junior High (5)	0	1,701	2	41	1,744	2	1,746	(99.9)	0	52	3	1	56	28	84
Wadsworth Ave. Elementary (319)	0	1,182	0	11	1,193	2	1,195	(99.8)	0	28	0	0	28	14	42
Grape Street Elementary (333)	0	975	1	42	1,018	2	1,020	(99.8)	0	33	0	0	33	6	39
Ascot Avenue Elementary (273)	0	1,006	0	7	1,013	2	1,015	(99.8)	0	36	0	0	36	8	44
Gompers Junior High (9)	2	2,290	3	50	2,345	5	2,350	(99.8)	0	57	2	3	62	55	117
99th Street Elementary (348)	0	876	2	12	890	2	892	(99.8)	0	27	0	0	27	1	28
Manhattan Place Elementary (342)	0	875	4	4	883	2	885	(99.8)	0	20	0	0	20	10	30
Harte Junior High (10)	1	2,212	9	58	2,280	6	2,286	(99.7)	0	36	6	1	43	52	95
49th Street Elementary (284)	0	1,070	0	4	1,074	3	1,077	(99.7)	0	14	5	0	19	18	37
118th Street Elementary (192)	1	1,006	3	29	1,039	3	1,042	(99.7)	0	21	6	0	27	16	43
Parmelee Avenue Elementary (360)	3	1,156	0	144	1,303	4	1,307	(99.7)	0	35	3	0	38	8	46
97th Street Elementary (350)	0	1,340	8	98	1,446	5	1,451	(99.7)	0	35	3	0	38	9	47
Russell Elementary (365)	0	1,309	4	48	1,361	5	1,366	(99.6)	0	38	1	0	39	12	51
36th Street Elementary (580)	0	782	10	8	800	3	803	(99.6)	0	13	2	0	15	12	27
Hooper Avenue Elementary (289)	0	1,585	3	9	1,597	6	1,603	(99.6)	0	34	2	0	36	20	56
61st Street Elementary (308)	0	1,002	0	14	1,016	4	1,020	(99.6)	0	23	1	1	25	14	39
20th Street Elementary (314)	0	464	0	12	476	2	478	(99.6)	0	13	0	0	13	5	18
Jefferson Senior High (52)	0	2,038	4	47	2,089	9	2,098	(99.6)	0	46	3	5	54	40	94
Cienega Elementary (552)	1	1,069	21	26	1,117	5	1,122	(99.6)	0	13	1	1	15	28	43
Avonlea Gardens Elementary (160)	0	443	0	0	443	2	445	(99.6)	0	3	1	0	4	10	14
Muir Junior High (113)	1	2,118	11	34	2,164	10	2,174	(99.5)	0	55	7	3	65	41	106
Main Street Elementary (296)	2	1,205	0	14	1,221	6	1,227	(99.5)	0	22	2	0	24	18	42
Ann Street Elementary (272)	1	169	4	221	395	2	397	(99.5)	0	5	2	1	8	9	17
Foshay Junior High (108)	0	2,190	143	64	2,397	14	2,411	(99.4)	0	51	5	4	60	38	98
28th Street Elementary (315)	0	708	37	250	995	6	1,001	(99.4)	0	26	4	0	30	10	40
Bethune Junior High (35)	0	1,585	0	34	1,619	10	1,629	(99.4)	0	27	1	2	30	36	66
Edison Junior High (38)	0	1,403	1	168	1,572	10	1,582	(99.4)	0	42	3	1	46	30	76
La Salle Avenue Elementary (337)	0	1,315	16	33	1,364	9	1,373	(99.3)	0	24	2	0	26	17	43
37th Street Elementary (312)	1	1,465	13	59	1,538	11	1,549	(99.3)	0	24	6	0	30	20	50
Manchester Avenue Elementary (341)	0	1,987	7	65	2,059	16	2,075	(99.2)	0	48	0	1	49	19	68
Marvin Avenue Elementary (567)	0	1,201	46	16	1,263	10	1,273	(99.2)	0	14	2	0	16	26	42
68th Street Elementary (307)	0	1,321	3	48	1,372	11	1,383	(99.2)	0	30	0	0	30	14	44
San Pedro Street Elementary (305)	0	234	67	313	614	5	619	(99.2)	0	14	2	1	17	12	29
Ritter Elementary (364)	0	458	0	29	487	4	491	(99.2)	0	15	0	0	15	4	19
Mann Junior High (110)	1	2,274	25	36	2,336	20	2,356	(99.2)	0	48	2	1	51	33	84
Normandie Avenue Elementary (302)	1	1,309	31	35	1,376	12	1,388	(99.1)	0	34	3	0	37	11	48
Belvedere Junior High (34)	4	20	34	2,076	2,131	19	2,150	(99.1)	0	6	7	16	29	69	98
Alta Loma Elementary (536)	4	978	40	48	1,070	10	1,080	(99.1)	0	13	1	0	14	21	35
Vaughn Street Elementary (482)	0	775	0	79	854	8	862	(99.1)	0	8	1	0	9	22	31
Virginia Road Elementary (582)	0	774	39	3	816	8	824	(99.0)	0	10	0	0	10	17	27
1st Street Elementary (233)	0	0	102	695	814	8	822	(99.0)	0	5	0	2	7	19	26
Marianna Avenue Elementary (252)	0	0	0	497	497	5	502	(99.0)	0	5	1	2	8	4	12
Malabar Street Elementary (251)	4	13	46	1,308	1,371	14	1,385	(99.0)	1	3	1	6	11	36	47
Garfield Senior High (50)	1	8	110	3,403	3,522	37	3,559	(99.0)	0	9	7	24	40	123	163
Menlo Avenue Elementary (298)	1	989	33	59	1,082	12	1,094	(98.9)	0	19	2	0	21	16	37
Brooklyn Avenue Elementary (219)	1	6	5	888	900	10	910	(98.9)	0	5	3	6	14	30	44
Adams Junior High (33)	3	1,285	60	302	1,650	19	1,669	(98.9)	1	24	9	5	39	44	83
75th Street Elementary (367)	2	1,710	7	67	1,786	21	1,807	(98.8)	0	40	1	1	42	19	61
Hammel Street Elementary (242)	0	5	3	1,226	1,234	15	1,249	(98.8)	0	9	5	2	16	19	35
Manual Arts Senior High (125)	2	2,467	112	118	2,699	34	2,733	(98.8)	0	49	10	3	62	69	131
24th Street Elementary (581)	0	1,556	11	68	1,635	21	1,656	(98.7)	0	19	5	2	26	28	54
Figueroa Street Elementary (180)	2	1,087	7	71	1,167	15	1,182	(98.7)	0	14	1	0	15	22	37
Angeles Mesa Elementary (538)	0	1,011	15	32	1,058	14	1,072	(98.7)	0	9	5	1	15	18	33
107th Street Elementary (356)	0	1,460	1	33	1,494	20	1,514	(98.7)	0						

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—							Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other		
Filmore Street Elementary (447)	1	911	3	31	946	18	964	(98.1)	0	9	0	0	9	27	36	
Ford Boulevard Elementary (234)	0	0	2	1,303	1,305	25	1,330	(98.1)	0	4	5	3	12	30	42	
Sixty-Sixth Street Elementary (309)	1	1,227	4	31	1,263	25	1,288	(98.1)	0	32	1	1	34	14	48	
Seventy-Fourth Street Elementary (368)	0	1,148	14	19	1,181	24	1,205	(98.0)	0	14	1	2	17	22	39	
Eastman Avenue Elementary (228)	0	0	4	1,447	1,451	32	1,483	(97.8)	0	8	4	10	22	29	51	
Harrison Elementary (243)	1	8	11	964	984	22	1,005	(97.8)	0	8	5	1	14	23	37	
Evergreen Avenue Elementary (231)	5	2	40	1,057	1,104	26	1,130	(97.7)	0	1	8	4	13	29	42	
Ninety-Fifth Street Elementary (347)	3	1,647	11	120	1,781	42	1,823	(97.7)	0	23	2	0	25	32	57	
Hollenbeck Junior High (40)	9	293	139	1,973	2,414	59	2,473	(97.6)	0	10	14	11	35	71	106	
Roosevelt Senior High (57)	12	218	248	2,766	3,244	92	3,336	(97.2)	0	10	10	16	36	102	138	
Burnside Avenue Elementary (546)	0	936	32	15	983	28	1,011	(97.2)	0	10	0	0	10	22	32	
Graham Elementary (332)	9	490	7	647	1,153	33	1,186	(97.2)	0	24	2	0	26	12	38	
Dublin Avenue Elementary (557)	1	449	191	16	657	19	676	(97.2)	0	4	6	0	10	12	22	
City Terrace Elementary (222)	0	0	23	718	741	22	763	(97.1)	0	4	2	8	14	9	23	
Bridge Street Elementary (218)	0	4	9	453	466	14	480	(97.1)	0	2	0	2	4	11	17	
Ramona Senior High (56)	0	9	0	57	66	2	68	(97.1)	0	5	5	1	15	2	10	
Humphreys Avenue Elementary (245)	0	3	3	1,077	1,083	33	1,116	(97.0)	0	9	5	2	15	31	36	
Lorena Street Elementary (249)	0	2	33	975	1,010	31	1,041	(97.0)	0	5	5	2	12	24	36	
Raymond Avenue Elementary (363)	0	1,538	15	47	1,600	50	1,650	(97.0)	0	28	0	0	29	27	56	
Arlington Heights Elementary (539)	0	747	147	63	957	31	988	(96.9)	0	9	4	1	14	19	33	
Soto Street Elementary (266)	0	4	6	395	405	14	419	(96.7)	0	0	0	3	3	12	15	
Dorsey Senior High (120)	0	1,738	912	29	2,779	81	2,860	(96.5)	0	23	8	5	36	70	105	
Sheridan Street Elementary (262)	0	0	47	1,068	1,145	41	1,186	(96.5)	0	5	4	2	11	28	39	
Utah Street Elementary (268)	4	727	2	546	1,279	47	1,326	(96.5)	0	12	1	4	17	27	44	
Stevenson Junior High (44)	1	3	32	1,842	1,891	71	1,962	(96.4)	0	10	6	15	31	29	60	
Griffin Avenue Elementary (241)	1	3	11	446	461	18	479	(96.2)	0	2	1	0	3	16	19	
Woodcrest Elementary (212)	5	1,626	5	95	1,731	72	1,803	(96.0)	0	16	5	1	22	35	57	
Washington Senior High (31)	0	2,405	84	164	2,653	122	2,765	(95.9)	0	29	3	6	38	89	127	
59th Street Elementary (329)	0	896	9	25	930	40	970	(95.9)	0	12	4	0	16	14	30	
Gates Street Elementary (237)	1	1	49	772	823	37	860	(95.7)	0	0	5	4	9	19	28	
Century Park Elementary (170)	0	1,042	7	26	1,075	50	1,125	(95.5)	0	13	1	0	14	23	37	
Castelar Elementary (276)	0	3	390	183	576	27	603	(95.5)	0	3	3	0	6	14	20	
Hillside Elementary (244)	0	2	10	483	495	24	519	(95.4)	0	4	0	0	4	12	16	
Lincoln Senior High (53)	36	57	93	2,683	2,869	141	3,010	(95.3)	0	6	10	13	29	122	151	
Flowers Avenue Elementary (331)	1	111	4	930	1,046	53	1,099	(95.2)	0	12	2	0	14	22	36	
West Vernon Avenue Elementary (321)	1	822	5	64	892	47	939	(95.0)	0	25	3	0	28	13	41	
Riggis Elementary (257)	0	10	0	837	847	45	892	(95.0)	0	7	4	6	17	19	36	
Griffith Junior High (39)	2	5	97	1,610	1,714	92	1,806	(94.9)	0	6	8	11	25	60	85	
Coliseum Street Elementary (555)	0	147	426	1	574	31	605	(94.9)	0	4	0	0	4	14	18	
Huntington Drive Elementary (246)	1	15	3	749	768	43	811	(94.7)	0	4	0	0	4	23	27	
Soland Avenue Elementary (265)	0	0	58	125	183	11	194	(94.3)	0	1	1	0	2	6	8	
Hillcrest Drive Elementary (563)	1	1,019	27	19	1,066	65	1,131	(94.3)	0	11	0	1	12	24	36	
Murchison Street Elementary (256)	6	74	11	1,152	1,243	77	1,320	(94.2)	0	16	5	4	25	34	59	
Audubon Junior High (103)	0	1,492	489	32	2,013	126	2,139	(94.1)	0	22	5	2	29	37	86	
Glen Alta Elementary (239)	0	22	12	362	396	28	424	(94.1)	0	2	0	0	2	12	14	
Lillian Street Elementary (292)	7	118	4	458	587	43	630	(93.2)	0	9	3	0	12	14	26	
Cortez Street Elementary (279)	7	17	57	955	1,036	80	1,116	(92.8)	0	5	6	1	12	26	38	
Robert Hill Lane (247)	0	0	167	177	344	27	371	(92.7)	0	0	1	0	1	10	11	
McKinley Avenue Elementary (343)	2	1,020	3	30	1,055	83	1,138	(92.7)	0	26	2	0	28	10	38	
Magnolia Avenue Elementary (295)	6	154	74	780	1,014	84	1,098	(92.3)	0	5	5	1	11	27	38	
2d Street Elementary (251)	31	108	23	602	764	67	831	(91.9)	0	4	3	1	8	20	28	
Norwood Street Elementary (303)	4	204	9	426	643	62	705	(91.2)	0	7	4	0	11	12	23	
Hyde Park Elementary (335)	2	695	11	35	743	72	815	(91.2)	0	15	2	0	17	9	26	
4th Street Elementary (235)	0	0	22	1,004	1,026	102	1,128	(91.0)	0	5	3	2	10	24	34	
Nightingale Junior High (45)	5	65	186	1,058	1,314	131	1,445	(90.9)	0	9	4	3	16	56	72	
El Sereno Elementary (229)	0	10	5	768	783	82	865	(90.5)	0	2	5	0	7	20	27	
Aragon Avenue Elementary (215)	4	2	6	626	638	69	707	(90.2)	0	0	1	0	2	18	20	
Windsor Hills Elementary (590)	0	662	32	7	701	77	778	(90.1)	0	5	1	0	6	17	23	
Vermont Avenue Elementary (317)	2	806	28	228	1,064	123	1,187	(89.6)	0	19	2	1	22	17	39	
Multnomah Street Elementary (255)	1	0	50	319	370	45	415	(89.2)	0	5	0	1	6	10	16	
54th Street Elementary (559)	0	661	49	29	739	90	829	(89.1)	0	8	1	0	9	17	26	
Wilmington Park Elementary (211)	0	180	9	759	948	119	1,067	(88.8)	0	2	4	2	7	29	36	
Farmdale Elementary (232)	0	4	112	672	788	99	887	(88.8)	0	4	1	0	5	41	46	
Pacoima Elementary (467)	4	752	9	587	1,352	171	1,523	(88.8)	0	3	2	0	5	37	42	
West Athens Elementary (209)	5	915	118	112	1,150	146	1,296	(88.7)	0	3	0	1	4	23	27	
Jackson Senior High (51)	1	46	1	162	210	28	238	(88.2)	0	3	0	1	4	23	27	
Loreto Street Elementary (250)	2	1	12	452	467	66	533	(87.6)	0	1	2	3	6	12	18	
Hobart Boulevard Elementary (287)	1	298	263	392	954	140	1,094	(87.2)	0	10	6	0	16	19	35	
10th Street Elementary (310)	25	9	22	627	683	103	786	(86.9)	0	7	2	4	13	19	32	
McDonnell Avenue Crippled Elementary (137)	0	31	9	109	149	24	173	(86.1)	0	5	0	0	5	9	14	
Queen Anne Place Elementary (572)	0	172	146	80	398	66	464	(85.8)	0	3	1	0	4	11	15	
Dorris Place Elementary (226)	0	3	79	393	475	79	554	(85.7)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17	
32d Street Elementary (311)	1	192	43	162	398	67	465	(85.6)	0	4	1	0	5	10	15	
Ross Senior High (58)	1	19	0	8	28	5	33	(84.8)	0	2	1	0	3	6	9	
San Fernando Elementary (473)	0	15	5	830	850	153	1,003	(84.7)	0	1	0	3	4	32	36	
Los Angeles Senior High (124)	6	1,862	481	310	2,659	481	3,140	(84.7)	0	23	10	3	36	107	143	
Broadway Elementary (544)	3	457	0	318	778	142	920	(84.6)	0	3	0	1	4	30	34	
Berendo Junior High (105)	4	228	156	684	1,072	202	1,274	(84.1)	0	15	7	5	27	29	56	
Wilson Senior High (59)	3	28	262	2,980	3,548	568	3,548	(84.0)	0	6	14	7	27	120	147	
Telfair Avenue (479)	3	130	21	812	966	206	1,172	(82.4)	0	1	0	0	1	35	36	
Sierra Park Elementary (263)	4	4	33	959	1,000	219	1,219	(82.0)	0	2	1	6	9	29	38	
Dacotah Street Elementary (223)	2	37	10	679	728	163	891	(81.7)	0	1	5	5	11	20	31	
Belmont Senior High (45)	19	131	442	1,572	2,164	489	2,65									

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Haddon Avenue Elementary (451)	1	33	7	891	932	308	1,240	(75.2)	1	0	0	0	1	39	40
Wilshire Crest Elementary (588)	0	392	59	31	482	160	642	(75.1)	0	3	2	0	5	15	20
Clay Junior High (3)	9	1,228	185	194	1,616	537	2,153	(75.1)	0	14	8	2	24	69	93
Omelvey Elementary (465)	1	43	8	591	643	214	857	(75.0)	0	1	1	3	5	26	31
Pasteur Junior High (115)	0	1,067	65	32	1,164	430	1,594	(73.0)	0	14	7	1	22	48	70
Normont Elementary Normonte (191)	6	232	34	267	539	204	743	(72.5)	0	6	4	1	11	22	33
Westminster Avenue Elementary (586)	8	410	5	306	729	277	1,006	(72.5)	0	3	1	1	5	31	36
Virgil Junior High (117)	6	86	136	903	1,131	430	1,561	(72.5)	0	9	8	3	20	42	62
Nora Sterry Elementary (578)	1	0	193	207	401	162	563	(71.2)	0	0	2	0	2	17	19
Hoover Street Elementary (290)	8	23	79	297	407	165	572	(71.2)	0	3	4	0	7	11	18
Bandini Branch Elementary (162)	0	63	6	148	217	89	306	(70.9)	0	0	1	0	1	10	11
Barton Hill Elementary (163)	3	248	42	416	709	292	1,001	(70.8)	0	3	0	2	5	29	34
San Fernando Senior High (98)	6	727	61	1,174	1,968	866	2,834	(69.4)	0	3	0	5	8	102	110
Joseph Pomeroy Widney Crippled High (147)	4	207	14	149	374	169	543	(68.9)	0	13	2	0	15	26	41
Hawaiian Avenue Elementary (186)	1	150	174	502	827	386	1,213	(68.2)	0	4	3	4	11	31	42
C.Morley Sallery Crippled Elementary (142)	0	125	9	27	161	76	237	(67.9)	0	2	2	1	5	15	20
Lockwood Avenue Elementary (293)	1	97	100	157	355	169	524	(67.7)	0	1	2	1	4	12	16
San Fernando Junior High (81)	0	359	24	855	1,238	615	1,853	(66.8)	0	7	1	5	13	66	79
Middleton Street Elementary (344)	2	0	10	533	545	272	817	(66.7)	0	2	0	0	2	24	26
Elysian Heights Elementary (281)	1	13	57	246	317	159	476	(66.6)	0	0	1	2	3	11	14
Marlton Deaf Elementary & Junior High (135)	0	112	15	65	192	98	290	(66.2)	0	6	1	0	7	32	39
Commonwealth Avenue Elementary (278)	3	19	71	266	359	187	546	(65.8)	0	3	1	3	7	10	17
Mayberry Street Elementary (297)	0	2	40	179	221	116	337	(65.6)	0	1	2	1	4	6	10
Cimarron Avenue Elementary (172)	0	466	31	25	522	284	806	(64.8)	0	4	2	0	6	23	29
Glassell Park Elementary (238)	0	6	26	440	472	258	730	(64.7)	0	1	1	0	2	22	24
McLay Junior High (68)	1	674	12	274	961	529	1,490	(64.5)	0	4	1	1	6	58	64
Huntington Park Senior High (25)	15	177	16	1,032	1,240	712	1,952	(63.5)	0	3	1	4	8	76	84
Gardena Elementary (182)	4	237	229	139	609	351	960	(63.4)	0	2	6	1	9	23	32
Venice Health Ctr. Branch Windey High (155)	0	10	0	2	12	7	19	(63.2)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Crescent Heights Boulevard Elementary (556)	0	377	22	23	422	248	670	(63.0)	0	6	0	1	6	16	22
Bandini Street Elementary (161)	0	63	7	173	243	147	390	(62.3)	0	1	0	1	3	9	12
Orthopaedic Hosp. Brch. Class of Wash. Blvd. (146)	0	4	0	9	13	8	21	(61.9)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Allesandro Elementary (271)	1	4	18	286	309	194	503	(61.4)	0	2	3	0	5	10	15
Denker Avenue Elementary (175)	1	4	537	310	852	549	1,401	(60.8)	0	1	10	0	11	33	44
Braddock Avenue Elementary (322)	4	86	86	424	600	423	1,023	(58.7)	0	3	2	0	5	29	34
Gage Junior High (8)	5	38	13	809	865	614	1,479	(58.5)	0	5	3	4	12	45	57
Broadacres Avenue Elementary (165)	0	424	17	62	503	360	863	(58.3)	0	7	5	0	12	16	28
Amestoy Elementary (158)	0	2	355	114	471	345	816	(57.7)	0	0	7	0	7	11	18
Peary Junior High (14)	6	531	801	354	1,692	1,361	3,053	(55.4)	0	9	12	3	24	93	117
Baldwin Hills Elementary (540)	1	271	205	64	541	445	986	(54.9)	0	4	2	1	7	24	31
Banning Senior High (19)	11	249	75	918	1,253	1,048	2,301	(54.5)	0	4	3	7	14	89	103
Micheltorena Street Elementary (299)	0	13	171	251	435	369	804	(54.1)	0	1	6	1	8	17	25
Clifford Elementary (277)	0	3	17	123	143	122	265	(54.0)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
153d Street Elementary (195)	2	50	190	85	327	279	606	(54.0)	0	0	2	0	2	22	24
Sharp Avenue Elementary (475)	3	33	12	623	671	579	1,250	(53.7)	0	1	0	0	1	37	38
Annalee Avenue Elementary (159)	0	262	52	55	369	327	696	(53.0)	0	6	2	0	8	15	23
Cabrillo Avenue Elementary (166)	1	27	17	353	398	355	753	(52.9)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
Fletcher Drive Elementary (283)	16	0	20	267	303	272	575	(52.7)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Wilton Place Elementary (589)	0	113	75	62	250	225	475	(52.6)	0	3	0	1	4	11	15
Fries Avenue Elementary (181)	4	20	39	556	619	592	1,211	(51.1)	0	1	0	0	1	42	43
Short Avenue Elementary (368)	1	5	244	337	587	567	1,154	(50.9)	0	0	4	0	4	30	34
Shriners Hospital Branch Class of Washington Boulevard (145)	0	1	0	12	13	13	26	(50.0)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Wilmington Health Center Branch Windey High (156)	0	6	1	4	11	11	22	(50.0)	0	1	0	0	1	1	2
Gardena Senior High (24)	5	457	733	368	1,563	1,571	3,134	(49.9)	0	3	8	5	16	113	129
Francis Blend Blind Elementary (130)	0	37	5	21	63	64	127	(49.6)	0	2	1	0	3	12	15
Stoner Avenue Elementary (373)	4	122	83	341	550	560	1,110	(49.5)	0	5	1	1	7	28	35
Wilmington Junior High (17)	6	105	52	907	1,070	1,093	2,163	(49.5)	0	4	3	2	9	74	83
135th Street Elementary (197)	2	52	174	169	397	406	803	(49.4)	0	1	4	0	5	20	25
King Junior High (42)	4	63	278	603	948	982	1,930	(49.1)	0	2	5	0	7	68	75
Gulf Avenue Elementary (183)	7	6	52	657	722	749	1,471	(49.1)	0	2	3	1	6	41	47
Monte Vista Street Elementary (253)	4	1	10	272	287	299	586	(49.0)	0	4	0	1	5	13	18
Leapwood Avenue (187)	0	109	176	112	397	416	813	(48.8)	0	1	5	0	6	19	25
Bushnell Way Elementary (221)	0	2	39	247	288	302	590	(48.8)	0	0	1	0	1	16	17
Aldama Elementary (213)	0	2	10	262	274	300	574	(47.7)	0	3	1	0	4	16	20
Montague Street Elementary (461)	0	11	42	408	461	514	975	(47.3)	0	2	0	0	2	35	37
Irving Junior High (41)	3	8	49	565	625	697	1,322	(47.3)	0	1	3	3	7	47	54
Loma Vista Avenue Elementary (339)	12	1	5	355	373	424	797	(46.8)	0	0	1	1	2	23	25
Pacoima Junior High (76)	5	64	40	836	945	1,076	2,021	(46.8)	0	3	5	3	11	74	85
Alexandria Avenue Elementary (379)	5	22	45	238	310	363	673	(46.1)	0	1	0	1	2	18	20
Glenfeliz Boulevard Elementary (286)	2	1	13	216	232	275	507	(45.8)	0	2	1	0	3	14	17
Childrens Hospital & Rehabilitation Center (141)	0	10	3	7	20	24	44	(45.5)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
186th Street Elementary (193)	0	2	376	201	579	695	1,274	(45.4)	0	1	9	0	10	30	40
Playa Del Rey Elementary (362)	0	10	146	79	235	284	519	(45.3)	0	0	2	0	2	14	16
Atwater Avenue Elementary (274)	1	1	27	201	230	278	508	(45.3)	0	0	3	0	3	15	18
Brocton Avenue Elementary (545)	2	3	100	140	245	306	551	(44.5)	0	1	3	0	4	15	19
Cooper Senior High (22)	0	2	0	18	20	25	45	(44.4)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Marina Del Rey Junior High (11)	4	78	245	392	719	904	1,623	(44.3)	0	2	0	2	4	59	63
Franklin Senior High (48)	6	10	42	841	899	1,153	2,052	(43.8)	0	0	6	6	12	78	90
Sylvan Park Elementary (425)	3	4	3	214	224	291	515	(43.5)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Pacoima Health Center Branch Class Miller High (139)	0	11	0	2	13	17	30	(43.3)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Aggeler Senior High (87)	2	12	0	26	40	54	94	(42.6)	0	1	0	0	1	9	10
15th Street Elementary (179)	2	6	29	333	370	519	889	(41.6)	0	0	0	2	2	26	28
Marshall Senior High (54)	2	47	338	518	905	1,308	2,213	(40.9)	0	1	3	3	7	83	90
El Dorado Avenue Elementary (443)	0	3													

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Morningside Elementary (462)	3	15	5	241	264	433	697	(37.9)	0	1	2	0	3	18	21
Dyer Street Elementary (442)	2	3	7	405	417	685	1,102	(37.8)	0	1	1	1	3	32	35
Carnegie Junior High (2)	1	284	122	397	804	1,323	2,127	(37.8)	0	3	4	2	9	72	81
Airport Junior High (1)	1	392	38	48	479	796	1,275	(37.6)	0	2	1	0	3	46	49
Stanford Avenue Elementary (371)	6	1	6	284	297	494	791	(37.5)	0	2	1	0	3	21	24
Harlan Shoemaker (143)	0	4	4	60	68	115	183	(37.2)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Catskill Avenue Elementary (169)	2	6	57	562	627	1,080	1,707	(36.7)	0	0	3	2	5	48	53
Miles Avenue Elementary (345)	2	1	15	346	364	648	1,012	(36.0)	0	1	1	0	2	27	29
Park Western Place Elementary (199)	8	29	21	218	276	509	785	(35.2)	0	1	1	1	3	22	25
Liberty Boulevard Elementary (338)	6	0	6	226	238	442	680	(35.0)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Annandale Elementary (214)	2	6	12	129	149	289	438	(34.0)	0	0	1	2	3	90	93
Dana Junior High (4)	8	165	40	583	796	1,554	2,350	(33.9)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Mary E. Bennett Deaf Elementary (129)	0	3	8	36	47	94	141	(33.3)	0	0	2	0	2	19	21
Coeur Dalene Elementary (554)	2	2	12	201	217	434	651	(32.8)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Richland Avenue Elementary (573)	0	0	56	123	179	356	545	(32.6)	0	1	3	2	6	133	139
Venice Senior High (128)	12	235	247	662	1,156	2,386	3,542	(32.6)	0	4	0	2	6	17	23
Fishburn Avenue Elementary (330)	7	4	6	113	126	248	388	(32.5)	0	0	0	0	2	13	15
Santa Monica Boulevard Elementary (419)	3	0	12	179	193	404	597	(32.3)	0	0	1	1	2	16	18
Buchanan Street Elementary (220)	4	1	110	214	330	695	1,025	(32.2)	0	7	4	1	12	22	34
Towne Avenue Elementary (206)	5	0	35	219	258	544	802	(32.2)	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
Roscoe Elementary (418)	4	0	56	289	345	728	1,073	(32.2)	0	2	7	1	10	23	33
Van Deene Avenue Elementary (208)	1	2	3	159	165	353	518	(31.9)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Van Nuys Elementary (430)	3	9	0	8	20	44	64	(31.3)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Booth Memorial Salvation Army Home (148)															
Bonita Street Elementary (164)	5	1	67	338	411	910	1,321	(31.1)	0	3	3	1	7	34	41
Los Feliz Elementary (409)	0	20	55	86	161	357	518	(31.1)	0	0	1	0	1	17	18
Shriners Hospital Branch Class Widney High (151)	0	0	1	3	4	9	13	(30.8)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Carson Street Elementary (168)	3	10	70	363	446	1,011	1,457	(30.6)	0	0	4	1	5	43	48
Webster Junior High (118)	2	98	183	196	479	1,086	1,565	(30.6)	0	2	2	1	5	53	58
Dodson Junior High (5)	0	127	52	382	561	1,274	1,835	(30.6)	0	1	9	1	11	60	71
Corona Avenue Elementary (325)	20	1	6	330	357	818	1,175	(30.4)	0	0	1	0	1	14	15
156th Street Elementary (194)	0	0	94	36	130	306	436	(29.8)	0	0	0	0	3	21	24
Garvanza Elementary (236)	0	1	9	230	240	565	805	(29.8)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Ivanhoe Elementary (291)	0	6	86	30	122	294	416	(29.3)	0	0	4	0	4	16	20
Chapman Elementary (171)	2	0	108	74	184	474	658	(28.0)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Selma Avenue Elementary (421)	2	4	8	68	82	213	296	(27.8)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Fenton Avenue Elementary (445)	3	181	17	109	310	807	1,117	(27.8)	0	2	1	0	3	31	34
San Pascual Avenue Elementary (260)	0	4	18	99	117	258	357	(27.7)	0	0	1	0	1	11	12
Heliopole Avenue Elementary (334)	8	1	9	169	187	491	678	(27.6)	0	0	0	1	1	21	22
Carson Senior High (21)	27	35	202	547	811	2,133	2,944	(27.5)	1	2	7	5	15	85	100
James J. McBride Crippled Elementary (136)	1	25	6	19	51	136	187	(27.3)	0	1	1	0	2	13	15
Burroughs Junior High (106)	0	342	125	62	529	1,423	1,952	(27.1)	0	4	3	1	8	65	73
Victoria Avenue Elementary (375)	2	0	3	203	208	564	772	(26.9)	0	0	1	0	1	23	24
San Pedro Senior High (29)	7	130	55	564	756	2,081	2,837	(26.6)	0	2	2	4	8	96	104
Vine Street Elementary (432)	2	15	17	101	135	372	507	(26.6)	0	0	1	2	2	14	16
Hart Street Elementary (506)	4	1	9	236	250	707	957	(26.1)	0	0	0	0	2	30	32
Cahuenga Elementary (385)	2	4	33	83	122	347	469	(26.0)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
South Gate Junior High (15)	7	94	8	467	576	1,658	2,234	(25.8)	0	4	2	1	7	78	85
White Junior High (16)	2	4	132	597	735	2,144	2,879	(25.5)	0	1	6	4	11	98	109
Toland Way Elementary (267)	2	0	32	149	183	538	721	(25.4)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Haldale Avenue Elementary (184)	0	11	116	100	227	670	897	(25.3)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29
Nimitz Junior High (13)	21	6	10	455	492	1,456	1,948	(25.3)	0	4	1	4	9	66	75
Charles Leroy Lowman Crippled Elementary Grades (134)	0	11	2	57	70	211	281	(24.9)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Emerson Manor Elementary (328)	1	66	2	20	89	273	362	(24.6)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Grant Elementary (400)	3	3	12	91	109	335	444	(24.5)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Sylmar Senior High (99)	2	105	21	493	621	1,913	2,534	(24.5)	0	0	3	4	7	92	99
Arminia Street Elementary (381)	3	3	39	159	204	632	836	(24.4)	0	0	0	1	1	25	26
Fernangeles Elementary (446)	2	6	50	170	228	707	935	(24.4)	0	1	0	0	1	26	27
Meyler Street Elementary (190)	2	1	69	279	351	1,102	1,453	(24.2)	0	0	0	0	0	44	44
232nd Place Elementary (207)	5	1	42	204	252	799	1,051	(24.0)	0	2	3	1	6	26	32
Purche Avenue Elementary (202)	1	123	88	45	257	818	1,075	(23.9)	0	2	3	2	7	27	34
Van Ness Avenue Elementary (429)	0	5	32	76	113	360	473	(23.9)	0	1	1	0	2	15	17
Harbor City Elementary (185)	5	2	22	171	197	628	825	(23.9)	0	0	0	2	2	25	27
S. Gate Senior High (30)	2	64	10	346	425	1,360	1,785	(23.8)	0	1	3	6	10	67	77
Dolores Street Elementary (175)	4	19	56	309	386	1,255	1,641	(23.5)	0	0	7	0	7	45	52
Narbonne Senior High (28)	2	98	105	386	593	1,933	2,526	(23.5)	0	2	5	2	9	101	110
Eagle Rock Senior High (47)	3	9	45	487	543	1,784	2,327	(23.3)	0	2	3	1	6	88	94
Camellia Avenue Elementary (386)	2	4	28	184	219	720	939	(23.3)	0	0	1	0	1	29	30
Fleming Junior High (7)	5	106	90	289	490	1,644	2,134	(23.0)	0	5	6	1	12	70	82
Oscheola Elementary (466)	0	10	23	106	139	470	609	(22.8)	0	2	0	1	3	16	19
Le Conte Junior High (109)	3	48	63	244	358	1,229	1,587	(22.6)	0	3	5	1	9	64	73
Lankershim Elementary (406)	2	5	5	102	114	393	507	(22.5)	0	1	1	0	2	18	20
Caroidale Avenue Elementary (167)	1	1	53	170	225	803	1,028	(21.9)	0	0	6	1	7	25	32
Park Avenue Elementary (359)	18	0	4	198	220	797	1,017	(21.6)	0	0	1	0	1	33	34
Point Fermin Elementary (200)	3	11	21	79	114	418	532	(21.4)	0	0	0	1	1	15	16
Walgrove Avenue Elementary (583)	0	3	22	280	305	1,126	1,431	(21.3)	0	1	0	1	2	15	16
Bell Senior High (20)	11	7	8	299	325	1,200	1,525	(21.3)	0	2	1	2	5	66	71
State Street Elementary (372)	4	0	7	163	174	648	822	(21.2)	0	0	3	0	3	23	26
Gridley Street Elementary (450)	0	2	5	140	147	549	696	(21.1)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Elizabeth Street Elementary (327)	27	0	20	316	363	1,380	1,743	(20.8)	1	3	1	1	6	48	54
Sun Valley Junior High (84)	5	7	46	311	369	1,418	1,787	(20.6)	1	0	1	2	4	63	67
St. Anns Maternity Home (150)	0	6	0	13	19	50	63	(20.6)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Olive Vista Junior High (75)	8	4	30	424	466	1,843	2,309	(20.2)	0	3	2	0	5	80	85
Charnock Road Elementary (551)	3	1	29	116	149	590	739	(20.2)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Woodlawn Avenue Elementary (378)	9	1	4	167	181	853	1,034	(17.5)	1	1	0	1	3	29	32
Beethoven Street Elementary (541)	2	1	20	138	161	772	933	(17.3)	0	2	0	0	2	24	26
Oxnard Street Elementary (412)	1	3	12	174	190	929	1,119	(17.0)	0	1	0	0	1	34	35
Anchorage Street Elementary (537)	3	1	7	58	69	338	407	(17.0)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Dominguez Elementary (177)	3	0	10	119	132	648	780	(16.9)	0	1	0	0	2	22	24
Victory Boulevard Elementary (431)	2	2	12	134	150	750	900	(16.7)	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
University Senior High (127)	6	44	230	227	507	2,559	3,066	(16.5)	0	3	3	1	7	107	114
Brainard Avenue (437)	1	36	12	64	113	590	703	(16.1)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Francis Polytechnic Senior High (92)	8	9	109	473	599	3,136	3,735	(16.0)	0	4	4	8	16	135	151
Fair Avenue Elementary (396)	1	2	5	141	149	783	932	(16.0)	0	0	1	0	1	27	28
Sylmar Elementary (478)	0	5	21	111	137	722	859	(15.9)	0	1	1	0	2	25	27
Beachy Avenue Elementary (436)	4	1	9	119	133	703	836	(15.9)	0	0	0	1	1	25	26
Glenwood Elementary (399)	0	0	13	151	164	878	1,042	(15.7)	1	1	0	0	2	30	32
Rockdale Elementary (258)	0	0	4	41	45	241	286	(15.7)	0	0	1	0	1	8	9
Leland Street Elementary (188)	0	2	19	103	124	668	792	(15.7)	0	1	1	0	2	23	25
Ve na Avenue Elementary (483)	2	9	4	102	117	633	750	(15.6)	0	0	0	1	1	22	23
San Gabriel Avenue Elementary (366)	0	0	0	85	85	474	559	(15.2)	0	1	0	0	0	16	17
Noble Avenue Elementary (464)	0	3	4	125	132	743	875	(15.1)	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
Lomita Elementary (189)	1	1	24	161	187	1,053	1,240	(15.1)	0	0	0	0	0	39	39
Liggett Street Elementary (459)	3	1	8	82	94	537	631	(14.9)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Tweedy Elementary (374)	11	1	1	59	71	406	477	(14.9)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Mar Vista Elementary (568)	1	75	16	49	141	822	963	(14.6)	0	1	2	0	3	29	32
Byrd Junior High (61)	0	2	53	162	223	1,305	1,528	(14.6)	1	1	0	3	5	55	60
Palms Elementary (571)	0	0	9	58	67	399	466	(14.4)	0	0	1	0	1	14	15
Overland Avenue Elementary (569)	0	53	10	78	139	809	948	(13.9)	0	2	1	0	3	15	18
Shenandoah Street Elementary (576)	0	60	14	55	129	899	938	(13.8)	0	1	0	0	2	26	28
Vinedale Elementary (484)	3	0	10	44	57	360	417	(13.7)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Florence Crittendon Maternity Home (149)	0	2	1	2	5	32	37	(13.5)	0	1	0	0	0	3	3
Hancock Park Elementary (562)	0	72	13	8	93	596	689	(13.5)	0	1	0	0	1	20	21
Grand View Boulevard Elementary (561)	4	3	38	95	140	903	1,043	(13.4)	0	2	2	0	4	30	34
Van Nuys Junior High (86)	3	8	15	189	215	1,391	1,606	(13.4)	0	0	0	0	0	66	66
Laurel Elementary (565)	0	51	6	44	101	670	771	(13.1)	0	2	1	0	3	20	23
Burton Street Elementary (384)	0	1	1	45	47	315	362	(13.0)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Paseo Del Rey Elementary (361)	0	60	12	17	89	622	711	(12.5)	0	0	2	0	2	21	23
Eagle Rock Elementary (227)	1	0	22	76	99	704	803	(12.3)	0	1	1	0	2	25	27
Clover Avenue Elementary (553)	0	18	25	29	72	524	596	(12.1)	0	4	0	1	5	15	20
Coldwater Canyon Avenue Elementary (391)	1	2	9	116	128	950	1,078	(11.9)	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Taper Avenue Elementary (205)	0	64	35	70	169	1,257	1,426	(11.9)	0	1	3	1	5	35	40
Plummer Elementary (471)	0	16	11	42	69	514	583	(11.8)	0	0	1	0	1	17	18
Harding Street Elementary (452)	0	11	17	42	70	547	617	(11.3)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Eshelman Avenue Elementary (178)	0	6	27	71	104	825	929	(11.2)	0	2	0	0	2	30	32
Hubbard Street Elementary (455)	4	9	20	128	161	1,323	1,484	(10.8)	0	4	1	1	6	39	45
Canterbury Avenue Elementary (438)	1	0	38	97	136	1,124	1,260	(10.8)	0	0	1	0	1	38	39
Rosewood Avenue Elementary (575)	0	24	7	22	53	442	495	(10.7)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Reseda Elementary (522)	1	0	8	69	78	654	732	(10.7)	0	0	1	0	1	21	22
Wright Junior High (18)	3	126	20	23	172	1,492	1,664	(10.3)	0	0	0	0	0	63	63
Vintage Street Elementary (485)	1	3	6	97	107	931	1,038	(10.3)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33
Gardner Street Elementary (397)	1	9	10	49	69	611	680	(10.1)	0	1	4	0	1	20	21
Palms Junior High (114)	0	97	11	52	160	1,438	1,598	(10.0)	0	1	4	3	8	45	53
Emerson Junior High (107)	0	116	33	33	182	1,637	1,819	(10.0)	0	0	2	0	2	65	67
Strathern Street Elementary (424)	1	0	18	73	92	849	941	(9.8)	0	3	0	0	3	26	29
Cantara Street Elementary (493)	4	3	5	89	101	938	1,039	(9.7)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31
Cheremoya Avenue Elementary (389)	0	17	15	23	55	512	567	(9.7)	0	1	2	0	3	15	18
Joaquin Miller Crippled High (138)	0	2	1	19	22	206	228	(9.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Cohasset Street Elementary (309)	0	0	9	41	50	471	521	(9.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Toluca Lake Elementary (426)	2	6	10	62	80	755	835	(9.6)	0	0	0	1	1	24	25
Pinewood Avenue Elementary (469)	2	2	9	83	96	925	1,021	(9.4)	0	0	2	0	2	30	32
White Point Elementary (210)	1	1	10	40	52	512	564	(9.2)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Chatsworth Park Elementary (495)	1	3	8	48	60	597	657	(9.1)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
98th Street Elementary (346)	0	2	5	19	26	266	292	(8.9)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Bancroft Junior High (104)	1	14	27	102	144	1,507	1,651	(8.7)	0	3	7	1	11	55	66
Roscomare Road Elementary (574)	4	23	17	1	45	472	517	(8.7)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16
Columbus Junior High (61)	1	5	22	174	202	2,119	2,321	(8.7)	0	0	1	1	2	83	85
Fairfax Senior High (121)	0	133	38	77	248	2,618	2,866	(8.7)	0	1	1	3	5	108	113
Napa Street Elementary (513)	0	0	9	88	91	1,024	1,121	(8.7)	0	0	1	1	2	30	32
Fullbright Avenue Elementary (502)	3	0	20	58	81	857	938	(8.6)	0	1	1	0	2	27	29
Pomelo Drive Elementary (520)	0	18	0	23	41	437	478	(8.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Bassett Street Elementary (382)	2	0	7	75	84	902	986	(8.5)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31
Valerio Street Elementary (427)	2	0	2	49	53	570	623	(8.5)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
Carly Center Elementary (548)	0	41	11	7	59	638	697	(8.5)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22
Emelita Street Elementary (500)	3	1	5	33	42	459	501	(8.4)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Apperson Street Elementary (434)	1	9	4	48	62	689	751	(8.3)	0	0	1	0	1	23	24
Oakdale Avenue Elementary (517)	0	0	4	51	55	620	675	(8.1)	0	0	0	1	1	23	24
Melrose Avenue Elementary (410)	0	2	5	34	41	466	507	(8.1)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Porter Junior High (78)	0	7	25	140	172	2,005	2,177	(7.9)	0	0	0	0	0	83	83
Winnetka Avenue Elementary (533)	5	4	2	69	80	939	1,019	(7.9)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31
Prairie Street Elementary (521)	1	23	11	16	51	602	653	(7.8)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Melvin Avenue Elementary (512)	0	0	8	62	70	839	909	(7.7)	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
Lassen Elementary (458)	1	0	26	36	63	756	819	(7.7)	0	1	0	0	1	25	26
Anatola Avenue Elementary (380)	0	0	1	31	32	386	418	(7.7)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Sutter Junior High (85)	2	3	15	134	154	1,894	2,048	(7.5)	0	0	0	1	1	81	82
Blythe Street Elementary (488)	1	3	6	43	53	663	716	(7.4)	1	0	0	0	1	21	22
West Hollywood Elementary (585)	0	6	5	14	25	316	341	(7.3)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Langdon Avenue Elementary (457)	0	1	10	42	53	693	746	(7.1)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Bryson Avenue Elementary (323)	0	1	1	48	50	661	711	(7.0)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Shirley Avenue Elementary (524)	1	2	10	63	76	1,006	1,082	(7.0)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33
Crestwood Street Elementary (173)	0	1	17	58	76	1,013	1,089	(7.0)	0	0	0	0	0	34	34
Germain Street Elementary (504)	0	4	17	42	63	844	907	(6.9)	0	1	0	2	3	25	28
Danube Avenue Elementary (440)	0	3	9	38	50	676	726	(6.9)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Gault Street Elementary (398)	0	2	6	49	57	784	841	(6.8)	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Northridge Junior High (74)	4	8	9	122	143	1,971	2,114	(6.8)	0	0	0	0	0	79	79
Bellagio Road Elementary (542)	1	35	4	7	47	652	699	(6.7)	0	1	0	0	1	21	22
Van Gogh Street Elementary (481)	0	7	21	7	35	486	521	(6.7)	0	0	1	0	1	16	17
Haskell Elementary (453)	0	0	11	44	55	765	820	(6.7)	0	0	0	0	0	22	23
Rio Vista Elementary (416)	1	3	16	30	50	697	747	(6.7)	0	1	0	0	1	22	23
Canoga Park Senior High (89)	4	4	22	221	251	3,541	3,792	(6.6)	0	0	1	4	5	151	156
Saticoy Elementary (420)	0	3	19	64	86	1,219	1,305	(6.6)	0	2	0	0	2	43	45

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Hazeltine Avenue Elementary (401).....	1	0	3	63	67	985	1,052	(6.4)	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Chandler Elementary (388).....	1	6	11	43	61	918	979	(6.2)	0	1	0	1	2	28	30
Westwood Elementary (587).....	0	5	15	18	38	576	614	(6.2)	0	1	1	0	2	17	19
Reseda Senior High (97).....	2	6	12	139	159	2,411	2,570	(6.2)	0	0	2	4	6	95	101
Dahlia Heights Elementary (224).....	0	0	3	21	24	365	389	(6.2)	0	0	1	1	2	10	12
Newcastle Elementary (516).....	0	0	3	31	34	518	552	(6.2)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Garden Grove Avenue Elementary (503).....	0	3	1	20	24	370	394	(6.1)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Reed Junior High (80).....	2	14	19	92	127	1,960	2,087	(6.1)	0	0	1	4	5	74	79
Third Street Elementary (579).....	0	4	15	18	37	584	621	(6.0)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
Collins Street Elementary (497).....	2	6	9	17	34	539	573	(5.9)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Tulsa Street Elementary (480).....	2	12	7	59	80	1,308	1,388	(5.8)	0	0	0	0	0	43	43
Capistrano Avenue Elementary (494).....	1	3	23	47	74	1,220	1,294	(5.7)	0	0	0	0	0	40	40
Nevada Avenue Elementary (515).....	0	4	24	23	51	841	892	(5.7)	0	0	0	0	0	27	27
Van Nuys Senior High (101).....	1	2	10	154	167	2,760	2,927	(5.7)	0	1	0	2	3	115	118
Dixie Canyon Avenue Elementary (393).....	3	3	15	32	53	881	934	(5.7)	0	0	2	0	2	27	29
Sunland Elementary (477).....	0	0	15	48	63	1,055	1,118	(5.6)	0	0	1	0	1	33	34
Sequoia Junior High (83).....	3	4	11	88	106	1,776	1,882	(5.6)	0	0	1	1	2	74	76
Plainview Avenue Elementary (470).....	4	0	2	54	60	1,008	1,068	(5.6)	0	0	1	0	1	31	32
North Hollywood Senior High (96).....	5	8	12	107	132	2,243	2,375	(5.6)	1	0	0	2	3	90	93
Mount Gleason Junior High (71).....	4	2	21	81	108	1,840	1,948	(5.5)	0	0	1	0	1	73	74
Fulton Junior High (62).....	0	0	7	90	99	1,700	1,799	(5.5)	0	2	0	2	5	66	71
Chase Street Elementary (439).....	0	0	7	28	35	607	642	(5.5)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Limerick Avenue Elementary (510).....	0	5	6	47	58	1,008	1,066	(5.4)	0	0	2	0	2	31	33
Burbank Boulevard Elementary (383).....	0	2	10	25	38	662	700	(5.4)	0	0	0	1	1	20	21
Warner Avenue Elementary (584).....	0	16	13	7	36	633	669	(5.4)	0	1	1	0	2	19	21
Westport Heights (377).....	0	0	8	27	35	623	658	(5.3)	0	0	2	0	2	19	21
Superior Street Elementary (526).....	2	4	12	29	47	839	886	(5.3)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Justice Street Elementary (509).....	1	8	16	28	53	952	1,005	(5.3)	0	0	1	0	1	30	31
Osage Avenue Elementary (356).....	0	2	5	34	41	738	779	(5.3)	0	0	0	1	1	22	23
Calahan Street Elementary (490).....	1	0	11	27	39	710	749	(5.2)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Stagg Street Elementary (423).....	0	0	3	34	37	678	715	(5.2)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Stonehurst Avenue Elementary (476).....	2	0	8	23	33	611	644	(5.1)	0	0	1	0	1	19	20
Verdugo Hills Senior High (102).....	3	8	20	90	121	2,244	2,365	(5.1)	0	0	2	4	6	89	95
Sven Lokrantz Crippled Elementary (132).....	0	3	3	6	12	223	235	(5.1)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
James Monroe Senior High (95).....	2	5	27	176	210	3,972	4,182	(5.0)	0	1	2	3	6	157	163
Sunny Brae Avenue Elementary (525).....	0	0	0	50	59	1,118	1,177	(5.0)	0	0	0	3	3	30	33
Rhoda Street Elementary (415).....	0	0	6	30	36	691	727	(5.0)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Granada Elementary (449).....	0	0	5	32	37	711	748	(4.9)	0	0	0	1	1	23	24
Sepulveda Junior High (82).....	0	4	16	80	100	1,946	2,046	(4.9)	0	1	1	1	3	75	78
Ranchito Avenue Elementary (414).....	1	0	3	19	23	450	473	(4.9)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Wonderland Avenue Elementary (591).....	0	11	4	19	37	391	414	(4.9)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Balboa Boulevard Elementary (435).....	0	0	12	14	26	523	549	(4.7)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Gledhill Street Elementary (448).....	0	0	12	29	41	829	870	(4.7)	0	0	1	0	1	26	27
Cleveland Senior High (91).....	2	2	12	121	137	2,841	2,978	(4.6)	0	0	2	6	8	105	113
Collax Avenue Elementary (392).....	5	2	7	22	36	764	800	(4.5)	0	0	1	0	1	24	25
Nestle Avenue Elementary (514).....	1	6	8	20	35	746	781	(4.5)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
Madison Junior High (69).....	2	1	20	79	102	2,248	2,350	(4.5)	0	0	2	0	2	86	88
Vansiden Avenue Elementary (530).....	6	0	2	24	32	708	740	(4.3)	0	0	1	0	1	23	24
Mountain View Elementary (463).....	0	0	4	32	36	801	837	(4.3)	0	0	1	0	1	25	26
Kittridge Street Elementary (404).....	3	0	3	29	35	779	814	(4.3)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Enadia Way Elementary (510).....	0	7	27	14	48	1,072	1,120	(4.3)	0	0	0	0	0	35	35
Encino Elementary (394).....	0	12	8	13	33	751	784	(4.2)	0	1	0	0	1	23	24
Sherman Oaks Elementary (422).....	0	8	20	24	52	1,185	1,237	(4.2)	0	0	1	0	1	37	38
Erwin Street Elementary (395).....	2	0	6	35	43	984	1,027	(4.2)	0	1	0	0	1	31	32
Bertrand Avenue Elementary (487).....	0	0	3	12	15	345	360	(4.2)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Calvert Street Elementary (491).....	0	17	1	12	30	690	720	(4.2)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Ernest Lawrence Junior High (67).....	4	9	7	44	64	1,512	1,576	(4.1)	0	0	1	0	1	59	59
El Oro Way Elementary (444).....	0	8	8	9	25	609	634	(3.9)	0	1	1	0	2	18	20
Lemay Street Elementary (407).....	1	1	0	24	26	634	660	(3.9)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Lockhurst Drive Elementary (511).....	0	2	7	37	46	1,143	1,189	(3.9)	0	0	0	0	0	37	37
Brentwood Elementary (543).....	0	4	30	15	49	1,221	1,270	(3.9)	0	3	1	0	4	36	40
Haynes Street Elementary (507).....	4	0	18	26	48	1,207	1,255	(3.8)	0	0	0	0	0	38	38
Mulholland Junior High (72).....	3	2	13	53	71	1,819	1,890	(3.8)	0	3	1	2	6	71	77
Lorne Street Elementary (408).....	0	1	11	28	39	741	769	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Welby Way Elementary (531).....	2	4	10	28	44	1,167	1,211	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	37	37
Kester Avenue Elementary (403).....	1	4	6	27	38	1,012	1,050	(3.6)	0	0	1	0	1	31	32
Parthenia Street Elementary (468).....	1	0	4	26	31	835	866	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Knollwood Elementary (456).....	1	2	7	28	38	1,031	1,069	(3.6)	0	0	0	1	1	21	22
Tarzana Elementary (527).....	1	1	4	13	19	518	537	(3.5)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Henry Junior High (64).....	5	10	25	49	89	2,433	2,522	(3.5)	0	0	0	0	0	93	93
Chatsworth Senior High (90).....	2	6	17	79	104	2,950	3,054	(3.4)	0	1	6	5	12	108	120
Devonshire Elementary (499).....	0	2	12	16	30	851	881	(3.4)	0	0	1	0	1	25	26
Portola Junior High (79).....	1	9	11	52	73	2,115	2,188	(3.3)	0	0	2	3	5	75	80
Darby Avenue Elementary (498).....	0	3	14	22	39	1,148	1,187	(3.3)	0	0	0	0	0	36	36
Mayall Street Elementary (460).....	0	7	7	24	38	1,119	1,157	(3.3)	0	1	0	0	1	35	36
Granada Hills Senior High (93).....	0	13	31	103	147	4,366	4,518	(3.3)	0	0	2	4	6	162	168
Canyon Elementary (548).....	0	2	0	12	14	417	431	(3.2)	0	0	0	2	2	11	13
Westchester Senior High (32).....	6	15	20	44	85	2,560	2,645	(3.2)	0	3	1	3	7	97	104
Serrania Avenue Elementary (523).....	1	4	6	13	24	726	750	(3.2)	0	0	1	0	1	22	23
Kenter Canyon Elementary (564).....	0	0	13	3	16	489	505	(3.2)	0	1	0	6	1	15	16
Nobel Junior High (73).....	0	3	28	48	79	2,439	2,518	(3.1)	0	0	0	0	0	88	88
South Shores Elementary (204).....	0	1	7	9	17	525	542	(3.1)	0	0	0	1	1	16	17
Holmes Junior High (65).....	4	0	11	42	57	1,829	1,886	(3.0)	0	0	1	0	1	71	72
Topeka Drive Elementary (529).....	0	0	11	8	19	613	633	(3.0)	0	0	1	0	1	19	20
Riverside Drive Elementary (417).....	0	0	18	28	44	944	972	(2.9)	0	0	1	0	1	30	31
Kentwood Elementary (336).....	3	0	11	15	29	813	831	(2.9)	0	0	1	0	1	18	19
Rinaldi Street Elementary (472).....	0	3	7	5	15	518	533	(2.8)	0	1	1	0	2	30	32
Canfield Avenue Elementary (547).....	1	0	8	7	16	557	573	(2.8)	0	0	0	0	0	16	17
Highlander Road Elementary (506).....	0	2	3	17	22	779	801	(2.7)	0	0	1	0	1	24	25
Castle Heights Elementary (550).....	0	3	8	2	13	465	478	(2.7)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Fairburn Avenue Elementary (558).....	0	0	11	9	20	720	740	(2.7)	0	0	1	0	1	23	24
John B. Monlux Elementary (411).....	0	3	18	73	94	3,539	3,633	(2.6)	0	2	2	5	9	129	138
Grant Senior High (94).....	0	6	12	38	56	2,163	2,219	(2.5)	0	0	0	0	0	81	81
Hale Junior High (63).....	0	1	14	38	53	2,063	2,116	(2.5)	0	0	2	0	2	77	79
Millikan Junior High (70).....	0	2	3	8	13	315	323	(2.5)	0	0	0	1	1	9	10
Valley View Elementary (428).....	0	2	3	3	8	315	323	(2.5)	0	0	0	1	1	9	10
Special Education Center Branch SVEN Lokrantz (133).....	0	1	0	1	2	79	81	(2.5)	0	0	0	0	0</		

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 591. REPRESENTING: 591. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Wilbur Avenue Elementary (532)	7	0	4	14	25	991	1,016	(2.5)	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Hamlin Street Elementary (505)	3	1	7	11	22	873	895	(2.5)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Beckford Avenue Elementary (486)	0	2	13	11	26	1,049	1,075	(2.4)	0	0	1	0	1	32	33
Parkman Junior High (77)	2	4	5	28	39	1,583	1,622	(2.4)	0	0	1	1	2	58	60
Hesby Street Elementary (402)	0	0	10	7	17	726	743	(2.3)	0	0	0	0	0	24	24
Hughes Junior High (66)	3	3	12	27	45	1,934	1,979	(2.3)	0	0	0	1	1	73	74
Woodlake Avenue Elementary (534)	0	0	12	9	21	937	958	(2.2)	0	0	2	0	2	28	30
Marquez Elementary (566)	0	2	11	7	20	932	952	(2.1)	0	1	1	0	2	27	29
Revere Junior High (116)	0	9	16	24	49	2,320	2,369	(2.1)	0	0	1	2	3	85	88
Pacific Palisades Elementary (570)	2	0	10	3	15	721	736	(2.0)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Carpenter Avenue Elementary (387)	0	3	4	5	12	605	617	(1.9)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Palisades Senior High (126)	1	10	18	15	44	2,268	2,312	(1.9)	0	2	2	2	6	81	87
Taft Senior High (100)	2	3	11	59	75	3,932	4,007	(1.9)	0	2	2	6	8	138	146
Andasol Avenue Elementary (433)	1	2	7	6	16	846	862	(1.9)	0	0	0	1	1	23	23
Platt Ranch Elementary (519)	0	1	7	6	14	755	769	(1.8)	0	0	1	1	2	22	24
Birmingham Senior High (88)	1	2	10	51	64	3,496	3,560	(1.8)	0	0	2	4	6	142	148
Loyola Village Elementary (340)	0	0	1	7	8	467	475	(1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Calabash Street Elementary (489)	0	3	7	6	16	944	960	(1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	30	30
Woodland Hills Elementary (535)	0	2	2	10	14	826	840	(1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	26	26
Dearborn Street Elementary (441)	1	0	3	3	7	427	434	(1.6)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Lanai Road Elementary (405)	0	0	8	7	15	939	954	(1.6)	0	1	0	0	1	29	30
Oso Avenue Elementary (518)	0	0	2	8	10	634	644	(1.6)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Cowan Avenue Elementary (326)	0	0	0	8	8	588	596	(1.3)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Topanga Elementary (528)	0	0	4	0	4	317	321	(1.2)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Collier Street Elementary (496)	0	0	3	6	9	729	738	(1.2)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
California Senior High (46)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	(0.0)	0	9	0	0	9	8	17

DISTRICT: LOS NIETOS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 5. REPRESENTING: 5. CITY: SANTA FE SPRINGS. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Numbers	3	6	29	1,927	1,965	1,085	3,050	0	3	9	6	18	91	109
Percent	0.1	0.2	1.0	63.2	64.4	35.6	100.0	0.0	2.8	8.3	5.5	16.5	83.5	100.0
Rancho Santa Gertrudes (4)	0	1	0	486	485	82	568	(85.6)	0	1	2	5	15	20
Aeolian (1)	1	2	1	518	522	150	672	(77.7)	0	0	2	4	20	24
Los Nietos Intermediate School (2)	0	0	2	435	437	207	644	(67.9)	0	1	0	1	20	21
Wallace S. Wiggins (5)	0	0	7	207	214	206	420	(51.0)	0	1	2	4	16	20
Ada S. Nelson (3)	2	3	19	282	306	440	746	(41.0)	0	1	2	4	20	24

DISTRICT: MONROVIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 10. REPRESENTING: 10. CITY: MONROVIA. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number	9	911	76	528	1,524	5,594	7,118	1	14	2	4	21	256	277
Percent	0.1	12.8	1.1	7.4	21.4	78.6	100.0	0.4	5.1	0.7	1.4	7.6	92.4	100.0
Huntington Elementary (3)	0	334	0	39	373	0	373	(100.0)	0	5	0	5	13	18
Santa Fe Elementary (6)	3	175	17	111	306	602	908	(33.7)	0	2	0	2	31	33
Moncon High (10)	0	8	0	6	14	29	53	(26.4)	0	0	0	0	3	3
Wild Rose Elementary (7)	1	54	7	80	142	429	571	(24.9)	0	1	0	1	20	21
Clifton Intermediate (8)	2	129	6	70	207	784	991	(20.9)	0	4	0	5	35	40
Monroe Elementary (4)	0	7	15	76	98	491	589	(16.6)	0	2	2	4	18	22
Monrovia High (9)	1	204	18	100	323	1,684	2,007	(16.1)	1	2	0	3	81	84
Bradoaks Elementary (1)	0	0	3	16	19	402	421	(4.5)	0	0	0	1	13	14
Plymouth Elementary (5)	1	0	8	14	23	579	602	(3.8)	0	0	0	0	20	20
Mayflower Elementary (2)	1	0	2	16	19	584	603	(3.2)	0	0	0	0	22	22

DISTRICT: MONTEBELLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 26. REPRESENTING: 26. CITY: MONTEBELLO. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Number	241	10	1,118	12,206	13,575	12,515	26,090	0	2	59	67	128	821	949
Percent	0.9	0.0	4.3	46.8	52.0	48.0	100.0	0.0	0.2	6.2	7.1	13.5	86.5	100.0
Montebello Gardens Elementary (12)	0	0	2	494	496	15	511	(97.1)	0	0	0	2	14	16
Winter Gardens Elementary (19)	1	0	4	641	646	44	690	(93.6)	0	0	4	8	16	24
Montebello Park (13)	0	0	10	737	747	85	832	(89.8)	0	0	1	3	21	25
Eastmont Elementary (5)	0	1	9	854	864	100	964	(89.6)	0	0	1	2	27	29
Bandini Elementary (1)	0	0	0	495	495	68	563	(87.9)	0	0	0	0	18	18
Eastmont Junior High (21)	2	0	15	1,021	1,038	208	1,246	(83.3)	0	0	4	6	46	56
Rosewood Park Elementary (15)	2	0	2	315	319	72	391	(81.6)	0	0	3	3	13	19
Fremont Elementary (6)	0	2	5	364	371	186	557	(66.6)	0	0	3	4	16	20
Bella Vista Elementary (2)	0	0	95	490	585	299	884	(66.2)	0	0	3	2	5	30
Grandview Elementary (8)	0	0	101	422	523	309	832	(62.9)	0	1	1	3	5	23
Vail Continuation High (26)	0	0	0	87	87	57	144	(60.4)	0	0	0	0	3	3
Montebello Junior High (22)	2	1	68	945	1,016	733	1,749	(58.1)	0	0	2	3	5	65
Greenwood Elementary (9)	2	1	47	717	767	589	1,356	(56.6)	0	0	4	2	6	42
Potrero Heights Elementary (14)	0	1	105	261	387	299	686	(56.4)	0	0	2	1	3	21
Washington Elementary (17)	0	0	26	411	437	359	796	(54.9)	0	0	2	1	3	26
Montebello Senior High (25)	7	3	208	1,615	1,833	1,567	3,400	(53.9)	0	0	2	11	13	126
La Merced Elementary (10)	0	0	1	107	333	443	851	(51.8)	0	0	0	3	3	23
Wilcox Elementary (18)	0	0	134	333	297	291	588	(50.5)	0	0	0	0	4	17
Schurr Junior High (23)	1	0	135	417	553	606	1,159	(47.7)	0	0	2	3	5	43
Bell Gardens Senior High (24)	19	0	7	300	326	936	1,262	(25.8)	0	0	0	3	3	53
Bell Gardens Elementary (3)	54	0	12	282	348	1,098	1,446	(24.1)	0	1	3	4	8	47
Suva Elementary (16)	38	0	4	278	320	1,113	1,433	(22.3)	0	0	8	3	11	36
Colmar Elementary (4)	37	0	11	182	230	915	1,145	(20.1)	0	0	6	0	6	30
Bell Gardens Junior High (20)	46	0	7	232	285	1,308	1,593	(17.9)	0	0	2	8	10	59
Live Oak Primary (11)	10	0	3	32	45	231	276	(16.3)	0	0	2	0	2	8
Garfield Elementary (7)	20	0	1	98	119	617	736	(16.2)	0	0	0	0	0	23

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: PASADENA SCHOOL DISTRICT OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 40. REPRESENTING: 40. CITY: PASADENA. COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

School	Students—							Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	Total		American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number.....	28	8,691	934	2,405	12,058	19,201	31,259	0	120	15	12	147	1,044	1,191	
Percent.....	0.1	27.8	3.0	7.7	38.6	61.4	100.0	0	10.1	1.3	1.0	12.3	87.7	100.0	
Grover Cleveland Elementary (7).....	0	479	6	15	500	13	513	(97.5)	0	7	1	0	8	11	
George Washington Elementary (28).....	1	1,036	18	47	1,102	47	1,149	(95.9)	0	13	0	0	13	24	
George Washington Junior High (34).....	0	1,057	99	57	1,213	62	1,275	(95.1)	0	20	0	0	20	38	
Abraham Lincoln Elementary (17).....	1	738	15	79	833	49	882	(94.4)	0	13	4	0	17	29	
Andrew Jackson Elementary (15).....	0	548	77	30	655	45	700	(93.6)	0	5	0	0	5	18	
Benjamin Franklin Elementary (11).....	3	475	14	37	529	61	590	(89.7)	0	8	1	0	9	13	
James Madison Elementary (21).....	1	596	17	144	758	176	934	(81.2)	0	10	0	0	10	19	
Audubon Elementary (4).....	0	374	25	40	439	158	597	(73.5)	0	2	0	0	2	17	
James A. Garfield Elementary (12).....	3	81	10	104	198	85	283	(70.0)	0	2	0	1	3	7	
Thomas Edison Elementary (9).....	4	322	21	49	396	210	606	(65.3)	0	1	1	0	2	18	
John Muir High (37).....	2	717	157	110	986	961	1,947	(50.6)	0	4	1	0	5	86	
Foothill (Continuation) High (39).....	0	91	0	26	117	123	240	(48.8)	0	0	0	0	0	11	
The Sycamores (5).....	0	1	0	3	4	5	9	(44.4)	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Roosevelt School for Handicapped Children (24).....	0	42	6	11	59	80	139	(42.4)	0	0	0	0	0	14	
William McKinley Elementary (22).....	0	46	5	50	101	154	255	(39.6)	0	3	0	0	3	7	
William McKinley Junior High (33).....	1	236	52	169	458	702	1,160	(39.5)	0	4	0	1	5	45	
Blair High (36).....	3	311	59	180	550	888	1,441	(38.4)	0	6	1	3	10	57	
Charles W. Eliot Junior High (31).....	0	497	38	73	609	1,118	1,727	(35.3)	0	7	2	0	9	62	
Loma Alta Elementary (19).....	0	155	9	22	186	354	540	(34.4)	0	1	0	0	1	18	
Aitadena Elementary (2).....	0	36	26	56	279	578	857	(32.6)	0	3	0	0	3	23	
Thomas Jefferson Elementary (16).....	0	97	26	145	270	581	788	(25.3)	0	1	0	0	1	27	
Henry W. Longfellow Elementary (20).....	0	122	44	123	289	814	1,103	(26.2)	0	3	0	1	4	30	
Alexander Hamilton Elementary (14).....	0	3	18	100	121	513	634	(19.1)	0	1	0	0	1	18	
John Marshall Junior High (32).....	2	127	29	152	310	1,457	1,767	(17.5)	0	1	0	0	1	69	
Allendale Elementary (1).....	1	0	16	65	82	395	477	(17.2)	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Pasadena High (38).....	0	334	54	143	531	2,891	3,422	(15.5)	0	3	0	4	7	141	
Arroyo Seco Elementary (3).....	0	10	0	12	22	120	142	(15.5)	0	0	0	0	0	6	
5 Acres (40).....	0	1	0	0	1	7	8	(12.5)	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Eugene Field Elementary (10).....	0	0	6	62	68	484	552	(12.3)	0	0	1	0	1	16	
Frances E. Willard Elementary (30).....	0	6	14	63	83	744	827	(10.0)	0	0	0	0	0	31	
George Ellery Hale Elementary (13).....	0	12	7	29	48	432	480	(10.0)	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Sierra Madre Elementary (26).....	0	0	10	38	48	513	561	(8.6)	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Wilson Junior High (35).....	1	5	21	84	111	1,307	1,418	(7.8)	0	1	0	1	2	56	
Luther Burbank Elementary (6).....	1	9	6	24	40	504	544	(7.4)	0	0	2	0	2	16	
Daniel Webster Elementary (29).....	0	20	6	22	48	658	706	(6.8)	0	1	0	0	1	22	
Sierra Mesa Elementary (27).....	2	0	2	19	23	434	457	(5.0)	0	0	1	0	1	13	
San Rafael Elementary (25).....	0	1	7	9	17	411	428	(4.0)	0	0	0	0	0	15	
Don Benito Elementary (8).....	0	3	8	10	21	527	548	(3.8)	0	0	0	0	0	17	
Linda Vista Elementary (18).....	0	2	4	1	7	202	209	(3.3)	0	0	0	0	0	7	
Arthur Amos Noyes Elementary (23).....	1	1	2	2	6	338	344	(1.7)	0	0	0	1	1	9	

DISTRICT: POMONA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 30. REPRESENTING: 30. CITY: POMONA COUNTY: 19. LOS ANGELES

Number.....	36	3,495	125	3,316	6,974	15,601	22,575	0	53	7	17	77	722	799
Percent.....	0.2	15.5	0.6	14.7	30.9	69.1	100.0	0.0	6.6	0.9	2.1	9.6	90.4	100.0
North San Antonio (15).....	0	566	0	31	597	73	670	(89.1)	0	8	0	2	10	16
Madison Elementary (13).....	1	209	7	409	626	134	760	(82.4)	0	2	0	2	4	20
Hamilton Elementary (7).....	0	124	0	297	421	130	551	(76.4)	0	3	0	1	4	14
Lexington (11).....	0	431	5	129	565	205	770	(73.4)	0	5	0	0	5	13
Arroyo Elementary (3).....	0	572	6	86	664	324	988	(67.2)	0	4	0	0	4	29
Garey High (28).....	1	184	6	293	484	621	1,105	(43.8)	0	1	0	1	2	41
Fremont Junior High (23).....	0	225	12	320	557	731	1,288	(43.2)	0	3	2	2	7	42
Park Avenue High (29).....	1	42	0	39	82	108	190	(43.2)	0	0	0	0	0	11
Washington (19).....	2	18	2	246	268	361	629	(42.6)	0	1	0	0	1	20
Marshall Junior High (24).....	1	209	5	103	318	605	923	(34.5)	0	3	0	0	3	33
Theodore Roosevelt Elementary (17).....	0	17	0	173	190	408	598	(31.8)	0	0	0	0	0	18
Palomares Junior High (25).....	4	218	0	43	265	617	882	(30.0)	0	3	0	0	3	33
Leroy Allison Elementary (2).....	2	106	3	33	144	380	524	(27.5)	0	2	0	1	3	16
Casa Colina (4).....	0	0	0	5	5	14	19	(26.3)	0	0	0	0	0	2
Kellogg Elementary (9).....	0	84	6	52	142	432	574	(24.7)	0	0	0	2	2	17
Ganesha High (27).....	1	169	3	149	322	988	1,310	(24.6)	0	2	0	0	2	48
Westmont Elementary (20).....	0	7	4	136	147	530	677	(21.7)	0	3	0	1	4	19
Louisa May Alcott Elementary (1).....	0	8	2	138	157	632	789	(19.9)	0	2	0	0	2	23
Simons Junior High (26).....	0	13	5	147	165	720	885	(18.6)	0	2	2	1	5	29
San Jose Elementary (18).....	3	37	12	25	77	420	497	(15.5)	0	0	0	0	0	18
Philadelphia Elementary (16).....	3	6	5	149	163	913	1,076	(15.1)	0	0	1	0	1	34
Pomona High (30).....	2	178	5	59	244	1,382	1,626	(15.0)	0	3	0	2	5	58
Harrison (8).....	0	29	5	38	72	567	639	(11.3)	0	1	1	0	2	19
Lincoln Elementary (12).....	0	1	2	48	51	426	477	(10.7)	0	1	0	0	1	14
Yorba Elementary (21).....	0	0	5	22	27	279	306	(8.8)	0	0	1	0	1	9
Montvue Elementary (14).....	4	16	8	29	57	612	669	(8.5)	0	2	0	0	2	21
Emerson Junior High (22).....	1	28	8	38	75	922	997	(7.5)	0	1	0	2	3	36
Kingsley Elementary (10).....	1	0	4	43	48	757	805	(6.0)	0	0	0	0	0	25
Golden Springs Elementary (6).....	0	0	3	28	31	717	748	(4.1)	0	1	0	0	1	23
Diamond Point Elementary (5).....	0	0	2	8	10	593	603	(1.7)	0	0	0	0	0	21

DISTRICT: WILLOWBROOK SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 5. REPRESENTING: 5. CITY: LOS ANGELES. COUNTY 19

Number.....	1	3,160	9	243	3,413	8	3,421	0	100	0	0	100	7	107
Percent.....	0.0	92.4	0.3	7.1	99.8	0.2	100.0	0.0	93.5	0.0	0.0	93.5	6.5	100.0
John F. Kennedy (4).....	0	549	1	28	578	0	578	(100.0)	0	16	0	0	16	2
Lincoln (5).....	0	670	0	15	685	1	686	(99.9)	0	21	0	0	21	1
Marian Anderson (1).....	0	607	0	170	777	2	779	(99.7)	0	22	0	0	22	2
George Washington Carver (2).....	1	675	0	1	677	2	679	(99.7)	0	20	0	0	20	2
Martin Luther King (3).....	0	659	8	29	696	3	699	(99.6)	0	21	0	0	21	0

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 19. REPRESENTING: 19. CITY: PICO RIVERA. COUNTY: 19 LOS ANGELES COUNTY

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	15	5	100	9,822	9,942	6,503	16,445		2	17	23	65	107	529	636
Percent	0.1	0.0	0.6	59.7	60.5	39.5	100.0		0.3	2.7	3.6	10.2	16.8	83.2	100.0
Pio Pico Elementary (12)	0	0	1	340	341	18	359	(95.0)	0	1	0	4	5	11	16
El Rancho Continuation (18)	0	0	1	64	65	15	80	(81.3)	0	0	0	1	1	2	3
North Park Jr. High (4)	0	0	4	89	89	208	1,103	(81.1)	1	0	2	6	9	36	45
North Ranchito Elementary (10)	0	0	3	902	906	222	1,128	(80.3)	0	3	2	4	9	31	40
Durfee Elementary (7)	0	0	0	460	463	121	584	(79.3)	1	0	0	2	3	17	21
Eugene A. Obregon (11)	0	0	0	492	492	139	631	(78.0)	0	0	0	3	3	17	20
South Ranchito Elementary (16)	0	0	6	620	626	274	900	(68.6)	0	1	1	2	4	24	28
Valencia Elementary (17)	0	0	6	558	564	278	842	(67.0)	0	0	0	2	2	24	26
Meller Jr. High (3)	0	0	6	534	540	340	880	(61.4)	0	0	0	5	5	32	37
Rio Vista Elementary (13)	4	0	5	432	441	323	764	(57.7)	0	0	1	0	1	26	27
Lawrence T. Magee Elementary (8)	0	0	7	390	397	322	719	(55.2)	0	0	1	2	3	22	25
Rivera Elementary (14)	2	0	3	359	364	315	679	(53.6)	0	0	2	2	4	19	23
Maizeland Elementary (9)	2	3	5	220	230	200	430	(53.5)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
El Rancho Adult School (19)	1	1	12	970	984	893	1,877	(52.4)	0	3	1	8	12	63	75
El Rancho High School (1)	2	2	15	1,508	1,526	1,400	2,926	(52.2)	0	4	5	10	19	108	127
Rivera Junior High School (5)	1	0	3	312	317	303	620	(51.1)	0	2	2	7	11	17	28
Osburn Burke Junior High School (2)	0	0	2	329	331	399	730	(45.3)	0	1	1	3	5	27	32
Alice M. Birney Elementary School (6)	2	0	10	313	325	464	789	(41.2)	0	1	2	1	4	25	29
Selby Grove School (15)	0	0	5	130	135	269	404	(33.4)	0	1	3	3	7	11	18

DISTRICT: MERCED CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 13. REPRESENTING: 13. CITY: MERCED. COUNTY: 24. MERCED

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	19	703	52	1,706	2,480	4,435	6,915		3	9	1	18	31	230	261
Percent	0.3	10.2	0.8	24.7	35.9	64.1	100.0		1.1	3.4	0.4	6.9	11.9	88.1	100.0
Galen Clark (2)	0	256	5	328	589	31	620	(95.0)	2	4	0	3	9	15	24
Tenays (10)	0	218	0	426	644	105	749	(86.0)	1	2	0	4	7	23	30
Preschool Center (1)	0	19	0	28	47	11	58	(81.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Margaret Sheehy (13)	1	178	2	337	518	145	663	(78.1)	0	2	0	1	3	21	24
Franklin (4)	8	7	2	76	93	347	440	(21.1)	0	0	0	2	2	15	17
John C. Fremont (3)	0	1	12	64	77	302	379	(20.3)	0	0	0	1	1	12	13
Ada Givens (8)	0	3	3	97	103	424	527	(19.5)	0	1	0	2	3	16	19
John Muir (12)	1	10	1	76	88	457	545	(16.1)	0	0	0	1	1	20	21
Herbert Hoover (5)	6	4	4	86	100	571	671	(14.9)	0	0	1	3	4	28	32
Charles Wright (6)	0	0	7	78	85	537	622	(13.7)	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
Luther Burbank (7)	0	3	12	49	64	554	618	(10.4)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Rudolph Rivera (9)	1	3	2	33	39	438	477	(8.2)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Donn B. Chenoweth (11)	2	1	2	28	33	513	546	(6.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18

DISTRICT: SALINAS CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 12. REPRESENTING: 12. CITY: SALINAS. COUNTY: 27. MONTEREY COUNTY ASSURANCE: 441

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	18	119	329	1,706	2,172	4,401	6,573		1	4	6	7	18	214	232
Percent	0.3	1.8	5.0	26.0	33.0	67.0	100.0		0.4	1.7	2.6	3.0	7.8	92.2	100.0
Boronda (20)	2	10	27	155	194	48	242	(80.2)	0	1	2	0	3	6	9
Sherwood (12)	0	27	32	483	542	231	773	(70.1)	1	0	0	0	1	28	29
Roosevelt (11)	11	17	28	294	350	339	689	(50.8)	0	1	0	2	3	20	23
Lincoln Elementary (5)	0	37	24	190	251	323	574	(43.7)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Ashton (1)	0	2	5	9	12	12	21	(42.9)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Loma Vista (6)	0	3	27	112	128	283	395	(28.4)	0	0	1	0	1	12	13
El Gabilan (3)	1	11	13	158	183	570	753	(24.3)	0	1	0	2	3	23	26
Los Padres (7)	0	1	8	61	70	224	294	(23.8)	0	0	0	0	0	10	10
Natividad (10)	0	5	67	80	153	500	652	(23.3)	0	0	0	1	1	23	24
Henry F. Kammann (4)	3	4	31	111	149	711	860	(17.3)	0	1	2	1	4	26	30
Mission Park (8)	1	1	41	84	127	691	818	(15.5)	0	0	1	0	1	27	28
Monterey Park (9)	0	1	19	13	33	469	502	(6.6)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19

DISTRICT: SOLEDAD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 2. REPRESENTING: 3. CITY: SOLEDAD. COUNTY: 27. MONTEREY

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	0	5	9	1,077	1,091	279	1,370		0	0	3	2	5	41	46
Percent	0.0	0.4	0.7	78.6	79.6	20.4	100.0		0.0	0.0	6.5	4.3	10.9	89.1	100.0
San Vicente (1)	0	3	6	19	528	127	655	(80.6)	0	0	1	0	1	21	22
Main Street (2)	0	2	3	558	563	152	715	(78.7)	0	0	2	2	4	20	22

DISTRICT: FULLERTON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 21. REPRESENTING: 21. CITY: FULLERTON. COUNTY: 30. ORANGE

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number	18	123	163	1,208	1,512	11,732	13,244		2	4	7	10	23	460	483
Percent	0.1	0.9	1.2	9.1	11.4	88.6	100.0		0.4	0.8	1.4	2.1	4.8	95.2	100.0
Maple Avenue (19)	0	55	0	235	290	4	294	(98.6)	0	1	0	1	2	10	12
Ford Avenue (5)	0	5	5	64	74	400	474	(15.6)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Nicolas Junior High (10)	0	1	10	138	149	898	1,047	(14.2)	0	0	2	2	4	45	49
Valencia Park (17)	0	0	2	109	111	732	843	(13.2)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Fern Drive (4)	11	4	12	42	69	462	531	(13.0)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Pacific Drive (12)	0	4	12	88	104	701	805	(12.9)	0	0	0	2	2	25	27
Wilshire Junior High (18)	0	12	4	98	114	779	893	(12.8)	1	0	1	0	2	35	37
Richman Elementary (14)	0	7	8	101	116	814	930	(12.5)	0	0	0	0	0	32	32
Woodcrest Special Education Unit (21)	0	0	0	7	7	54	61	(11.5)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
Commonwealth (3)	1	4	12	56	73	585	658	(11.1)	0	0	0	1	1	22	23
Raymond (13)	0	8	11	52	71	600	671	(10.6)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Woodcrest (20)	1	1	5	28	36	437	473	(7.6)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Orangethorpe (11)	1	0	13	45	59	753	812	(7.3)	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
Beechwood Elementary School (2)	0	0	10	6	16	258	274	(5.8)	0	0	0	0	1	8	9
Ladera Vista Junior High (8)	1	5	8	52	66	1,078	1,144	(5.8)	0	0	0	3	3	43	46
Rolling Hills (15)	0	1	13	20	34	559	593	(5.7)	1	0	0	0	1	20	21
Acacia (1)	0	3	5	24	32	546	578	(5.5)	1	0	2	0	2	18	20
Golden Hill (6)	0	1	9	14	27	522	549	(4.9)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Laguna Road (9)	0	3	12	10	25	559	584	(4.3)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Sunset Lane (16)	1	1	11	12	25	581	606	(4.1)	0	0	1	0	1	20	21
Hermosa Drive (7)	0	0	7	7	14	410	424	(3.3)	0	0	1	0	1	13	14

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 32. REPRESENTING: 32. CITY: SANTA ANA. COUNTY: 30

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Number.....	52	2,066	258	8,117	10,493	17,498	27,991	0	23	5	21	49	933	982	
Percent.....	0.2	7.4	0.9	29.0	37.5	62.5	100.0	0.0	2.3	0.5	2.1	5.0	95.0	100.0	
James Monroe (15).....	1	25	4	333	363	13	376	(96.5)	0	0	0	0	13	13	
Franklin Elementary (3).....	1	140	1	398	540	53	593	(91.1)	0	2	0	1	3	16	
McKinley (13).....	1	34	2	352	389	85	474	(82.1)	0	0	0	0	0	16	
John C. Fremont (4).....	0	119	13	590	722	159	881	(82.0)	0	3	0	0	3	23	
Monte Vista (17).....	4	542	12	397	955	344	1,299	(73.5)	0	5	2	0	7	33	
Edison Elementary (2).....	7	5	9	655	676	277	953	(70.9)	0	0	1	0	1	31	
Lowell (10).....	0	87	4	294	385	164	549	(70.1)	0	0	0	0	0	18	
Lincoln Elementary (9).....	0	328	10	166	504	273	777	(64.9)	0	1	0	1	2	23	
Roosevelt Elementary (19).....	1	14	5	268	288	161	449	(64.1)	0	0	0	0	0	14	
John Muir Elementary (18).....	0	1	4	179	184	117	301	(61.1)	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Lathrop Junior High (25).....	3	28	9	602	642	695	1,337	(48.0)	0	1	0	3	4	47	
Smedley Junior High (27).....	1	287	3	553	844	937	1,781	(47.4)	0	3	0	0	3	65	
Kenneth E. Mitchell (14).....	0	7	2	23	32	40	72	(44.4)	0	1	0	0	1	6	
Mountain View High (16).....	2	18	3	62	85	126	211	(40.3)	0	1	0	0	1	10	
Santa Ana High (30).....	1	81	23	679	784	1,530	2,314	(33.9)	0	2	0	3	5	82	
James Madison (11).....	7	17	27	208	259	576	835	(31.0)	0	0	0	1	1	30	
Valley High (31).....	2	175	2	246	425	1,002	1,427	(29.8)	0	1	0	2	3	57	
Sierra Elementary (21).....	0	18	0	146	164	411	575	(28.5)	0	0	1	1	1	20	
Diamond (1).....	0	2	4	221	227	594	821	(27.6)	0	1	0	0	1	26	
Spurgeon Elementary (22).....	0	4	0	119	123	322	445	(27.6)	0	0	1	1	1	15	
Wilson (24).....	1	20	6	140	167	444	611	(27.3)	0	0	0	2	2	18	
Glenn L. Martin (12).....	2	25	7	211	245	761	1,006	(24.4)	0	1	0	0	1	31	
Saddleback High (29).....	3	7	10	256	276	869	1,145	(24.1)	0	0	0	2	2	47	
Willard Junior High (28).....	3	45	10	237	295	1,068	1,363	(21.6)	0	0	0	2	2	45	
McFadden Junior High (26).....	3	10	8	256	277	1,129	1,406	(19.7)	0	1	0	2	3	48	
George Washington (23).....	0	1	13	133	147	912	1,059	(13.9)	0	0	1	0	0	33	
Herbert Hoover Elementary (6).....	0	2	0	61	72	509	581	(12.4)	0	0	0	0	1	17	
Carl Harvey (5).....	1	0	5	10	11	79	90	(12.2)	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Jefferson Elementary (8).....	0	5	17	82	104	860	964	(10.8)	0	0	0	0	0	29	
Andrew Jackson (7).....	4	4	9	102	119	1,003	1,122	(10.5)	0	0	0	0	0	34	
John Adams (32).....	4	5	15	102	126	1,129	1,255	(10.0)	0	0	1	0	1	39	
Santiago Elementary (20).....	0	10	17	36	63	856	919	(6.9)	0	0	0	0	0	29	

DISTRICT: COACHELLA SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 4. REPRESENTING: 5. CITY: COACHELLA. COUNTY: 33. RIVERSIDE

Number.....	0	34	13	1,753	1,800	411	2,211	0	0	0	2	2	75	77
Percent.....	0.5	1.5	0.6	79.3	81.4	18.6	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	97.4	100.0
Peter Pendleton (3).....	0	7	3	486	496	101	597	(83.1)	0	0	0	0	0	20
Valley View (2).....	0	15	0	426	441	95	536	(82.3)	0	0	0	0	0	18
Palm View (4).....	0	2	1	370	373	89	462	(80.7)	0	0	0	0	0	17
Dateland (1).....	0	10	9	471	490	126	616	(79.5)	0	0	2	2	20	22

DISTRICT: DESERT SANDS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 12. REPRESENTING: 12. CITY: INDIO. COUNTY: 33. RIVERSIDE

Number.....	19	275	62	2,227	2,583	4,674	7,258	2	6	1	5	14	252	266
Percent.....	0.3	3.8	0.9	30.7	35.6	64.4	100.0	0.8	2.3	0.4	1.9	5.3	94.7	100.0
Martin Van Buren (7).....	0	12	0	275	287	21	308	(93.2)	0	0	0	0	0	11
Theodore Roosevelt (6).....	0	60	0	257	317	70	387	(81.9)	0	2	0	1	3	10
Herbert Hoover (2).....	16	58	8	220	302	276	578	(52.2)	0	1	0	1	2	18
Dwight D. Eisenhower (1).....	0	8	5	295	308	293	601	(51.2)	0	0	0	0	0	20
Wilson Middle (11).....	0	4	5	162	171	267	458	(37.3)	0	0	0	0	0	18
Thomas Jefferson Middle (9).....	0	28	10	150	188	324	512	(36.7)	1	0	1	0	2	20
Indio High (12).....	0	61	21	473	555	1,367	1,922	(28.9)	1	3	0	2	6	75
Andrew Jackson (3).....	2	14	2	184	202	503	705	(28.7)	0	0	0	0	0	21
John F. Kennedy (4).....	1	30	8	79	118	495	613	(19.2)	0	0	0	0	0	20
Abraham Lincoln (5).....	0	0	2	58	60	354	414	(14.5)	0	0	0	0	0	13
George Washington (8).....	0	0	1	58	59	437	496	(11.9)	0	0	0	0	0	17
Palm Desert Middle (10).....	0	0	0	16	16	247	263	(6.1)	0	0	1	1	9	10

DISTRICT: DEL PASO HEIGHTS ELEMENTARY. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 5. REPRESENTING: 7. CITY: SACRAMENTO. COUNTY: 34. SACRAMENTO

Number.....	2	1,377	3	218	1,600	334	1,934	0	33	0	4	37	56	93
Percent.....	0.1	71.2	0.2	11.3	82.7	17.3	100.0	0.0	35.5	0.0	4.3	39.8	60.2	100.0
North Avenue (3).....	2	470	0	42	514	33	547	(94.0)	0	13	0	0	13	15
Fairbanks (2).....	0	462	3	35	500	89	589	(84.9)	0	6	0	0	6	19
Del Paso Heights Elementary (1).....	0	272	0	63	335	66	401	(83.5)	0	8	0	3	11	11
Morey Avenue (5).....	0	123	0	38	161	72	233	(69.1)	0	4	0	1	5	10
Garden Valley (4).....	0	50	0	40	90	74	164	(54.9)	0	2	0	0	2	6

DISTRICT: SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 77. REPRESENTING: 77. CITY: SACRAMENTO. COUNTY: 34.

Number.....	38	7,324	4,236	6,184	17,782	34,763	52,545	0	97	53	18	168	1,769	1,937
Percent.....	0.1	13.9	8.1	11.8	33.8	66.2	100.0	0.0	5.0	2.7	0.9	8.7	91.3	100.0
Camellia Elementary (25).....	0	259	0	34	293	21	314	(93.3)	0	4	0	0	4	9
William Land Elementary (75).....	1	54	182	91	328	75	403	(81.4)	0	1	0	1	1	15
Lincoln Junior High (14).....	1	74	82	153	310	75	385	(80.5)	0	2	2	0	4	16
Donner Elementary (31).....	1	249	6	47	303	101	404	(75.0)	0	4	0	0	4	12
Lincoln Elementary (50).....	0	42	20	56	118	44	162	(72.8)	0	1	0	1	2	9
Elder Creek Elementary (35).....	0	115	3	109	227	95	322	(70.5)	0	2	1	1	4	11
Oak Ridge Elementary (60).....	0	198	9	145	352	160	512	(68.8)	0	2	0	0	2	18
Ethel Phillips Elementary (38).....	0	193	11	190	394	200	594	(66.3)	0	5	0	0	5	17
Jedediah Smith Elementary (46).....	0	115	23	206	344	190	534	(64.4)	0	0	3	0	3	16
Newton Booth Elementary (58).....	3	63	65	76	207	148	355	(58.3)	0	4	2	0	6	10

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 77. REPRESENTING: 77. CITY: SACRAMENTO. COUNTY: 34—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Washington Elementary (74)	3	17	3	99	122	89	211	(57.8)	0	2	0	1	3	11	14
Riverside Elementary (67)	0	10	173	20	203	154	357	(56.9)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
Marshall Elementary (57)	1	99	3	75	178	138	316	(56.3)	0	1	0	2	3	8	11
Fruitridge Elementary (41)	3	240	30	142	415	322	737	(56.3)	0	3	0	0	3	20	23
Bret Harte Elementary (23)	5	181	12	77	275	229	504	(54.6)	0	1	1	0	2	17	19
California Junior High (8)	0	231	122	111	464	450	914	(50.8)	0	0	1	1	2	36	38
Maple Elementary (54)	0	34	11	112	157	154	311	(50.5)	0	2	1	0	3	8	11
Sacramento Senior High (5)	1	485	251	436	1,173	1,193	2,366	(49.6)	0	3	0	2	5	95	100
Sutterville Elementary (70)	0	47	227	26	300	316	616	(48.7)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
American Legion High (6)	0	64	0	49	113	120	233	(48.5)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11
John Cabrillo Elementary (48)	0	71	181	22	274	302	576	(47.6)	0	0	2	0	2	13	15
Woodbine Elementary (76)	0	58	1	105	164	184	348	(47.1)	0	2	0	0	2	13	15
Joaquin Miller Junior High (11)	0	104	198	139	441	514	955	(46.2)	0	2	2	1	5	38	43
Preschool (77)	0	187	86	147	420	492	912	(46.1)	0	2	1	1	4	28	32
Peter Lassen Junior High (15)	1	279	39	168	487	599	1,086	(44.8)	0	5	1	0	6	41	47
John Muir Elementary (52)	0	29	4	17	50	62	112	(44.6)	0	2	0	0	2	9	11
Fremont Elementary (40)	0	48	21	56	125	155	280	(44.6)	0	1	0	0	1	9	10
Sutter Junior High (17)	1	32	73	182	288	401	689	(41.8)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29
Alice Birney Elementary (19)	0	111	114	11	236	330	566	(41.7)	0	1	1	0	2	17	19
Will C. Wood Junior High (18)	0	222	20	151	393	550	943	(41.7)	0	1	1	1	3	39	42
Hollywood Park Elementary (43)	0	77	93	58	228	331	559	(40.8)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
H. W. Harkness Elementary (42)	0	187	99	55	341	531	872	(39.1)	0	2	0	0	2	26	28
Coloma Elementary (29)	1	69	10	49	129	215	344	(27.5)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Earl Warren Elementary (32)	1	45	13	111	170	288	458	(37.1)	0	2	0	0	2	17	19
O. K. McClatchy Senior High (1)	0	119	424	193	736	1,292	2,028	(36.3)	0	0	1	1	2	78	80
John D. Sloat Elementary (49)	2	114	16	46	178	351	529	(33.6)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Caroline Wenzel Elementary (26)	0	3	29	90	122	242	364	(33.5)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Sam Brannan Junior High (16)	0	103	243	33	379	753	1,132	(33.5)	0	1	4	0	5	38	43
Collis P. Huntington Elementary (28)	0	10	85	58	153	305	458	(33.4)	0	2	0	1	3	13	16
Bear Flag Elementary (21)	0	60	87	24	171	346	517	(33.1)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16
Mark Hopkins Elementary (55)	0	113	21	61	194	437	631	(30.7)	0	1	2	0	3	16	19
Pony Express Elementary (65)	0	18	120	61	199	459	658	(30.2)	0	1	2	0	3	21	23
Charles M. Goethe Junior High (9)	1	200	92	95	388	901	1,289	(30.1)	0	2	1	0	3	50	53
Tahoe Elementary (71)	0	74	15	42	131	314	445	(29.4)	0	0	1	0	1	14	15
John Bidwell Elementary (47)	3	88	66	63	220	529	749	(29.4)	0	2	2	0	4	19	23
Phoebe Hearst Elementary (65)	1	97	7	47	152	376	528	(28.8)	0	2	0	0	2	16	18
Freeport Elementary (39)	0	124	43	82	249	621	870	(28.6)	0	2	2	0	4	23	27
John F. Morse Elementary (51)	0	55	20	9	85	219	304	(28.0)	0	1	1	0	2	8	10
Sierra Elementary (69)	0	71	9	36	116	311	427	(27.2)	0	0	1	0	1	12	13
John F. Kennedy Senior High (3)	0	165	174	72	411	1,161	1,572	(26.1)	0	1	1	0	2	55	57
David Lubin Elementary (33)	0	61	4	50	115	330	445	(25.8)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
John H. Still Junior High (12)	0	105	21	43	169	505	674	(25.1)	0	1	1	0	2	25	27
A. M. Winn Elementary (20)	0	99	12	12	123	380	503	(24.5)	0	1	0	0	1	17	18
Ethel I. Baker Elementary (37)	0	49	28	74	151	490	641	(23.6)	0	0	1	0	1	20	21
Theodore Judah Elementary (72)	0	58	11	46	115	376	491	(23.4)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Joseph Bonheim Elementary (53)	0	38	57	123	218	724	942	(23.1)	0	1	1	0	2	28	30
Luther Burbank Senior High (4)	0	164	88	249	501	1,676	2,177	(23.0)	0	3	0	0	3	80	83
Hiram Johnson Senior High (2)	0	256	78	269	603	2,024	2,627	(23.0)	0	1	1	2	4	93	97
Kit Carson Junior High (13)	0	127	23	63	213	729	942	(22.6)	0	2	0	0	2	40	42
Nicholas Elementary (59)	2	88	18	77	185	635	820	(22.6)	0	2	0	0	2	22	24
El Dorado Elementary (36)	0	35	10	28	73	253	326	(22.4)	0	0	1	0	1	11	12
Caleb Greenwood Elementary (24)	2	89	6	24	121	425	546	(22.2)	0	1	0	1	2	15	17
Clayton B. Wire Elementary (27)	0	37	13	46	96	351	447	(21.5)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13
Pacific Elementary (62)	0	30	14	46	96	351	447	(21.5)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13
Edward Kemble Elementary (34)	0	104	18	32	154	657	811	(19.0)	0	2	0	0	2	17	18
Bowling Green Elementary (22)	0	45	30	35	110	492	602	(18.3)	0	0	2	0	2	23	25
Peter Burnett Elementary (64)	0	45	8	48	101	470	571	(17.7)	0	2	0	0	2	13	15
Crocker Elementary (30)	0	6	41	15	62	320	382	(16.2)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16
Mark Twain Elementary (56)	0	27	11	96	134	693	827	(16.2)	0	1	0	0	1	23	24
Fern Bacon Junior High (10)	1	63	30	109	203	1,093	1,296	(15.7)	0	1	1	2	4	45	49
Albert Einstein Junior High (7)	2	42	23	34	101	789	890	(11.3)	0	2	2	0	4	29	33
Thomas Jefferson Elementary (73)	0	8	17	29	54	493	547	(9.9)	0	0	1	0	1	16	17
Hubert H. Bancroft Elementary (44)	0	5	16	23	44	477	521	(8.4)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Parkway Elementary (63)	0	18	4	17	39	621	660	(5.9)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Sequoia Elementary (68)	0	5	16	24	45	744	789	(5.7)	0	0	1	0	1	23	24
O. W. Erlwin Elementary (61)	0	8	1	9	18	313	331	(5.4)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Isador Cohen Elementary (45)	0	9	2	6	17	397	414	(4.1)	0	0	0	0	0	12	13

DISTRICT: BARSTOW UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 21. REPRESENTING: 21. CITY: BARSTOW. COUNTY: 36. SAN BERNARDINO

Number	292	741	129	2,413	3,575	7,154	10,729	1	18	2	14	35	412	447	
Percent	2.7	6.9	1.2	22.5	33.3	66.7	100.0	0.2	4.0	0.4	3.1	7.8	92.2	100.0	
Waterman (12)	31	51	0	131	213	31	244	(87.3)	0	2	0	0	2	8	10
Kelso (4)	11	0	0	20	31	9	40	(77.5)	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Henderson (10)	6	75	7	193	281	309	590	(47.6)	0	3	0	0	3	21	24
East Barstow (8)	9	109	14	33	165	233	398	(41.5)	1	1	0	1	3	13	16
Thomson (13)	16	14	5	153	188	287	455	(41.3)	0	0	0	1	2	13	15
Daggett (7)	65	32	4	36	137	196	333	(41.1)	0	1	0	1	2	13	15
Montara (21)	16	64	20	159	259	408	667	(38.8)	0	3	1	1	5	22	27
John F. Kennedy High (19)	32	120	11	288	451	753	1,204	(37.5)	0	1	0	4	5	50	55
Crestline (6)	7	7	2	179	195	354	549	(35.5)	0	1	0	0	1	20	21
Barstow Intermediate (11)	19	79	6	319	423	858	1,281	(33.0)	0	1	0	1	2	50	52
Lenwood (15)	9	3	3	130	145	313	458	(31.7)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Skyline North (14)	0	28	4	89	121	274	395	(30.6)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Barstow High (18)	21	42	9	353	425	1,054	1,479	(88.7)	0	1	1	4	6	68	74
Fort Irwin (9)	5	69	13	19	106	290	396	(26.8)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Yermo (17)	12	11	10	81	114	387	501	(22.8)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Ingels (16)	1	3	10	47	61	209	270	(22.6)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Cameron (5)	1	23	11	119	154	554	708	(21.8)	0	2	0	0	2	22	24
Hinkley (20)	17	11	0	52	80	368	448	(17.9)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Mount Pass (3)	4	0	0	7	11	73	84	(13.1)	0	0	0	1	1	2	3
Newberry (1)	10	0	0	5	15	111	126	(11.9)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Baker (2)	0	0	0	0	0	103	103	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: COLTON JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 20. REPRESENTING: 20. CITY: COLTON. COUNTY: 36 SAN BERNARDINO

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other		
Number	24	64	49	4,349	4,486	7,620	12,106		2	12	3	9	26	440	466	
Percent	0.2	0.5	0.4	35.9	37.1	62.9	100.0		0.4	2.6	0.6	1.9	5.6	94.4	100.0	
Woodrow Wilson (18)	0	6	2	495	503	17	520	(96.7)	0	0	0	2	2	22	24	
George Washington (17)	0	0	0	130	130	63	193	(67.4)	0	0	0	0	0	8	8	
Abraham Lincoln (12)	0	2	1	377	380	216	596	(63.8)	0	0	1	1	2	19	21	
San Salvadore (2)	0	1	1	75	77	46	123	(62.6)	0	2	0	0	1	8	10	
William McKinley (13)	3	10	5	389	407	265	672	(60.6)	0	1	0	0	1	20	21	
Colton Junior High (4)	2	5	0	502	509	376	885	(57.5)	0	0	0	1	1	37	38	
U. S. Grant (9)	0	5	2	318	325	265	590	(55.1)	0	1	1	1	3	17	20	
Colton High (1)	1	5	5	928	939	1,178	2,117	(44.4)	0	0	3	3	77	80		
Dr. Paul J. Rogers (14)	0	1	3	217	221	299	520	(42.5)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19	
Alice Birney (6)	2	0	0	110	112	243	355	(31.5)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12	
Ruth Grimes (10)	0	5	0	130	135	346	481	(28.1)	0	2	0	1	3	17	20	
Walter Zimmerman (19)	0	3	2	123	128	450	578	(22.1)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20	
Terrace Hills Junior High (5)	0	0	1	83	84	336	420	(20.0)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	
Barton (3)	0	6	4	49	59	491	550	(10.7)	0	3	0	1	4	13	17	
Arrowhead (2)	1	12	1	24	38	328	366	(10.4)	0	1	0	0	1	10	11	
Vermont (41)	0	7	0	44	51	468	519	(9.8)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16	
Newmark (32)	1	32	0	32	65	618	683	(9.5)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20	
Del Rosa (12)	0	26	1	52	79	926	1,005	(7.9)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31	
Parkside (33)	1	28	0	11	40	548	588	(6.8)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19	
Fairfax (14)	1	2	5	32	40	582	622	(6.4)	0	2	0	0	2	17	19	
Hillside (17)	0	13	8	21	42	695	737	(5.7)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21	
Cajon (7)	0	0	0	3	3	164	167	(1.8)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	

DISTRICT: REDLANDS UNIFIED SHCOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 19. REPRESENTING: 19. CITY: REDLANDS. COUNTY: 36 SAN BERNARDINO

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other		
Number	40	305	58	2,198	2,601	9,715	12,316		1	7	3	9	20	441	461	
Percent	0.3	2.5	0.5	17.8	21.1	78.9	100.0		0.2	1.5	0.7	2.0	4.3	95.7	100.0	
Lincoln (7)	0	53	0	242	295	46	341	(86.5)	0	0	0	1	1	11	12	
Lugonia (8)	0	37	1	385	423	453	876	(48.3)	0	0	0	0	0	30	30	
Henry G. Clement Junior High (15)	0	24	1	228	253	431	684	(37.0)	0	0	0	1	1	29	30	
Cram (3)	0	0	0	41	41	75	116	(35.3)	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	
O.H. Henry G. Clement Junior High (16)	0	3	1	17	21	41	62	(33.9)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	
Redlands Continuation High (1)	0	1	0	22	23	45	68	(33.8)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	
Mission (11)	5	7	4	92	108	285	393	(27.5)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13	
Victoria Elementary (14)	0	3	5	112	120	325	445	(27.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18	
Smiley Elementary (13)	0	12	5	164	181	601	782	(23.1)	0	1	0	0	1	27	28	
Franklin (5)	0	13	1	94	108	370	478	(22.6)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15	
McKinley Elementary (10)	1	35	3	56	95	354	449	(21.2)	0	1	1	0	2	13	15	
Edward M. Cape Junior High (17)	13	52	4	183	252	952	1,204	(20.9)	0	1	0	3	4	44	48	
Redlands Senior High (19)	15	51	16	352	434	2,245	2,679	(16.2)	1	2	1	2	6	103	109	
Mentone Elementary (12)	2	2	1	54	59	312	371	(15.9)	0	0	0	1	1	12	13	
Crafton (2)	0	4	5	3	73	85	693	(10.9)	0	1	0	0	1	27	28	
Moore Junior High (18)	0	5	4	58	67	1,064	1,131	(5.9)	0	1	0	1	2	41	43	
Kimberly Elementary (6)	0	2	6	18	26	869	895	(2.9)	0	0	1	0	1	25	26	
Mariposa Elementary (9)	0	0	3	7	10	510	520	(1.9)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17	
Fallsville Elementary (4)	0	0	0	0	0	44	44	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	

DISTRICT: SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DIST. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 58. REPRESENTING: 58. CITY: SAN BERNARDINO. COUNTY: 36

School	Students—							Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	American Indians			Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other		
Number	59	5,584	190	7,217	13,050	25,338	38,388		2	87	3	48	140	1,249	1,389	
Percent	0.2	14.5	0.5	18.8	34.0	66.0	100.0		0.1	6.3	0.2	3.5	10.1	89.9	100.0	
Alessandro (1)	0	176	0	205	381	1	382	(99.7)	0	3	0	1	4	12	16	
Ramona (34)	0	254	0	305	559	4	563	(99.3)	0	2	0	4	6	17	23	
Rio Vista (36)	0	446	0	37	483	4	487	(99.2)	0	3	0	0	3	16	19	
Mt. Vernon (29)	0	220	1	389	610	7	617	(98.9)	0	5	1	0	6	20	26	
Franklin Junior High (50)	0	356	1	192	549	7	556	(98.7)	0	1	0	1	2	26	28	
Roosevelt (37)	0	241	2	557	800	14	814	(98.3)	0	7	0	1	8	23	31	
Muscott (30)	0	342	0	51	393	13	406	(96.8)	0	4	0	0	4	13	17	
California (8)	0	465	0	44	509	17	526	(96.8)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20	
Harding (15)	0	44	2	227	273	29	302	(90.4)	0	2	0	1	3	10	14	
Burbank (6)	0	73	1	185	259	86	345	(75.1)	0	2	0	2	4	10	14	
Sturges Junior High (55)	7	87	3	425	522	206	728	(71.7)	0	3	0	3	6	24	30	
Urbana (40)	0	0	0	191	191	76	267	(71.5)	0	0	0	1	1	7	8	
Richardson Junior High (54)	1	86	3	239	329	138	467	(70.4)	1	0	0	1	2	18	20	
Jefferson (19)	0	44	2	121	167	82	249	(67.1)	0	2	0	0	2	8	10	
Waterman Gardens (44)	1	3	0	15	19	10	29	(65.5)	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	
Lytle Creek (24)	0	10	1	272	283	159	442	(64.0)	0	0	0	5	5	13	18	
Metcalf Special (26)	0	33	0	27	60	47	107	(56.1)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9	
Riley (35)	0	16	5	127	148	132	280	(52.9)	0	0	0	1	1	8	9	
Conrad Continuation High (48)	0	9	0	12	21	20	41	(51.2)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Lyman (23)	0	58	1	115	174	176	350	(49.7)	1	0	0	0	1	13	14	
Fremont Junior High (51)	0	304	0	62	366	395	761	(48.1)	0	3	0	2	5	33	38	
Muscovy (31)	0	214	0	94	308	336	644	(47.8)	0	8	0	0	8	18	26	
San Bernardino High (57)	1	521	4	538	1,065	1,393	2,458	(43.3)	0	3	0	4	7	91	98	
Cunrad Junior High (47)	0	22	0	10	32	56	88	(36.4)	0	0	0	1	1	2	3	
Curtis Junior High (48)	2	114	8	229	353	679	1,032	(30.9)	0	0	0	1	1	39	40	
Monterey (28)	4	39	7	147	197	441	638	(30.9)	0	1	0	0	1	24	25	
Pacific High (56)	5	164	16	581	766	1,771	2,537	(30.2)	0	0	1	2	3	93	96	
Wilson (43)	0	53	0	51	104	296	400	(26.0)	0	1	0	0	2	16	19	
Cole (9)	1	71	9	68	149	463	612	(24.3)	0	1	0	0	1	13	19	
Lankershim (21)	0	33	2	91	126	419	545	(23.1)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	
Arrowview Junior High (45)	1	76	2	157	236	802	1,038	(22.7)	0	0	0	1	1	38	39	
Kendall (20)	2	27	1	19	49	169	218	(22.5)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7	
Lincoln (22)	4	15	2	62	83	304	387	(21.4)	0	1	0	0	1	11	12	
Hunt (18)	2	53	9	77	141	531	672	(21.0)	0	1	0	1	2	20	22	
Thompson (39)	0	53	3	73	129	550	679	(19.0)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20	

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS. 58. REPRESENTING: 58. CITY; SAN BERNARDINO. COUNTY: 36—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
San Geronio High (58)	4	157	15	192	368	1,858	2,226	(16.5)	0	1	0	4	5	72	77
Sterling (38)	1	32	2	36	71	416	487	(14.6)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16
Marshall (25)	1	20	2	43	66	387	453	(14.6)	0	1	1	1	3	11	14
Highland Junior High (53)	3	58	14	110	185	1,113	1,298	(14.3)	0	2	0	0	2	44	46
Davidson (11)	1	15	7	59	82	501	583	(14.1)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19
Mitchell (27)	3	56	3	25	87	537	624	(13.9)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Del Vallejo Junior High (49)	1	78	6	108	193	1,234	1,427	(13.5)	0	1	0	1	2	50	52
Bradley (5)	0	15	0	46	61	422	483	(12.6)	0	1	0	0	1	15	16
Golden Valley Junior High (52)	0	92	8	55	155	1,213	1,368	(11.3)	0	3	0	3	6	48	54
Highland-Pacific (16)	1	32	7	31	71	567	638	(11.1)	0	2	0	1	3	17	20
Belvedere (4)	2	65	0	12	79	642	721	(11.0)	0	2	0	0	2	20	22
Crestmore Elementary (7)	6	10	4	72	92	407	499	(18.4)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Bloomington Junior High (3)	6	2	7	93	108	586	694	(15.6)	0	0	0	0	0	29	29
Bloomington High (20)	2	3	5	170	180	980	1,160	(15.5)	2	1	0	0	3	47	50
Gerald A. Smith (15)	0	6	2	51	59	333	392	(15.1)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Mary B. Lewis (11)	2	0	4	38	44	351	395	(11.1)	0	1	0	0	1	14	15
Terrace View (16)	0	0	4	19	23	358	381	(6.0)	0	1	0	1	1	12	13
Grand Terrace (8)	0	0	1	29	30	505	535	(5.6)	0	1	0	0	1	18	19

DISTRICT: VICTOR SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 7. REPRESENTING: 9. CITY: VICTORVILLE. COUNTY: 36. SAN BERNARDINO

Number	0	156	19	312	487	1,689	2,176	100.0	0	8	1	0	9	65	74
Percent	0.0	7.2	0.9	14.3	22.4	77.6	100.0	100.0	0.0	10.8	1.4	0.0	12.2	87.8	100.0
Eva Dell (3)	0	51	0	27	78	1	79	(98.7)	0	1	0	0	1	2	3
Victor (6)	0	38	5	81	124	95	219	(56.6)	0	1	0	0	1	6	7
Irwin (4)	0	20	4	105	129	350	479	(26.9)	0	2	0	0	2	14	16
Village Elementary (7)	0	13	2	14	29	108	137	(21.2)	0	1	1	0	2	4	6
Park View Elementary (5)	0	15	1	49	65	437	502	(12.9)	0	1	0	0	1	16	17
Del Rey (1)	0	19	6	35	60	586	646	(9.3)	0	2	0	0	2	18	20
Desert Knolls Elementary (2)	0	0	1	1	2	112	114	(1.8)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

DISTRICT: NAT'L SCHOOL DISTRICT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 9. REPRESENTING: 9. CITY: NATIONAL CITY. COUNTY: 37. SAN DIEGO

Number	28	114	132	1,804	2,078	3,015	5,093	100.0	0	1	1	6	8	153	161
Percent	0.5	2.2	2.6	35.4	40.8	59.2	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.6	0.6	3.7	5.0	95.0	100.0
Kimball (3)	0	2	0	309	311	52	363	(85.7)	0	0	0	3	3	9	12
Highland (5)	0	3	8	150	161	200	361	(44.5)	0	0	0	1	1	10	11
Central (1)	0	4	17	235	256	365	621	(41.2)	0	0	1	0	1	18	19
Las Palmas (4)	14	0	20	164	198	308	508	(39.1)	0	1	0	0	1	13	14
El Toyon (2)	4	82	25	261	372	580	952	(39.1)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Ira Harbison (7)	1	2	29	195	227	357	584	(38.9)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Olivewood (8)	1	10	12	149	172	290	462	(37.2)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Lincoln Acres (6)	7	6	11	209	233	458	691	(33.7)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
Palmer Way (9)	1	5	10	132	148	405	553	(26.8)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19

DISTRICT: SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 155. REPRESENTING: 155. CITY: SAN DIEGO. COUNTY: 37. SAN DIEGO

Number	211	15,004	2,555	12,981	30,751	98,163	128,914	100.0	1	190	29	97	317	4,571	4,888
Percent	0.2	11.6	2.0	10.1	23.9	76.1	100.0	100.0	0.0	3.9	0.6	2.0	6.5	93.5	100.0
Logan Elementary (113)	0	448	10	287	745	7	752	(99.1)	0	1	0	1	2	36	38
David Crockett Elementary (65)	0	294	15	94	403	5	408	(98.8)	0	0	0	2	2	16	18
Stockton Elementary (142)	0	843	4	76	923	16	939	(98.3)	0	5	0	0	5	31	36
Baker Elementary (41)	0	336	33	57	426	10	436	(97.7)	0	4	0	1	5	17	19
Abraham Lincoln Senior High (27)	0	899	45	151	1,095	33	1,128	(97.1)	0	7	2	2	11	54	68
Emerson Elementary (74)	0	441	22	172	635	20	655	(96.9)	0	1	0	1	2	25	27
Henry C. Johnson Elementary (102)	0	356	4	16	376	12	388	(96.9)	0	3	0	0	3	12	15
Valencia Park Elementary (145)	0	611	4	29	644	21	665	(96.8)	0	5	0	0	5	20	25
Harley E. Knox Elementary (107)	0	596	29	41	666	29	695	(95.8)	0	4	0	0	4	22	26
Samuel Gompers Junior High (7)	0	715	27	139	881	45	926	(95.1)	0	8	0	1	9	44	53
Bandini Elementary (43)	0	193	10	65	268	14	282	(95.0)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
Memorial Junior High (12)	5	840	26	582	1,453	83	1,536	(94.6)	0	11	0	6	17	77	94
Chollas Elementary (62)	3	448	35	130	616	38	654	(94.2)	0	3	0	0	3	24	27
James Russell Lowell Elementary (116)	14	38	5	354	411	27	438	(93.8)	0	1	0	4	5	15	20
Kennedy Elementary (106)	0	719	1	48	768	53	821	(93.5)	0	3	0	0	3	35	38
Francis Mead Elementary (122)	0	248	23	102	373	26	399	(93.5)	0	3	0	0	3	10	13
Luther Burbank Elementary (55)	0	178	6	149	333	24	357	(93.3)	0	3	0	1	4	12	16
Sherman Elementary (138)	0	461	3	380	844	100	944	(89.4)	0	8	0	1	9	37	46
Balboa Elementary (42)	0	369	56	494	919	136	1,055	(87.1)	0	8	2	4	14	33	47
Wright Brothers Junior-Senior High (35)	0	84	2	22	108	21	129	(83.7)	0	3	0	0	3	16	19
Fulton Elementary (87)	0	526	7	30	563	126	689	(81.7)	0	1	0	0	1	23	24
Webster Elementary (150)	0	216	8	39	263	67	330	(79.7)	0	2	0	0	2	9	11
Horton Elementary (99)	0	293	52	40	385	162	547	(70.4)	0	4	2	0	6	14	20
San Diego High (33)	7	462	66	737	1,272	970	2,242	(56.7)	0	6	2	5	13	93	106
O'Farrell Junior High (15)	2	623	49	262	936	932	1,868	(50.1)	0	9	1	2	12	77	89
Central Elementary (60)	1	152	14	152	319	339	658	(48.5)	0	1	1	0	2	23	25
Encanto Elementary (75)	4	161	34	306	505	642	1,147	(44.0)	0	0	0	0	0	40	40
E. R. Snyder Continuation High (34)	0	72	1	93	166	226	392	(42.3)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Samuel F. B. Morse (31)	5	411	74	328	818	1,147	1,965	(41.6)	0	7	2	4	13	77	90
Fremont Elementary (36)	0	42	6	57	105	152	257	(40.9)	0	1	0	1	2	7	9
Fairhaven Elementary (77)	0	67	0	37	104	157	261	(39.8)	0	2	2	0	4	18	22
Washington Elementary (149)	1	6	20	116	143	220	363	(39.4)	0	1	0	0	1	12	13
Annie B. Keller Elementary (105)	0	49	9	108	166	271	437	(38.0)	0	2	0	0	2	12	14
Linda Vista Elementary (111)	1	110	53	159	323	536	859	(37.6)	0	0	0	0	0	31	31
Bell Junior High (3)	4	181	23	133	341	719	1,060	(32.2)	0	6	0	0	6	51	57
Brooklyn Elementary (54)	1	23	35	270	329	695	1,024	(32.1)	0	2	0	2	4	30	34
Paradise Hills Elementary (129)	5	94	48	142	289	626	915	(31.6)	0	2	0	1	3	27	30
Clara Barton Elementary (45)	4	67	35	48	154	370	524	(29.4)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Rev. Development Center for Handicapped Minors (1)	0	9	0	8	17	43	60	(28.3)	0	0	0	2	2	5	7

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 155. REPRESENTING: 155. CITY: SAN DIEGO. COUNTY: 37 SAN DIEGO.—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Elizabeth Freese Elementary (85)	0	113	24	94	231	606	837	(27.6)	0	3	0	1	4	24	28
Kit Carson Elementary (58)	3	92	37	143	275	725	1,000	(27.5)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33
Roosevelt Junior High (18)	6	109	44	286	445	1,212	1,657	(26.9)	0	1	0	2	3	70	73
Oliver Hazard Perry Elementary (130)	1	165	54	78	298	844	1,142	(26.1)	0	9	0	1	10	25	35
John James Audubon Elementary (40)	2	43	29	155	229	671	900	(25.4)	0	3	0	0	3	25	28
Oak Park Elementary (126)	0	77	15	57	149	443	592	(25.2)	0	0	0	0	0	19	19
Daniel Boone Elementary (53)	0	33	61	112	206	683	889	(23.2)	0	0	0	0	0	28	28
Sunshine School (144)	1	15	0	18	34	114	148	(23.0)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
George Dewey Elementary (72)	0	87	18	14	119	400	519	(22.9)	0	1	1	0	2	18	20
Mark Twain Elementary (147)	0	7	12	51	70	245	315	(22.2)	0	0	0	1	1	8	9
Robert E. Lee Elementary (110)	1	35	28	186	250	949	1,199	(20.9)	0	2	0	1	3	35	38
John J. Montgomery Junior High (13)	2	135	16	181	334	1,322	1,655	(20.2)	0	2	0	2	4	70	74
Chesterston Elementary (61)	0	93	16	21	130	521	651	(20.0)	0	1	1	0	2	7	7
Woodrow Wilson Junior High (20)	3	77	32	251	363	1,484	1,847	(19.7)	0	1	0	2	3	71	74
Angier Elementary (39)	0	147	1	42	247	1,013	1,260	(19.6)	0	1	0	1	2	39	41
Cabrillo Elementary (56)	1	1	97	110	217	457	567	(19.4)	0	0	0	0	1	16	16
Horace Mann Junior High (10)	4	181	34	236	455	2,043	2,498	(18.2)	0	2	1	2	5	96	101
Andrew Jackson Elementary (100)	4	49	14	46	113	540	653	(17.3)	0	0	0	0	0	22	22
John Marshall Elementary (120)	0	6	17	71	94	452	546	(17.2)	0	0	0	1	1	16	17
Alice Birney Elementary (52)	1	8	18	80	107	515	622	(17.2)	0	0	0	0	0	21	21
Edison Elementary (73)	0	2	8	68	78	384	462	(16.9)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Euclid Elementary (76)	3	10	15	80	108	583	691	(15.6)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
McKinley Elementary (117)	2	0	29	106	137	742	879	(15.6)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Herbert Hoover High (24)	10	63	32	229	334	1,871	2,205	(15.1)	1	2	0	0	3	87	90
Stephen Watts Kearny High (25)	10	138	45	188	381	2,153	2,534	(15.0)	0	3	1	0	4	100	104
Carver Elementary (59)	0	1	1	52	54	309	363	(14.9)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
La Jolla Elementary (109)	0	17	3	79	99	588	687	(14.4)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Garfield Elementary (89)	0	1	8	64	73	452	525	(13.9)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Silver Gate Elementary (139)	0	56	2	26	84	524	608	(13.8)	0	0	1	0	1	20	21
Prog for Physically Handicapped (2)	0	8	0	5	13	84	97	(13.4)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sequoia Elementary (136)	10	1	28	107	146	946	1,092	(13.4)	0	0	0	0	0	37	37
Alexander Hamilton Elementary (94)	0	12	17	85	114	746	860	(13.3)	0	1	0	0	1	28	29
Jefferson Elementary (101)	1	1	15	63	80	531	611	(13.1)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Florence Elementary (81)	0	3	10	47	60	429	489	(12.3)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Midway Junior-Senior High (29)	1	12	1	21	35	251	286	(12.2)	0	0	0	0	1	23	24
Rowan Elementary (134)	0	9	6	30	45	328	373	(12.1)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
Maddow Elementary (118)	2	3	30	79	114	856	960	(12.0)	0	0	0	0	0	33	33
Bay Park Elementary (46)	0	0	11	39	50	384	434	(11.5)	0	0	0	1	2	12	13
Rolando Park Elementary (132)	0	12	20	66	98	765	863	(11.4)	0	1	1	0	2	29	31
Nathaniel Hawthorne Elementary (96)	0	30	18	54	102	818	920	(11.1)	0	0	1	1	2	40	42
Collier Junior High (4)	0	30	18	54	102	818	920	(11.1)	0	0	1	1	2	40	42
Robert Louis Stevenson Elementary (141)	3	0	23	57	83	674	757	(11.0)	0	1	0	0	1	26	27
Foster Elementary (83)	3	3	7	56	69	570	639	(10.8)	0	1	0	0	1	19	20
Ocean Beach Elementary (127)	2	0	16	60	78	655	733	(10.6)	0	0	1	0	1	22	23
Adams Elementary (36)	2	0	17	59	78	659	737	(10.6)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Crown Point Elementary (66)	1	5	9	47	62	537	599	(10.4)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Will C. Crawford High (22)	7	28	46	166	307	2,698	3,005	(10.2)	0	0	1	1	2	111	113
Taft Junior High (19)	4	33	31	83	151	1,170	1,370	(9.6)	0	1	0	1	2	62	64
Lafayette Elementary (108)	2	14	17	47	80	763	843	(9.5)	0	2	0	0	2	32	34
Bayview Terrace Elementary (47)	0	27	6	33	66	651	717	(9.2)	0	1	0	0	1	22	23
Point Loma High (32)	2	34	9	153	198	1,959	2,157	(9.2)	0	0	1	1	2	87	89
Beale Elementary (48)	0	5	13	28	46	462	508	(9.1)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Whittier Elementary (154)	1	3	6	34	44	443	487	(9.0)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Louisa M. Alcott Elementary (37)	3	0	22	47	72	763	835	(8.6)	0	0	0	1	1	26	27
Wegforth Elementary (151)	0	11	15	32	58	616	674	(8.6)	0	1	0	1	2	19	21
Barnard Elementary (44)	1	0	11	26	38	409	447	(8.5)	0	0	0	0	0	13	13
Eugene Field Elementary (79)	0	0	15	42	57	618	675	(8.4)	0	1	0	0	1	24	25
Charles A. Lindbergh Elementary (112)	3	8	32	61	104	1,138	1,242	(8.4)	0	0	0	0	0	45	45
Kate Douglas Wiggin Elementary (155)	1	2	16	35	54	382	416	(8.2)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
Einstein Junior High (6)	3	3	25	126	157	1,803	1,960	(8.0)	0	0	0	1	1	81	82
George W. Marston Junior High (11)	0	6	26	147	184	2,126	2,310	(8.0)	0	2	0	3	5	84	89
Dana Junior High (5)	0	7	5	69	81	937	1,018	(8.0)	0	3	0	1	4	37	41
Darnall Elementary (69)	0	3	0	31	34	396	430	(7.9)	0	0	0	0	0	15	15
Eliwood P. Cubberley Elementary (67)	1	2	22	29	54	645	699	(7.7)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Jones Elementary (103)	1	9	33	39	82	1,016	1,098	(7.5)	0	1	0	1	2	33	35
Pete W. Ross Elementary (133)	1	12	13	31	57	739	796	(7.2)	0	0	0	1	1	25	26
Loma Portal Elementary (114)	2	1	22	28	53	693	746	(7.1)	0	0	0	1	1	21	22
Maria Curie Elementary (68)	1	0	16	42	59	793	852	(6.9)	0	0	0	1	1	27	28
James Madison High (28)	9	5	29	147	190	2,589	2,779	(6.8)	0	1	1	1	3	102	105
Benjamin Franklin Elementary (84)	0	6	8	19	33	450	483	(6.8)	0	0	0	0	0	17	17
Hale Junior High (8)	4	15	27	80	126	1,727	1,853	(6.8)	0	1	0	3	4	71	75
Belle Benchley (50)	0	1	3	11	15	209	224	(6.8)	0	0	0	0	0	7	7
Fletcher Elementary (80)	0	7	13	21	41	588	629	(6.5)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Walt Whitman Elementary (153)	1	2	15	43	61	877	938	(6.5)	0	0	0	1	1	29	30
Hardy Elementary (95)	0	28	1	2	31	448	479	(6.5)	0	0	0	2	2	13	15
Martha Farnum Elementary (78)	0	7	7	11	25	373	398	(6.3)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14
Beale Elementary (49)	0	0	0	1	1	15	16	(6.3)	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Clay Elementary (63)	0	2	0	20	22	331	353	(6.2)	0	0	0	0	0	11	11
Juarez Elementary (104)	0	0	14	23	37	562	599	(6.2)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Oliver Wendell Holmes Elementary (98)	0	0	17	19	36	553	589	(6.1)	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Clairemont High (21)	5	7	15	105	132	2,054	2,186	(6.0)	0	0	0	1	1	91	92
Hans Christian Andersen (38)	2	7	9	20	38	614	652	(5.8)	0	0	0	0	0	20	20
Cadman Elementary (57)	3	6	12	27	48	782	830	(5.8)	0	0	0	0	0	25	25
Torrey Pines Elementary (146)	0	0	3	26	36	267	283	(5.5)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Pacific Beach Elementary (128)	2	2	4	26	34	579	613	(5.5)	0	0	0	1	1	18	19
Grantville Elementary (92)	0	2	2	13	17	296	313	(5							

CALIFORNIA STATE TOTAL—Continued

B SERIES—SYSTEMS WITH AT LEAST 1 SCHOOL WITH MINORITY GROUP ENROLLMENT OVER 80 PERCENT—Continued

DISTRICT: SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 155. REPRESENTING: 155. CITY: SAN DIEGO. COUNTY: 37 SAN DIEGO.—Continued

School	Students—						Total	Weight: 1.0	Teachers—						Total
	American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other			American Indians	Negro	Oriental	Spanish-American	Minority total	Other	
Pershing Junior High (17)	0	7	6	54	67	1,566	1,633	(4.1)	0	0	0	2	2	60	62
Weinberger Elementary (152)	0	1	5	21	27	655	682	(4.0)	0	0	0	1	1	19	20
Myron B. Green Elementary (93)	1	1	5	15	22	535	557	(3.9)	0	0	0	1	1	17	18
La Jolla High (26)	0	7	4	31	42	1,060	1,102	(3.8)	0	0	0	3	3	41	44
Mission Beach Elementary (123)	0	0	1	5	6	159	165	(3.6)	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
John G. Marvin Elementary (121)	0	2	7	20	29	783	812	(3.6)	0	1	0	0	1	25	26
Lyman Judson Gage Elementary (88)	1	2	18	29	50	1,366	1,416	(3.5)	0	2	0	1	3	43	46
Bird Rock Elementary (51)	0	0	6	7	13	379	392	(3.3)	0	0	0	0	0	12	12
James Whitcomb Riley Elementary (131)	0	2	5	22	29	858	887	(3.3)	0	2	0	0	2	24	26
Montezuma Elementary (124)	0	3	1	5	9	274	283	(3.2)	0	0	0	0	0	9	9
Lewis Junior High (9)	1	0	7	31	44	1,370	1,414	(3.1)	0	0	0	0	0	55	55
May Scott Marcy Elementary (119)	0	0	12	17	29	743	762	(2.5)	0	0	0	0	0	23	23
Patrick Henry High (23)	0	8	6	25	41	1,690	1,731	(2.4)	0	0	0	1	1	64	65
William P. Toler Elementary (145)	0	0	3	6	9	400	409	(2.2)	0	0	1	0	1	15	16
Stephen Decatur Elementary (71)	0	0	3	4	7	477	484	(1.4)	0	0	0	0	0	16	16
De Anza Elementary (70)	0	0	1	2	3	299	232	(1.3)	0	0	1	0	1	8	9
Hearst Elementary (97)	0	0	1	4	5	685	690	(0.7)	0	1	1	0	2	19	21
Scripps Elementary (135)	0	0	1	0	1	265	266	(0.4)	0	1	0	0	1	8	9
John Muir Elementary (125)	0	0	0	0	0	159	159	(0.0)	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

DISTRICT: SAN YSIDRO SCHOOL DISTRICT. NUMBER OF SCHOOLS: 3. REPRESENTING: 6. CITY: SAN YSIDRO. COUNTY: 37. SAN DIEGO

Number	1	1	4	861	867	153	1,020	0	0	1	3	4	41	45	
Percent	0.1	0.1	0.4	84.4	85.0	15.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	2.2	6.7	8.9	91.1	100.0	
Willow (1)	0	0	0	348	348	47	395	(88.1)	0	0	1	2	3	14	17
Beyer (3)	0	1	3	249	253	48	301	(84.1)	0	0	0	1	1	13	14
Sunset (2)	1	0	1	264	266	58	324	(82.1)	0	0	0	0	0	14	14

LAND REFORM IN VIETNAM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an important article on land reform in Vietnam be printed in the RECORD. Recently, I introduced Senate Resolution 290, which deals with the important subject of land reform in Vietnam. Roy L. Prosterman, associate professor of law at the University of Washington Law School, is a leading expert in land reform. Professor Prosterman has made one trip under private grant to Vietnam and two trips as the land law consultant to Stanford Research Institute under a Government-sponsored project.

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

LAND REFORM IN VIETNAM
(By Roy L. Prosterman)

Old Vietnamese Proverb: "He should own the land who rubs it between his hands each season."

Joseph Alsop, in the New Yorker, June 25, 1955: "The Vietminh could not possibly have carried on the resistance [against the French] for one year, let alone nine years, without the people's strong, united support."

President Nguyen Van Thieu in a speech delivered January 18, 1968: "In the Social Reconstruction mission, Land Reform as is natural has to be placed on the top line. . . . Nevertheless, we must bravely acknowledge that, until now, the results obtained are lower in consideration of its goal and its requirements."

It should be in no way surprising that in a country where the bulk of the population—still 80 per cent today—is dependent on the land as its sole source of livelihood (as has been the case in Vietnam for at least 2,000

years) the question of land tenure should assume gigantic proportions.¹ Tenure imbalance strikes at the very base of the country's economic and political stability. Historically, breaking up large holdings and transferring them to individual small owners was a means of power consolidation by new Vietnamese royal dynasties. Even as late as the first decades of the nineteenth century, Nguyen Anh, who founded the last dynasty, set about breaking up large feudal landholdings in Vietnam. This policy was pursued by his successor, who acceded to the throne in 1820. The advent of French colonialism in the 1860's was accompanied by dramatic changes.

It is estimated that between 1880 and 1930 the land area devoted to rice in the fertile, southern region of Vietnam then known as Cochinchina (which included, in particular, the Mekong Delta region south of Saigon), grew by at least 400 per cent, with resulting increased yields. Yet, by 1930, the position of the Vietnamese peasant in the economy had so deteriorated that his situation was worse than it had been prior to French intrusion. Land was sold at absurdly cheap prices to colonialists who amassed vast holdings; the rice that could have put an end to peasant starvation was extracted through land rents and was exported, rather than made available to the indigenous population. The rough figures that are available indicate that during the 1930's some 57 per cent of the rural population of Cochinchina was landless.

As Joseph Buttinger, a leading Western historian of Vietnam, summed it up in *Vietnam: A Dragon Embattled*,² "the rural masses became as dependent on the rich landowners as the serfs of medieval Europe had been on their feudal lords."

After a third visit to Vietnam, in September, 1969, I had to conclude that the final word on success or failure of land reform as a program bearing on the conflict could not—

quite—be written yet. Like Pearl lashed to the rail, and then rescued, this quintessential program had been up and down again so many times over the last 15 years that even a week's lead time before publication might find one badly out of date. But at least for one sparkling moment, starting in May, 1969, and lasting at least through mid-fall, land reform was definitely "up" again. Whether or not the Vietnamese Senate or President Nguyen Van Thieu himself utilizes far reaching amendment powers to restore Thieu's genuinely excellent legislative proposal (after its evisceration at the hands of the lower house at the start of September), it would still be true that 1969 was the best year ever for South Vietnamese land reform. Unfortunately, this is not really saying much. Without a good bill to effect the transfer of privately owned lands, plus vigorous enforcement of the legislation and of programs begun earlier this year, South Vietnam will lose what is very likely her last chance to make sense out of this most basic of all "pacification" programs, and to acquire the leverage this might supply for a political settlement broadly satisfactory to various shades of American opinion.

LAND TENURE PATTERN

That the land problem is near the root of the conflict—as it was, for example, in China and in Cuba—has long been clear to most careful and scholarly observers; it is a point on which there has been close agreement among Bernard Fall (land reform is "as essential to success as ammunition for howitzers—in fact, more so"), Buttinger, Douglas Pake, and many, many others. Today, at least three-fifths of South Vietnam's population of about 17 million is rural and derives a livelihood chiefly from rice farming. About three-fifths of this rural population lives in the Mekong Delta, south of Saigon, where 80 per cent of the country's rice is produced. Most of the remaining two-fifths of the farmers live in a narrow belt of riceland running up the coast—the area known as the Central Lowlands.

The tenure pattern under which the bulk of these farmers live and gain their sustenance is not fundamentally changed from

¹The author has just returned from his third extended trip to Vietnam to review progress in the land-reform area. This trip was taken under private grant, while the two

²(New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967).

that shown in the 1960-1961 Agricultural Census of South Vietnam, as confirmed by field work by the Stanford Research Institute (S.R.I.) in which I participated at the end of 1967. During the critical period of the conflict's development in the early 1960's only 257,000 out of 1,175,000—or 23 per cent—of the Mekong Delta's farming families owned all the land they worked. Their average holding was four and one-half acres. Another 334,000 families, or 28.5 per cent of the total, tilled six acres—four of which were rented, while 521,000 families, roughly 44 per cent, farmed an average of three and one-half acres of land that was *totally* rented. Thus, in the Delta, more than seven farming families out of 10 (44 per cent + 28.5 per cent = 72.5 per cent) were substantially dependent on tenant farming.

The massive dislocation of the war has reduced the rural population from 75 to 80 per cent to the current 60 per cent figure, and the exodus to the cities was probably proportionately greater among those who had no land of their own. But the 1967 field work showed that at least 60 per cent of the Delta's agricultural population, in the relatively secure areas (where the field work could be carried on), remained without ownership of land, and the size of holdings and conditions of tenure remained unchanged. In its percentage of landlessness, the Mekong Delta thus qualified as one of the four worst areas of the world—along with the Huk country of Central Luzon, Java, and northeastern Brazil—and equalled or exceeded pre-revolutionary China, Russia and Cuba.

The S.R.I. field work—the major portion of which consisted of nearly one thousand hour-long interviews with Mekong Delta residents, carefully randomized, and using an extensively pretested set of questions and Vietnamese interviewers under American supervisors—uncovered further details, although most of these simply confirmed the accurate appraisals which had already been available for more than a decade. In the Delta, landlords supply virtually no inputs: no credit, seeds, implements, fertilizer or advice. They collect rents—typically one-third to one-half of the gross crop, and sometimes even more. The landlords of roughly half the tenanted land are absentees, so rent collection becomes an annual foray either by them or by agents—often local officials or military men who get a cut of what they collect.

Tenants can usually be evicted at will. They are held responsible for most, or all, of the rent even when their crops fail, for the rent is calculated in advance on an *estimate* of the gross crop. Thus, after major flooding reduced the harvest of 1966-67—the Delta harvest period is from December to February—many tenants were held for rents that exceeded 75 per cent of their actual production. Should a tenant be unable to pay his rent, he is confronted with interest rates on the unpaid portion that *average* 60 per cent a year, and which in one case out of five exceeded 120 per cent a year.

The situation is no better in the Central Lowlands. As the 1960-1961 census showed, the typical family—403,000 out of 695,000—lived on a two-acre farm, one acre of which was rented. About 74,000 families held rented land only, their average holding being one and one-tenth acres. Rents on the tenanted or share-cropped portion of lands in the Central Lowlands generally are 50 per cent of the gross crop, although here the actual crop is the measure more often than an estimate made in advance. Security of tenure, however, is as nonexistent as it is in the Delta.

These land-tenure figures can be given some perspective by noting that South Vietnamese calculations indicate that once the rents go much above one-fifth of the crop, even a three and one-half acre Delta plot (the average for the 44 per cent of families that the census showed to be living wholly

on rented land) does not produce enough rice to keep the average six-person household at recommended minimum sustenance levels.

The typical Central Lowlands mixed-tenure holding, as indicated, averages only two acres, one-half of which is rented.

A further finding of the S.R.I. study, contrary to a vast amount of conventional wisdom found in Saigon offices (but generally not found out in the field), was that the tenant farmers of the Mekong Delta—in an open-ended question with multiple responses allowed—regarded land ownership as a paramount concern five times as frequently as they regarded physical security as a paramount concern, and rated agricultural credit as a paramount concern four times as frequently as security.

THE VIETCONG PROGRAM

All the above data, however, relates to "tenancy" as it exists in areas under South Vietnamese government control. In areas where the Vietcong are in control, they have offered only one substantive program: land reform. The program has deep roots, adumbrated in the Joseph Alsop quotation that begins this article.

By the time that the Geneva Conference was convened in 1954, the Vietminh ruled 60 to 90 per cent of what is now South Vietnam. Their support by the rural population had accounted in substantial part for the crucial advantage that had enabled them to overcome the superior arms and manpower of the French. In their struggle, they had built their broad base of support on the strong foundation of anticolonial nationalism, and they had added to this (even more concretely than the Algerian rebels were to do a few years later) the attraction of land-tenure reform for the mass of the peasantry.

Beginning in 1945, in areas that they controlled, the Vietminh had enforced strict limitations on rent and interest rates. Lands held by the French, communal lands, and the land of "traitors" were confiscated and given to the poorer peasants. Beginning in 1953, the Vietminh undertook the second, more sweeping phase of their land reform program, under a classification system similar to that which had been employed by the Communist Chinese ("landlord," "rich peasant," "middle peasant," "poor peasant" and "agricultural worker"). In its first stage of implementation this system was aimed at taking land from the first two groups and giving it to the last two. Wherever it was applied, the program utterly transformed the village social structure.

The sad history of the post-1954 years can only be briefly sketched here. The North Vietnamese moved to a stage featuring bloody village "trials" of the landlords and—very broadly defined—"rich peasants" (100,000 died, according to the best estimates), and then to collectivization. President Ngo Dinh Diem missed the chance to carry out a competitive democratic land reform, on models such as those of Mexico, Japan, Taiwan, Bolivia or South Korea (all of which had inaugurated sweeping land reforms before 1954). Instead, he adopted a law that was blatantly impossible to administer, attempting to control the landlord-tenant relationship—actually restoring the landlord-tenant relationship for hundreds of thousands of families in formerly Vietminh-controlled areas who had thought the land was now theirs—plus an extremely mild law regulating the acquisition of large holdings. The latter allowed retention of 247 acres (eventually raised to 284 in most cases), which was at least 30 times greater than the "retention limits" in the successful Asian land reform programs of Japan, South Korea and—ten years too late—Taiwan. It also suffered from multiple administrative defects.³ Diem's pro-

³ One example: regulations ultimately gave landlords eight years in which to prove

gram ground to a final halt in 1961, with benefits for only one out of ten tenant families. Local officials were allowed to retain and rent out the best of the acquired lands.

This left two great groups identifying the Communists with land reform and Saigon with the interests of the landed oligarchy:

About one million peasants who remained under Vietminh control even in Diem's heyday, and who continued to live under the economic and social transformations wrought by "first stage" (i.e., precollectivization) Communist land reform.

The great mass of tenant farmers who returned to Diem's control, who not only gained no benefits from Diem's unworkable laws, but actually found the government reestablishing a relationship that the Vietminh had already sundered.

Under the circumstances, it was not only logical but virtually inevitable that at the end of the 1950's the Vietcong should become the active successors of the Vietminh, building popular support throughout the countryside with the promise of the maintenance and extension of the Vietminh land reforms.

Saigon's response, from 1961 onward, not only totally omitted any competitive land reform measures, but from late 1965 onward actually involved the elaboration of decrees which justified the ultimate, very common "pacification" process by which the American innocents, having "secured" a village and moved on, were followed by the landlords riding in on the jeeps with "ARVN" (the South Vietnamese Army) to reassert control over their former lands. Not surprisingly, but very tragically indeed, many Americans have died at the hands of enraged peasants who have associated them with "pacification" in this, its completed, sense.

Unfortunately, the role of AID⁴ and the United States State Department in all of this was pusillanimous. Starting with clear marching orders from President Dwight Eisenhower and those at the top in 1954 that made support for land reform a matter of high priority, working-level officials allowed themselves to be backed off step by step from a workable program by the clear signs of hostility emanating from major segments of the ruling elite. During 1960-65, the United States Mission obligingly failed to have present in Vietnam even one full-time official dealing with the land reform problem, and a plethora of rationalizations sprang up about the need to rely on the landlord class for political stability. In the case of some officials, all these rationalizations stubbornly failed to give way even when the house of cards collapsed in the early 1960's and the preeminent role of the peasants in supporting the rebellion became clear.

PEASANT SUPPORT FOR THE WAR

It is this deeply rooted peasant support which has given the Vietnamese conflict the very strong "insurrection" or "civil war" flavor which it still retains, despite the highly publicized infusions of manpower from the North which began in 1965. The measures of this peasant support are not hard to find. In March, 1968, *The New York Times* noted that the Vietcong had been steadily able to recruit 5,000 to 7,000 men a month. Lieutenant Colonel William Corson, former head of the Marine's Combined Action Platoons (CAP) program, writing in the summer of 1968, noted that some three-fifths of these Vietcong recruits could be regarded as volunteers of "soft-sell" enlistees. The common appeal in wide areas where Vietcong land re-

"preordnance" transfers to others that brought their holdings below the point where the law took hold; transfers to relatives and strawmen were common; and the author has met Vietnamese who openly admit that they still "own" over 2,000 acres.

⁴ The United States Agency for International Development.

form was in effect was "The movement has given you land, give us your son."

Newsweek, on January 1, 1968, reported that 377,000 men were bearing arms against the United States and South Vietnamese forces, of whom only one-sixth were North Vietnamese. *The New York Times* on March 19, 1968, offered official estimates of all five categories of enemy strength, in which the North Vietnamese were said to play an even smaller role (See Table I).

Estimates made during my 1969 visit were that the North Vietnamese "main force" component was up, and that of southern recruits was down; in the local level southerners were still functioning in large numbers. The vitally important category of southern "cadres" or "V.C.I." (Vietcong infrastructure) had been somewhat depleted by the Communists' chosen tactics during *Tet*, but since then had hardly been touched. These V.C.I. do the recruiting, arrange the reconnaissance, obtain the porters and, by establishing supply and ammunition depots at intervals of about a day's march, prepare the way for main force actions—a *sine quo non* of these actions, since the main force units cannot carry with them the supplies and ammunition needed for their attacks. Moreover, despite well-reported "battles," it was doggedly, tragically true that over one-half of American casualties were the result of such essentially local guerrilla activities as the planting of mines and booby traps (and the mute silence of the villagers as they watched Americans walk into them).

The one bright spot in the picture was that fresh Vietcong recruitment had fallen to about 3,500 men a month, apparently through a combination of the loss of senior cadres at *Tet*, the spread of knowledge that main force units have been using southern recruits at the "first wave," and the first important stirrings of land reform under Nguyen Van Thieu, including an important effort to prevent landlords from returning to reclaim their lands in "pacified" villages.

The final part of this history—which was still undergoing almost daily changes as I was writing this—has involved the process by which the Thieu government appears, at last, and perhaps too late, to have embraced a really sweeping and workable program of land reform. The bizarre reality, of course, is that while the Communists have successfully billed themselves in Vietnam (and elsewhere) as "land reformers," genuine democratic land reform does not take a back seat to Communist land reforms by any means. Quite the contrary: the collectivization which has been the universal "second stage" of Communist land reform promises that have led to successful revolutions has been an economic disaster vastly distasteful to the peasantry, while the half-dozen successful non-Communist land reforms of this century⁶ have led to major increases in agricultural production and have furnished a bulwark of political stability—including assistance in defeating attempts to start guerrilla movements in Bolivia and South Korea by depriving the would-be revolutionaries of their "gut" issue.

TABLE I: ENEMY STRENGTH

	National intelligence estimate	C.I.A. estimate
1. Main force units.....	118,000	160,000
North Vietnam.....	54,000	80,000
Viet Cong.....	64,000	80,000
2. Village guerrilla platoons and squads.....	70,000-90,000	100,000-120,000
3. "Irregular" or self-militia.....	150,000	100,000
4. Administrative and logistic apparatus.....	35,000-40,000	75,000-80,000
5. Political cadres.....	75,000-85,000	80,000-120,000

⁶ In Mexico, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Bolivia and Iran, in that order, perhaps soon to be followed by Peru.

THIEU'S LAND REFORM PROGRAM

The first signs of real movement came from the South Vietnamese. President Thieu, speaking to a gathering of provincial land-affairs officials on January 18, 1968, just before the *Tet* offensive, had made the statement quoted at the beginning of this article.

Over the following months, the *Tet* offensive, the Johnson announcement of a bombing halt, the start of talks in Paris and the presidential campaign of Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy all supplied additional shocks to the Vietnamese, and major elements of a land reform program began to take shape.

First of all, distribution of the choice lands taken by Diem but never distributed began in earnest. Procedures were simplified with the help of United States land reform advisers so that village-level committees could approve the applications made by the present cultivators and hand out deeds in under a week, and a tremendous boost was given the program when President Thieu decreed at the start of July, 1969, that henceforth the distribution would be free and that former recipients would be freed from their payment obligations. The distribution over the two years sharply accelerated:

TABLE II. LAND DISTRIBUTION, 1968-1969	
January-June, 1968—20,000 acres distributed.	
July-December, 1968—40,000 acres distributed.	
January-August, 1969—90,000 acres distributed.	
September-December, 1969 (est.)—90,000 acres distributed.	

In 1969, an estimated 50,000 families will receive these government-owned lands.

Second, a temporary end, at least, was brought to "negative land reform." In September, 1968, Thieu declared that the processes by which landlords evicted occupants and collected rents in newly "secured" areas would be ended. Very likely, he had the forthcoming "accelerated pacification" drive in mind: if the process of planting the flag, at least in daytime, in additional villages, were to be accompanied by the customary inflow of returning landlords, the results for Saigon would be politically—and perhaps militarily—disastrous. This declaration was followed by three decrees:

One in November, 1968, that prohibited officials or soldiers in newly secured villages from reinstalling landlords or helping to collect rents;

A second in February, 1969, that extended the prohibition to the private landlords themselves and made it effective until February, 1970;

And a third in April, that made the earlier prohibitions countrywide, apparently in anticipation that landlords in more secure areas might try to evict tenants and resume personal occupation in contemplation of further land reform measures.

My just-concluded field work persuades me that the countrywide occupancy "freeze" is being widely adhered to. It has been well publicized; it involves a highly visible action if it is violated; and in areas where the new local-force units ("Popular Forces," "Regional Forces," and "Local Self Defense Forces") have received some 500,000 rifles, the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) can no longer trample on peasants' legal rights with impunity. The rent "freeze" (supposedly at a zero level in newly secured areas) involves more clandestine violations, and appears to be only spottily effective.

Third, there was an almost disastrous decision in February, 1969, to design the biggest, final part of the program—involving transfer of some, most, or all of the 3,000,000 acres of privately owned lands that are farmed by tenants—as a "voluntary" purchase program. This would have merely urged landlord transfers for 2 to 3 years and

then would have "required" them only when the administrators could determine (with the land records for three out of eight villages totally destroyed) that a landlord held more than 37, or perhaps 75, acres. Fortunately, President Thieu took a personal hand, which resulted in the scrapping of the "voluntary" plan, the sacking of the land reform minister, and the drafting of the sweeping "Land to the Tiller" bill and its presentation, in early July, to the lower house. This bill would affect all of the 3,000,000 acres of land that are cultivated by tenants or non-owners, and would make all Vietnamese peasants the owners of the land they till. The regime of tenant farming for a million families would be ended in a drastically simplified and rapid way:

All land not tilled by the owner would be affected (so there would be no need to apply a "retention limit" under which each owner would have to make a "declaration" of how much he owns, with the onus on the administrators to find out if he is lying).

The peasant tilling the land would receive it free (so there would be no occasion for corrupt administrators to dun the peasant for payments and the message would be the simplest possible: you don't pay anything to anybody).

The effect would be nationwide (so that peasants tilling land in insecure areas could nevermore be goaded to support the Vietcong with the threat that landlords would otherwise return: "negative land reform" would be gone for good).

Confirmation of title would come via a highly simplified village-level application procedure, involving only a few days' delay, and requiring neither the shifting of families, the shifting of present boundaries, nor the resurveying of the land.

Landlords would be fully compensated (20 percent in cash, 80 percent in 8-year inflation-adjusting bonds). The total cost would be \$400 million, equal to between five and six days' cost of the war.

The bill, in fact, represents one of the great non-Communist land reforms of the twentieth century, even more sweeping, for example, than those of Japan and South Korea. The "Land to the Tiller" program, however, is now in deep political trouble, the basic difficulty being that the South Vietnamese landlords do not trust the bonds. Because of this, they combined their influence in the lower house with another group that sees opposition (shortsightedly would be an understatement) as a way of preventing Thieu from increasing his political power. This combined opposition eviscerated the bill—putting in a 37-acre "retention limit" and adding that only "legal" occupants could receive land—and even then added a provision boosting the cash portion of compensation for the landlords from 20 percent to 60 to 70 percent.

Now the upper house is considering the bill. In a heartening demonstration of firmness, President Thieu has asked to have it amended to its original strong version. Under Vietnamese law, the upper house amendments, if any, will prevail unless overridden by two-thirds of the total membership of the lower house. Even then President Thieu can amend and will prevail, unless his amendments are overridden by a majority of the joint membership of the two houses. Thus, for the moment, with President Thieu's continued exhibition of firmness, land reform is "up" again after its lower house drubbing.

But whether the upper house amends and—if not—whether President Thieu amends and is not overridden, now depend crucially on the credibility of the compensation to the landlords.

As this was written, pressures appeared to be building for a United States declaration of financial support for the program—consistent with President Richard Nixon's strong general statement of support for the program

in the Midway communiqué of June, 1969. Whether such a statement is made may well be decisive in determining whether, as this is being read, the mass of South Vietnamese peasants are finally becoming owner-farmers, or whether the chance to achieve an impact during the 1969 main Delta harvest period (December to February) has been missed. If, finally, land reform goes "down" again, it may well be for the final count.

THE U.S. AMBASSADOR TO GREECE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I have requested Senate Majority Leader MANSFIELD to place a hold on the consideration of the nomination of Henry J. Tasca to be U.S. Ambassador to Greece.

My reason is that I believe this is not the propitious moment for the United States to send an ambassador to Greece—not that I have any reservations concerning Mr. Tasca's qualifications.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement I issued yesterday explaining the reasons for my action be printed in the RECORD, as well as an editorial on this subject which appeared in today's New York Times.

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

GOODELL REQUESTS SENATE TO DEFER NOMINATION OF AMBASSADOR DESIGNATE TO GREEK MILITARY DICTATORSHIP

I have requested Senate Majority Leader Mansfield to hold up consideration of the nomination of Henry J. Tasca to be our Ambassador to Greece.

My reason is not that I have any reservations concerning Mr. Tasca's qualifications. He is, by all accounts, an able diplomat who is fully qualified to hold ambassadorial rank.

I have taken this action because I think it is not advisable at the present moment for the United States to send an ambassador to the Greek dictatorship.

I recognize that it is often desirable to have full representation in countries with whose policies we fundamentally disagree. Diplomatic communication is important between countries having different political systems.

This, however, is a delicate moment.

The Council of Europe is about to consider a motion to suspend or expel the Greek regime from membership because of its violations of the basic human rights of Greek citizens.

The Administration has been urging the Greek regime to adopt more democratic policies.

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I am pleased to note, has decided against authorizing any military aid to Greece.

There are signs that the forces behind the Greek junta might respond to these and other pressures for reform.

I am hopeful that the temporary withholding of an ambassador would be an additional signal of our displeasure with the dictatorship's present practices and might encourage responsible elements in Greece to press for more democratic and humane policies.

I am fearful that the dispatch of an ambassador at this time—two days before the Council of Europe meets to consider the suspension or expulsion of Greece—would be particularly ill-timed. It could be misconstrued in Europe as a gesture of support for the junta and its present course; and intrude ourselves gratuitously in a decision that should be made by the Europeans themselves.

I note also, that we have not even nominated an ambassador to Sweden. Many in that country apparently believe that we have not done so because we are displeased with the Swedish government's position on Viet-

nam. I do not know if this is the case. Whatever happens, we must certainly avoid giving the impression that we are more concerned over Swedish views on Vietnam than we are over totalitarian practices in Greece.

In summary, I am proposing a temporary hold on the nomination because I believe this is the wrong moment to send an ambassador; and also to emphasize our disapproval of the Greek junta's present policies and encourage responsible forces for change in Greece.

A police state now reigns in Greece, the birthplace of democracy. Government by terror and by torture rules in the land which first conceived of government by consent of the governed.

The Human Rights Commission of the Council of Europe, after extensive investigation, has found that torture and ill-treatment of political prisoners amounted to an "administrative practice" that has been "officially tolerated" by Greek government authorities. The Commission specifically reported 213 cases in which it had found evidence of torture—including a number of cases in which evidence of torture was found to be conclusive.

In addition to torture, the Commission found the Greek junta guilty of widespread abuses of civil and personal rights.

The Commission also exploded the fiction propagated by the junta that its seizure of power and subsequent rule was justified by the threat of a Communist takeover. After reviewing the evidence, it found there was no substance to the junta's claims that a Communist coup was imminent in 1967.

At this critical moment, it is imperative that we do nothing that can be misinterpreted by the Greek dictatorship and other nations as an endorsement of the junta's present policies.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 11, 1969]

THE GREEK JUNTA ON TRIAL

Membership in the Council of Europe is restricted by its statute to countries that "accept the principles of the rule of law" and enjoyment by all citizens of "human rights and fundamental freedoms." Foreign ministers of the eighteen members vote in Paris tomorrow on a resolution adopted by a huge majority of the Council's Consultative Assembly demanding the ouster of Greece "for serious violations of the conditions of membership."

The ministers will have before them a 1,200-page report by the European Commission on Human Rights that details many cases of torture of political prisoners by the Greek junta. They will also doubtless consider the uncovering by a respected British reporter of what appears to be a top-secret document, signed by the Director-General of the Greek Foreign Ministry, involving Premier Papadopoulos himself in a right-wing plot to stage a military coup in Italy.

In these circumstances, Senator Goodell has acted responsibly in asking Majority Leader Mansfield to delay a vote on the confirmation of Henry J. Tasca as United States Ambassador to Athens. As Mr. Goodell makes clear, this is no reflection on Mr. Tasca; nor is it an effort to keep the ambassadorship in Athens vacant indefinitely because of disapproval of the junta.

It is simply that for the Senate to confirm Mr. Tasca on the eve of the Council's vote would be interpreted as an attempt by Washington to pressure undecided Governments to keep Greece in the fold. The United States is already being accused of trying to influence the Council's decision in favor of the junta. A brief delay will not damage Mr. Tasca's standing with the colonels; indeed, it may enhance his influence if the delay helps persuade them that the United States is genuinely concerned at their failure to move Greece back toward freedom and democracy.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 581, 594, 595, 596, 597, 598, and 599.

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

PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2809), to amend the Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with amendments, on page 2, after line 5, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof: "\$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$21,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$27,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

And, after line 13, insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 3. Section 306(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof: "\$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

So as to make the bill read:

S. 2809

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 309(c) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "\$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, \$6,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and \$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970" and inserting in lieu thereof: "\$7,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, \$9,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

SEC. 2. Section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and \$12,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof: "\$15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$21,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$24,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$27,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

SEC. 3. Section 306(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by striking out "and \$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof: "\$14,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, \$18,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, \$22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, \$26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and \$30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975".

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, today a high rate of infant mortality is the major reason why the United States lags behind other major countries in longevity. Prenatal and infant care and

nutrition education needed to reduce our infant mortality rate are essentially public health problems. So are the long-term chronic illnesses of age becoming a new domain for public health inquiry and control.

Increased urbanization and acceptance of public responsibility for new health services to the population have expanded the need for personnel trained in protecting the public health. For many years agencies concerned with community health problems have been faced by shortages of professional personnel with public health training, including physicians, nurses, and sanitarians.

Approximately 5,400 positions in State and local health departments are currently vacant or filled by individuals lacking appropriate training. This represents one-third of the total positions that require advanced training in public health. Many such jobs are also going unfilled in voluntary public health agencies and on university faculties. If the need for graduates with training in public health methods and specialties continued to expand at the same rate between now and the early 1970's as it did between 1962 and 1967, the current deficit in trained manpower will more than triple in size by 1975.

Thus, earlier this year I introduced S. 2809, to extend the program of formula grants to schools of public health. As reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 2809 would extend until June 30, 1975, three authorities of the Public Health Service that have as their objective the training of additional and better-prepared public health personnel. The provisions of this bill as amended by the committee have the support of the Association of Schools of Public Health, the American Public Health Association, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers.

The bill, as amended, would extend the existing programs of formula grants for schools of public health, section 309 (c) of the Public Health Service Act; project grants for graduate training in public health, section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act; and traineeships for professional public health personnel, section 306 of the Public Health Service Act.

These three programs are not new. The traineeships were authorized in 1957, the formula grants in 1958 and the project grants in 1960.

S. 2809, as reported, would authorize the following appropriations:

For traineeships, \$18 million for 1972; \$22 million for 1973; \$26 million for 1974; and \$30 million for 1975.

For project grants, \$15 million for 1971; \$18 million for 1972; \$21 million for 1973; \$24 million for 1974; and \$27 million for 1975.

For formula grants, \$9 million for 1971; \$12 million for 1972; \$15 million for 1973; \$18 million for 1974; and \$20 million for 1975.

Mr. President, the 16 schools of public health, nine of which are in State universities, have the responsibility for providing graduates capable of duty in the health services of all the 50 States, the territories, and the Federal Government,

as well as for international activities. They are analogous to national service academies in that they must prepare students for public service anywhere in the country. Ninety percent of their graduates enter public service and hold key posts in local, city, State, National, and international agencies, and the character of professional leadership in the teaching of public health in the United States has been reflected in the frequency with which faculty members are called on for consultation abroad.

Mr. President, because this bill is vitally important to the training and better preparation of public health personnel, I recommend that this bill pass the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-586), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

SUMMARY

As reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, S. 2809 would extend until June 30, 1975, three authorities of the Public Health Service that have as their objective the training of additional and better-prepared public health personnel. The provisions of this bill as amended by the committee have the support of the Association of Schools of Public Health, the American Public Health Association, and the Association of State and Territorial Health Officers.

The bill, as amended, would extend the existing programs of formula grants for schools of public health, section 309(c) of the Public Health Service Act, project grants for graduate training in public health, section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act, and traineeships for professional public health personnel, section 306 of the Public Health Service Act.

These three programs are not new. The traineeships were authorized in 1957, the formula grants in 1958 and the project grants in 1960.

AMENDMENTS

As introduced, S. 2809 would have extended and expanded the existing program of formula grants for graduate schools of public health under section 309(c) of the Public Health Service Act that is scheduled to expire on June 30, 1970.

These formula grants are one of three basic, closely related sources of support for the training of public health personnel. The other two are section 306 of the Public Health Service Act that authorizes appropriations for traineeships for professional public health personnel and section 309(a) of the Public Health Service Act that authorizes appropriations for project grants for graduate training in public health. Both of the latter two authorizations expire June 30, 1971.

The common objective of these formula grants, project grants, and traineeships is to increase the supply of well-trained public health personnel. These sources of financial support are closely related.

It is recommended, therefore, that the formula grants, project grants, and traineeships be given a common expiration date of June 30, 1975.

THE PROBLEM

Advancing urbanization and acceptance of public responsibility for new health services to the population have expanded the need for personnel trained in protecting the public health. For many years agencies concerned with community health programs have been faced by shortages of professional

personnel with public health training—including physicians, nurses, and sanitarians.

In recent years the shortages have become more severe than ever before as new concepts of the role of public health have evolved. New responsibilities have been given State and local health departments. Some years ago the control of infectious diseases represented the major role of health departments. Today immunization programs are a relatively small but none the less important aspect of the activities of health departments and these activities require highly specialized and trained public health personnel. Among the new responsibilities are comprehensive health planning, health and medical care administration; environmental management in the areas of air, water, and land; population and family planning; chronic disease control; and licensure of health care facilities.

Approximately 5,400 positions in State and local health departments are currently vacant or filled by individuals lacking appropriate training. This represents one-third of the total positions that require advanced training in public health. Many such jobs are also going unfilled in voluntary public health agencies and on university faculties. If the need for graduates with training in public health methods and specialties continued to expand at the same rate between now and the early 1970's as it did between 1962 and 1967, the current deficit in trained manpower will more than triple in size by 1975.

To meet the need for training more public health personnel, many educational institutions—such as schools of public health, engineering, and nursing; departments of preventive medicine and dentistry; and other institutions which provide special public health training—must continue to expand their enrollment capacity. Such expansion will require additional highly specialized faculty and supportive staff.

BACKGROUND

The formula grants for graduate schools of public health assist in providing comprehensive programs of graduate training in public health professions. These grants are awarded on a formula basis. The formula provides that one-third of the total appropriations be divided among the schools equally. The remaining two-thirds is divided among the schools according to the number of Federally sponsored students enrolled. Formula grants are entitlement grants available only to the accredited schools of public health which the schools can use for administrative and direct educational purposes. They reflect the unique situation of these schools as a national resource with a substantial proportion of federally sponsored students.

The project grants are available to support graduate public health training proposals recommended by the National Advisory Public Health Training Council as having a high national priority after competitive review. The grants are used for projects related to development, innovation, and otherwise for strengthening and expanding graduate public health curriculums in colleges and universities including schools of public health, medical and dental schools, engineering colleges, schools of nursing, and similar institutions.

Traineeships for professional public health personnel are awarded through grants to individuals and grants to training institutions which then select the individuals to receive support.

Formula grants

The program of formula grants for graduate schools of public health was originally enacted in 1958 as Public Law 85-544. It provided the first formal recognition by Congress of the Federal responsibility for schools of public health as a national resource. At that time there were 11 schools of public

health eligible for grants. Since that time five new schools of public health have been accredited and several more are in various stages of development. Proposals to establish new schools of public health are under consideration in Alabama, Illinois, Ohio, and Washington.

At the present time, schools of public health are located at the following universities:

California (Berkeley), California (Los Angeles), Columbia, Harvard, Hawaii, Johns Hospital, Loma Linda, Michigan, Minnesota, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pittsburgh, Puerto Rico, Texas, Tulane, and Yale.

The authorization for appropriations has increased from \$1 million in 1958 to \$7 million in 1970.

It must be emphasized that the 16 schools of public health, nine of which are in State universities, have the responsibility for providing graduates capable of duty in the health services of all the 50 States, the territories and the Federal Government, as well as for international activities of the United States and the international agencies. Thus, each school has had to be concerned with an area far beyond that of its ordinary university range of influence. It has been pointed out that the schools of public health are analogous to national service academies in that they must prepare students for public service anywhere in the country. This point is particularly significant in the State schools since State legislatures, faced with mounting costs in all fields, customarily sharply restrict out-of-State registrants.

More than 90 percent of the graduates of schools of public health enter public service and hold the key posts in local, city, State, National, and international agencies. The character of professional leadership in the teaching of public health in the United States has been reflected in the frequency with which faculty members are called on for consultation abroad. Moreover, schools of public health on the American pattern have been formed in many countries elsewhere in the world, thus making it possible for students of those countries to see more directly applied the principles taught in our schools of public health.

Schools of public health have found it necessary to enlarge faculty to bring new skills in order to pay proper attention to the many teaching programs which have had to be added. Some index of the scope of a school of public health in 1969 may be gained from listing the programs of study offered at the school of public health of the University of Michigan:

Air Pollution, Biostatistics, Chronic Diseases, Adult Health and aging, Dental Public Health, Environmental Health—Food Contact, Environmental Health—General, Environmental Health—Water Contact, Epidemiology, Health Education, and Health Planning.

Hospital Administration, Industrial Hygiene, Maternal and Child Health, Medical Care Organization, Mental Health, Nutrition, Occupational Medicine, Population Planning, Public Health Administration, Public Health Laboratory Practice, Public Health Nursing, and Radiological Health.

A study conducted by the Association of Schools of Public Health covering the years since the formula grant legislation was approved disclosed the following improvements since 1958:

A doubling in the number of graduate degrees awarded;

A tripling in the number of students enrolled;

An increase in the number of accredited schools from 11 to 16;

A tripling in the number of federally sponsored students attending schools of public health; and

The addition of hundreds of courses in the schools to meet the health needs of our changing society.

This study also showed that formula grants met only 12 percent of the total costs of basic operations and teaching in 1968 as compared to 16 percent in 1963.

This same study revealed that the existing 16 schools of public health estimated that substantial increases in the formula grants would be required. To meet expanding student enrollments, teaching programs, and increases in basic operating costs they estimated the need for the following appropriations in formula grants:

Fiscal year 1971	\$12,500,000
Fiscal year 1972	16,800,000
Fiscal year 1973	21,600,000

Project grants

The program of project grants for graduate training in public health was originally enacted in 1960 as Public Law 86-720. The legislation was extended in 1964 and the authorization for appropriations has been increased from \$2 million in 1961 to \$8.5 million in 1970. The major change in the legislation came in 1964 when the eligibility for grants was broadened from schools of public health, engineering, and nursing which provide graduate or specialized training in public health to include all public or private nonprofit institutions which provide such training.

This program, coupled with the student traineeships authorized in section 306 of the Public Health Service Act, has made a significant contribution to the expansion and improvement of public and community health training throughout the country, and to increasing the numbers of trained public health specialists so badly needed in today's society. It has made possible:

(a) special innovative programs in schools of public health to provide them with the capacity to become balanced centers of public health training and major public health consultative and investigative resources for the Federal, State, and local governments;

(b) the initiation of specialized preventive medicine and public health graduate training programs in schools of nursing to prepare well-qualified nurses for public health nursing positions;

(c) the strengthening and broadening of graduate training programs in environmental public health engineering so critical in view of contemporary problems of urban environmental hazards; and

(d) the development, expansion and strengthening of programs of community-preventive medicine and dentistry in medical and dental schools with the result of making young physicians and dentists more aware of careers in public health.

During the period from fiscal year 1961, when the program was initiated, through fiscal year 1968, 779 project grant awards were made: 270 in schools of public health, 156 in schools of nursing, and 189 in schools of engineering. Effective with fiscal year 1965 eligibility for the grants was extended to departments of medicine and dentistry. In fiscal years 1965 through 1968, 112 grants were awarded in schools of medicine, and 52 in schools of dentistry.

The 1968 awards represent 15 major curricular areas, including medical care economics and administration, public health nursing, environmental health, chronic disease, and preventive medicine and dentistry. These projects are often administered in conjunction with public health traineeship grants, which provide support for students trained in these specialized areas.

During the period 1961-65, 49 new faculty positions had been added through this program, including such disciplines as air pollution engineering, pharmacology, environmental chemistry, bioengineering, environmental biology, and microbiology.

In schools of medicine, the project grants have been used to revise curricula in departments of preventive medicine. In 1967 alone,

approximately 5,000 medical students were exposed to the expanded teaching of preventive and community medicine.

TABLE 1.—SUMMARY OF PROJECT GRANTS FOR GRADUATE PUBLIC HEALTH TRAINING AWARDED IN FISCAL YEAR 1968

Type of school	Number of schools awarded grants	Number of grants	Amount of grants
Total	91	124	\$4,498,950
Public health	14	43	1,880,816
Nursing	13	14	419,989
Engineering	13	14	284,294
Medicine	34	36	1,286,658
Dentistry	17	17	627,193

Traineeships

The program of traineeships for professional public health personnel was originally enacted in 1956 as Public Law 84-911. The legislation was extended in 1959, 1960, and 1964. The annual authorization for appropriations was increased to \$10 million for 1968, 1969, and 1970.

Since the program was initiated, the number of long-term academic traineeships awarded has increased to more than 1,500 annually. In addition, the program has been expanded to provide support for short-term training to upgrade and develop special professional skills for approximately 4,500 trainees annually, 70 residencies in preventive medicine and dentistry, and 600 medical and dental apprenticeships each year. By the end of fiscal year 1969, more than 12,000 individuals had received long-term academic training, 47,000 short-term training, 223 residency awards and 2,135 apprenticeship awards.

The primary objective of traineeships for full-time graduate training in public health has been to increase the numbers of adequately trained public health professionals. Categories and number supported to date include physicians (822) dentists (307), nurses (4,450), engineers (1,180), sanitarians (449), veterinarians (127), social workers (46), health educators (928), dental hygienists (92), administrators (1,077), and others. Special emphasis has been placed on training for new and developing program areas such as medical care administration, family planning, and environmental health. These programs have succeeded in attracting greater numbers of increasingly able students to public health training and careers. Of 3,800 past trainees who were surveyed in preparation for the Third National Conference on Public Health Training, approximately 2,400 or 63 percent are now working in public health, the majority in State and local health departments. About 5 percent are in Federal programs and an additional 7 percent (280) are still in school. Of the remainder, a significant number are housewives, many of whom plan to return to service in public health.

In addition to staffing traditional public health programs in official and voluntary agencies, these trainees constitute a crucial manpower source for such recently enacted programs as Medicare, the Appalachian and urban health centers authorized through OEO and HUD programs, comprehensive health planning, air and water pollution control, and solid wastes.

The primary purposes of traineeship support for short-term training have been to upgrade the skills of public health personnel working in the field, and to update their knowledge in areas essential to new or ongoing public health programs. This grant program has been widely and enthusiastically utilized by official and voluntary health agencies, professional organizations, and academic institutions.

Traineeship support for apprenticeship as-

signments was designed to provide medical, dental, and osteopathic students with an exposure to public health programs in order to attract them to careers in public health and/or to prepare them for constructive participation in community health programs as private practitioners. This program has been highly successful in arousing tremendous enthusiasm in the medical schools and the communities involved. An important byproduct of the apprenticeship training program has been the contributions of these trainees to more than 150 projects to which they have been assigned during their apprenticeships.

Traineeship support for residency training in the public health specialties for physicians and dentists is intended to increase the numbers of teachers of preventive medicine and dentistry and of well-trained public health physicians and dentists, particularly for leadership positions in local and State public health programs.

In fiscal year 1969 approved applications will exceed available funds by approximately \$6,025,000. This backlog will include \$6 million for approved long-term traineeships which would have supported 1,330 trainees. In the area of short-term training, the backlog will amount to \$25,000 which would have provided training to an estimated 165 professional health workers.

TABLE 2.—TRAINEESHIPS FOR PROFESSIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH PERSONNEL, SEC. 306, PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ACT

[Number of trainees by type of program, 1957-69]

Year	Type of program				Total
	Long term	Residency	Apprenticeships	Short term	
1957	363				365
1958	665				663
1959	654				654
1960	634				634
1961	607				607
1962	568				568
1963	1,054		1,482		2,536
1964	1,092		3,534		4,626
1965	1,057		119	5,440	6,616
1966	1,314	24	333	10,081	11,752
1967	1,361	61	498	12,000	13,920
1968	1,300	70	600	10,000	11,970
1969	1,392	68	585	4,456	6,501
Total	12,061	223	2,135	46,933	61,412

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

Since 1967 the actual appropriations for formula grants for schools of public health, project grants for graduate training in public health and traineeships for professional public health personnel have lagged far behind the authorizations for appropriations. In 1969, for example, only 70 percent of the authorized appropriations were actually approved. With this consideration, the authorizations of S. 2809 are set forth below:

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

[In millions of dollars]

Program and PHS Act section	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975
Sec. 306, traineeships	18	22	26	30	30
Sec. 309(a), project grants	13	18	21	24	27
Sec. 309(c), formula grants	9	12	15	18	20
Total	12	48	58	68	77

* S. 2809 would increase the 1971 authorization for project grants from \$12,000,000 to \$15,000,000.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 and third reading of the bill.

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

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act so as to extend for an additional period the authority to make formula grants to schools of public health, project grants for graduate training in public health and traineeships for professional public health personnel."

THE MIGRATORY FARM LABOR PROBLEM IN THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 283) authorizing the printing of additional copies of "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 283

Resolved, That there be printed, for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, two thousand nine hundred additional copies of the 1969 report of its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" (Senate Report Numbered 91-83, Ninety-first Congress).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-598), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

Senate Resolution 283 would authorize the printing for the use of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of 2,900 additional copies of the 1969 report of its Subcommittee on Migratory Labor entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States" (S. Rept. No. 91-83).

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

Printing-cost estimate

Back to press, first 1,000 copies	\$796.41
1,900 additional copies, at \$206.34 per 1,000	392.04
Total estimated cost, Senate Resolution 283	1,188.45

MARY K. DURISOE

The resolution (S. Res. 295) to pay a gratuity to Mary K. Durisoe was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 295

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mary K. Durisoe, widow of John E. Durisoe, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to eight months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

JAMES H. NEWMAN, SR.

The resolution (S. Res. 296) to pay a gratuity to James H. Newman, Sr., was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. RES. 296

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay,

from the contingent fund of the Senate, to James H. Newman, Senior, father of James H. Newman, an employee of the Senate at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS OF THE 44TH BIENNIAL MEETING, CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 47) authorizing the printing of the report of the proceedings of the 44th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf as a Senate document which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment in line 6, after the word "that", strike out "six" and insert "five"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

S. CON. RES. 47

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the report of the proceedings of the forty-fourth biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Berkeley, California, June 20-27, 1969, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and that five thousand additional copies be printed and bound for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-599), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 47 as referred would provide (1) that the report of the proceedings of the 44th biennial meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Berkeley, Calif., June 20-27, 1969, be printed with illustrations as a Senate document; and (2) that 6,000 additional copies of such document be printed and bound for the use of the Joint Committee on Printing.

The Committee on Rules and Administration has amended Senate Concurrent Resolution 47 by reducing the number of additional copies to be printed from 6,000 to 5,000, the quantity customarily provided biennially.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE 1969 REPORT OF THE SENATE SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INDIAN EDUCATION

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 50) authorizing the printing of additional copies of the 1969 report of the Senate Special Subcommittee on Indian Education was considered and agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 50

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare three thousand additional copies of the 1969 report of its Special Subcommittee on Indian Education entitled "American Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge" (Senate Report 91-501).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-600), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

Senate Concurrent Resolution 50 would authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of 3,000 additional copies of the 1969 report of its Special Subcommittee on Indian Education entitled "American Indian Education: A National Tragedy—A National Challenge" (S. Rept. 91-501).

This proposal is identical to that contained in Senate Resolution 293, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration on December 9, 1969. Since the concurrence of the House of Representatives is required on proposals to print additional copies costing in excess of \$1,200 (44 U.S.C. 703), the Committee on Rules and Administration is expressing its approval of this proposal by reporting out this original concurrent resolution in lieu of Senate Resolution 293.

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

<i>Printing-cost estimate</i>	
Back to press, 1st 1,000 copies.....	\$1,315.29
2,000 additional copies, at \$373.81 per thousand	747.62
<hr/>	
Total estimated cost, S. Con. Res. 50.....	2,602.91

A GUIDE TO STUDENT ASSISTANCE

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 345) providing for printing as a House document "A Guide to Student Assistance" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-601), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 345 would provide (1) that there be printed as a House document "A Guide to Student Assistance," prepared by the House Committee on Education and Labor; and (2) that there be printed 62,200 additional copies of such document, of which 43,900 would be for the use of the House of Representatives (100 per Member), 10,300 would be for the use of the Senate (100 per Member), 4,000 would be for the use of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and 4,000 would be for the use of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Copies of the document would be pro-rated to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives for a period of 60 days, after which the unused balances would be distributed by the respective Senate and House Document Rooms.

OUR FLAG

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 407) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled "Our Flag" was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report

(No. 91-602), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

House Concurrent Resolution 407 would provide (1) that the publication entitled "Our Flag," published by the Office of the Armed Services Information and Education, Department of Defense, be printed with illustrations as a House document; and (2) that there be printed 271,000 additional copies of such document, of which 219,500 would be for the use of the House of Representatives (500 per Member), and 51,500 would be for the use of the Senate (500 per Member).

The printing-cost estimate, supplied by the Public Printer, is as follows:

<i>Printing-cost estimate</i>	
To print as a document (1,500 copies)	\$2,832.00
271,000 additional copies, at \$53.56 per thousand.....	14,514.76
<hr/>	
Total estimated cost, H. Con. Res. 407.....	17,346.76

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar and brings us to the pending business, and I thank the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee for permitting me to proceed with the consideration of the bills on the calendar.

FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 14580) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I derive no pleasure in presenting the foreign aid bill to the Senate. It is submitted to the Senate not with enthusiasm, but with reluctance. And, speaking for myself only, the committee's endorsement of the bill now before the Senate should not be taken as a vote of confidence in foreign aid as presently constituted. This is a stop-gap bill only—and no more—pending the development of a new, more workable program.

The House approved major substantive changes in the foreign aid program. The Foreign Relations Committee, however, is submitting an amendment which does not authorize new programs but continues the existing programs at approximately the same level as last year.

Last year Congress appropriated foreign aid funds totaling \$1.7 billion for both economic and military assistance; this year the Senate bill authorizes appropriations of \$1.9 billion. This slight increase is, at worst, a vote of reluctant acceptance of the existing foreign aid program. At best, it is a tranquilizer. At its best or at its worst, I am reluctant to support most of the bilateral aspects of the aid program—even at the level of funding provided for last year.

Mr. President, prior to the committee's final action on the bill, I proposed a continuing resolution for the purpose of carrying existing programs forward while, at the same time, providing that they be phased out by December 31, 1970.

I appreciate the novelty of this suggestion in terms of our traditional legislative procedure and I understand why my proposal was not accepted. Nevertheless, the concept of a continuing resolution this year was not without a rationale. The 1970 fiscal year is almost half gone and much has happened to change the frame of reference for foreign aid legislation since the President's message to Congress on May 28.

Domestically, inflation has continued unchecked—to such a degree that the President has announced he could not accept the tax reform bill as passed by the Senate. The stock market—as the Nation's single most important measure of our fiscal and economic well-being—continues to set new record lows, and our balance-of-payments situation has continued its downward slide, with a record deficit this year approaching \$10 billion, twice as large a deficit as that for any previous year in the postwar period. This situation has forced considerable retrenchment on much needed domestic programs.

On the international front, the new administration is still in the throes of reappraisals stretching from Asia to the Middle East. If "Vietnamization" works, the economic bill for reconstruction in Vietnam will be big. The report of the World Bank's Commission on International Development, headed by Lester Pearson, has been made public, but its costs have not been assessed.

Finally, the President has initiated a reappraisal of the entire foreign program and, by law, has been requested to submit his findings and recommendations to Congress no later than March 31, 1970—less than 4 months away.

In short, time and events have rendered the President's 1970 foreign aid proposals obsolete. Under these circumstances, it seems to me that for Congress to pass any substantive foreign aid bill at this point would be putting the cart before the horse.

Mr. President, year after year, the Committee on Foreign Relations has attempted to bring about needed reforms in foreign aid, but with little practical effect. Experience has shown that the only means left to bring about significant reform is to phase out the existing program and start afresh.

Four years ago, the Senate decided to do that. It voted to terminate the aid program so that fundamental reappraisals might provide not only a rationale for the program, but programs consistent with the lessons we have learned—programs which would not perpetuate the errors of the past. Unfortunately, the House did not accept the Senate's proposal and the program has stumbled along for 4 more years—finally developing a pattern of incipient danger to the legislative process itself. This is the pattern of authorizing and appropriating funds for specific foreign countries and projects. I fear we have come to the point where some lobbyists for foreign governments are more effective in promoting their special projects than Members of this body are in promoting projects for their own States and districts. The foreign aid bill which the Senate received from the other body had earmarked \$155

million—as much as we spend on some Government departments—for projects of a size and type which no Member of Congress could hope to get for his own constituency, especially without the approval of the Bureau of the Budget—the administration, in effect.

What Member of this body could with equal ease get \$50 million more than the President requested for his State—as was the case with South Korea? What Member could get \$54.5 million more than the President requested—as was the case with Taiwan? What Member could get \$50.5 million more than the President requested—as was the case with Israel?

Senators know how exceedingly difficult it is for them to get money, in any size or of any consequence, for their own States without the support of the administration.

These amounts were earmarked in the foreign aid bill that came to the Senate from the other body. The Committee on Foreign Relations removed some of these unrequested authorizations; but I expect the final bill will contain funds for these purposes.

To shed a little more light on this issue, I am sure some of my colleagues will recall having received last year a letter from a Minister of Defense of an allied nation calling upon Senators to give their support for an additional \$100 million in military assistance for his country. An additional \$50 million has now been authorized for South Korea by the House—as I say, without budgetary approval by the administration. I fail to see how lobbying activities of this kind differ in any practical way from the finagling that went on behind the scenes to secure \$28 million for building the so-called freedom fighter—also without the recommendation of the Budget. This project is to lay the groundwork for providing certain countries with fighter aircraft which they otherwise could not afford.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, does the Senator care to discuss these matters as he goes along, or does he wish to be unmolested until he completes his statement?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A Senator can interrupt at any time. I am always honored to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I was interested in the Senator's statement as to the effectiveness of foreign lobbyists. I know foreign lobbyists are not backward, and some of the ambassadors from foreign countries are not backward, in encouraging us to spend money in their countries; but I would say, in the long run, it is the American concerns, the industrialists, that are more effective.

When the Senator refers to the \$54 million which the House put in the bill for planes for Taiwan, I am satisfied it was the people who expected to manufacture those planes who were successful in getting that item inserted.

I can assure the Senator that, as far as I am concerned, the bill will not contain that item of \$54 million, which was not asked for by the foreign government, and was not asked for by our own Government, but was slipped into the House bill. I feel quite sure it was American industrial concerns that did that.

The same may be true of South Korea, although the South Korean Government has fared very well at the hands of the U.S. Government, and they want to fare better, of course. There again we have to put the blame or responsibility on our own people to a greater extent than we do on the foreign people.

I want to assure the Senator that as far as I am concerned, these funds, which our own executive branch did not ask for and even the foreign government did not ask for, will not be in the bill. I would rather have no bill than to have industrial concerns running our foreign aid program, because the trouble with the foreign aid program now is that these interests have really converted it, in large part, to a subsidy for American industry. I can hardly blame the foreign countries for that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will say to the Senator that, while I am quite sure the companies directly involved have probably expressed themselves, I am not quite prepared to say that the foreign countries did not ask for the military aid. I can assure the Senator, for example, that I myself received a letter from the Government of South Korea last year, suggesting, asking, or pleading for additional funds, which was something I had never experienced before. This was a letter addressed to me, which came from the Ministry of National Defense of the Republic of Korea.

Mr. AIKEN. What date was that?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This was last year, February of 1968.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Well, I am sure they still want all the assistance they can get.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator is quite accurate in saying foreign governments have not asked for assistance.

Mr. AIKEN. That may be true on an informal basis but I believe that officially there was no request on the matter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I think they have asked for it. In the hearings on Taiwan, if the Senator remembers, there was the evidence of the enlargement of their bases, for no apparent purpose other than to get ready to receive planes which only the United States could have furnished. There had been no public statement in the press, but I think the meaning of it was quite clear. They were not going to spend that amount of money for any other reason. They were expecting those additional planes.

I believe the press also reported—I think I read it in the newspapers—that Members of the House of Representatives who visited Mr. Chiang Kai-shek last summer were the ones who sponsored the amendment in the House of Representatives. It was not in the administration bill to supply those planes.

Mr. AIKEN. But as I said earlier officially we have no request from the Government of Taiwan for those planes, and no request from the U.S. Government to furnish the planes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is not unusual. I do not know of any lobbyist who operates through official channels in that respect. Their influence has become very powerful, a fact which I deplore.

In the foreign aid bill, we do not at-

tempt to write into the legislation itself the specific countries to which the aid will go. There have been a few exceptions where we have been overruled because of the persuasiveness of certain Senators. But the practice has been, I think the Senator will agree, not to specify in the legislation itself the country, and just how much is for what. But there have been some exceptions.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. Although the committee cut the request of the administration and the authorization of the House of Representatives down \$226 million, I have had no protest on that from our own executive branch, up to this point.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Well, I have not received any protest, either. I imagine one reason for the lack of protest is that, as I was told a few minutes ago, the House of Representatives passed its own appropriation bill by a margin of only five votes. In fact, the Senator from Vermont told me that.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. So the administration probably was very lucky to get a bill at all.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes. I believe the program as presently constituted cannot last more than a year or so longer. We are in the very unhappy situation, here in the United States, of not being satisfied with what we have and not knowing just what we want. I think we will have to extend the present program for 1 year. I would like to see technical assistance carried on for 2 years, but I believe I was outvoted by the committee on that, and this measure simply extends the program until next July, and before that time we shall have to decide what we want to do in the future.

We cannot just sever connections with every country in the world all at once, but we can, I hope, work out a program which will make our foreign aid program more acceptable to the people of the United States, and possibly to the people of the other countries as well.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have certainly never suggested, and I do not know of anyone who has suggested, that we cut off all relations with the other nations of the world. But there is a difference of opinion, and I think a legitimate difference, as to how we should give aid and assistance to other countries.

I, myself, have advocated for some years that it be given primarily, except for very limited items, through international institutions such as are outlined and referred to on page 4 of the committee report: The Inter-American Development Bank, the Asian Development Bank, and the International Development Association.

The World Bank is not listed there, but it is, of course, the parent organization of the International Development Association.

I have at various times given explanations of my reasons for that position. At least I know what I would like to see. It is true that in the Senate, and in the Government as a whole, there is considerable division about what the majority want in the way of an aid program.

The Pearson commission has made its report. We really have not had time to digest it; it is a very recent report. The President is authorized, in fact he is requested—or his task force is—to report on March 31, 1970, and make its recommendations with respect to foreign aid in general.

I would hope that the next session of this Congress, with the recommendations of the administration, will determine that a new approach on this whole problem would be in order; and I hope a start can be made before the end of this fiscal year. That was one of the main reasons why I recommended a continuing resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Again, I think there is very little disagreement in the committee that we could and should do more of this work through the international multilateral agencies. However, we should not give up all bilateral programs, because, as I understand it, the multilateral agencies sometimes take a long, long time to make arrangements with the country which needs their help, whereas in bilateral arrangements, it can be done more quickly. That is one advantage of bilateral aid.

However, we should do more through the multilateral agencies, and I think that is the opinion of nearly every member of our committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hope that is true, and I hope that we can move in that direction.

As to responding quickly in the case of emergencies, if the Senator from Vermont is talking of taking action in such cases, that is one thing. But the development loan program, and the like, are not for emergencies. We are supposed to make careful surveys of the needs of each country. I do not know that there is any substantial difference in these ongoing programs, particularly in development lending, between the multilateral banks' procedures and AID's.

Contingency items, of course, are different. We have always had programs of relief for acts of God, floods, fires, and earthquakes. But that is another matter. I think we could meet those problems, which are different from the ones I am talking about.

The incipient danger to our legislative process in all this is that other nations, seeing the success of some nations in tapping the American till, will seek to do the same for themselves. The examples I have cited surely will not be lost on others. It will only be a question of time until we will be persuaded by other lobbies to take care of their clients.

This practice could become standard operating procedure and, in effect, we will have acquired foreign constituencies of our own. As the number of these constituencies grows, we can expect to receive more offers of friendship and solidarity, more offers of special favors, more offers of expense paid trips—and more pressures from the agents of foreign governments, which may or may not be representing the real interest of their people.

As a part of this developing pattern, it has become increasingly apparent to me in recent months that far too many

of our officials abroad tend to represent the country to which they are assigned as effectively as they represent the United States. Aid has become an indispensable crutch for diplomacy—no aid, no influence. As a result, career diplomats who often thought of aid programs as too grubby for career advancement are now in the position of having to make the best case they can for the aid-receiving country to which they are accredited. Their position is not unlike a lawyer-client relationship, in that they are expected to defend any aid request regardless of their client's need or, for that matter, the legitimate interests of the United States.

In making these observations, I only wish to point to the indications that representatives of some foreign nations are able to muster legislative support for their purposes—purposes which have the effect of taking needed money from domestic programs for support of questionable projects abroad.

Is it more important to have a desalting plant in the Middle East than in our own Southwest? Is it more important to provide \$54 million worth of fighter aircraft to one government and \$50 million for an air squadron to another than to have this amount available for perfecting antipollution techniques, or cancer research, or education, or cleaning and rehabilitating our cities?

In the bill the House sent over, these and similar questions were answered in the affirmative.

Mr. President, these actions are an indication that our foreign aid program is based on a bankrupt and outdated policy of dollar diplomacy which mires the United States ever deeper in the political affairs of aid recipients while, at the same time, forcing us to cut back on programs to meet the needs of our own citizens. And any Senator with doubts about the entangling character of bilateral aid should read the transcripts of the revealing hearings on the Philippines, Laos, Thailand, and Taiwan chaired by the senior Senator from Missouri.

Most regretfully there is another aspect of foreign aid that is disturbing. It is that the aid program is becoming a symbol of the confusion that pervades our foreign policy. One would never know what this Nation stands for by studying the bill which the House has acted upon and which is now before us.

The stated policy purposes of the aid program include such phrases as "freedom of the press," "freedom of information," and "freedom of religion." There is in the policy statement strong objection to ignorance, hunger, despair, aggression, and subversion.

But what of the reality? The reality is that aid in large part is an instrument for maintaining the status quo by supporting dictatorships—with the support couched in terms of maintaining economic and political stability. I will not name the countries enjoying the fruits of our questionable stabilization efforts; but I challenge anyone to go through the list and deny that about half of them are dictatorships. In short, our aid program has become—despite the

best of intentions—an instrument for the perpetuation of the political status quo—whether that be in the Middle East, the Far East, Latin America, or Africa.

But no matter how serious the shortcomings of the aid program, sheer inertia seems capable of keeping the present program moving indefinitely in the same rut. No businessman would attempt to carry on business as usual with an enterprise which was failing; he would salvage what he could and start afresh. It is time for Congress to exhibit a similar degree of prudence and recognize that dollars are not a substitute for a sound foreign policy.

I believe most of us realize that our national priorities are confused. Part of the distortion comes from foreign aid programs which too often attempt to remake the societies of ancient lands in the American image—at the expense of the social needs of our own Nation.

Mr. President, to sum up, I think it is remarkable that the committee reported out any foreign aid bill this year. Our present program has run out of steam. We know it is inadequate in amount—that we should do more to promote development—but it has not been our inclination to put more money into programs which are inadequate in conception and distorted in practice. The majority, I believe, felt that, in the absence of an immediate and viable alternative, it was best to continue the existing program—with the understanding that a new program would be forthcoming next year.

I do not wish to conclude these brief remarks without indicating the direction in which I believe foreign aid programs should move if they are to have support in the Nation and in the Congress.

In the first place, as a matter of principle, I believe the developed, wealthy nations should give economic assistance to the impoverished and underdeveloped countries. This is not only humanitarian in motivation, but is in the financial and political interest of the developed industrial countries.

Second, I believe the bulk of economic assistance should be extended through multilateral institutions such as the World Bank, the International Development Association, and consortia devoted to specific projects. Multilateral institutions can maximize the economic controls necessary to sustained development and minimize the political interference in sovereign nations conscious of their national identity.

Third, I believe it essential that bilateral aid be kept at a minimum and when it is provided that it be used to support projects rather than governments. Bilateral aid which is extended to governments unavoidably involves the benefactor nation in the internal politics of the recipient nation—and involvement in the internal politics of any nation is the first step toward involvement in civil strife which may be expected in countries struggling toward nationhood.

Fourth, I believe it essential that military assistance be limited and eventually terminated. Any country which receives grant military assistance from another is accepting interference in the most

delicate area of its sovereignty. It is not for the United States to tell a country that it needs tanks, or aircraft, or missiles. Items a nation needs for its national defense should be purchased from its own treasury. If it spends too much for defense or for prestigious weapons, it is to be expected that multilateral sources of economic aid would dry up.

There has been some slight movement in recent years in the directions I have suggested. It seems to me, however, that the new administration has opportunity to build an aid program which can find some stability in public support and which will serve the long-term interests of the United States. It will not be able to do so by packaging the shibboleths of the past in new boxes with new wrappings and ribbons. It is the substance which must be changed. If the opportunity is not grasped now, I believe we can only anticipate further erosion of the foreign aid program.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 422

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators MAGNUSON, PACKWOOD, HART, CRANSTON, DODD, and JACKSON, I introduce today an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969. This amendment would authorize U.S. assistance, at a level of \$80 million a year for 4 years, and is designed to encourage positive action by the Government of South Vietnam in enacting a program of land reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed in the Record following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Land Reform in Vietnam," written by Dr. Roy L. Prosterman, and published in the current issue of South-east Asia be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, last July President Thieu of the Republic of South Vietnam initiated legislation calling for a broad program of land reform in South Vietnam. The major provision of this "land to the tillers" bill are as follows:

First. All land not tilled directly by the landowner would be affected, on a nationwide basis—approximately 3 million acres.

Second. The peasant tilling the land would receive it free. Any large landowner who has directly tilled his land in the past would receive the right to retain a certain portion of this land with the condition that he must directly cultivate within 2 years from promulgation of this law.

Third. Landlords would be fully compensated by the South Vietnamese Government, on a ratio of 20 percent cash and 80 percent 8-year inflation-adjusting bonds. Total cost would be \$400 million.

Fourth. Reapportioned land would be distributed to every farming family for

each of which the maximum would be 5 hectares in South Vietnam and 3 hectares in Central Vietnam.

Fifth. Recipients would include those who have fled from the countryside and wish to return to their villages.

Sixth. The Government of South Vietnam would encourage the establishment of farm cooperatives to facilitate the improvement of agricultural methods.

Due to a widespread lack of confidence in the value of these bonds to be offered as compensation, South Vietnamese landowners exerted sufficient pressure for the bill to be rendered virtually ineffective by the lower house of the South Vietnamese Legislature in early September. Unless an immediate effort is made to assure the landlords that a substantial proportion of the bonds can be turned into productive resources, it is likely that similar action will be taken in the Upper House which is considering the bill at the present time.

I believe that such reform is essential to the development of a viable, free society in South Vietnam. Currently, more than 100,000 landlord families own land cultivated by some 1 million tenant farmer families who pay one-third to one-half of their crop in rent. Massive land reform would go far toward giving the peasants, who constitute by far the largest single group in South Vietnamese society, a stake in the preservation of their country, and toward discouraging the recruitment of an estimated 40,000 peasants a year into the Vietcong.

The 1969-70 Mekong Delta rice harvest is now beginning, and will last until February. It is essential that action be taken now, before the collection of rents from this season's harvest, if the full impact of reform is to be felt.

Therefore, I propose the following amendment, in support of meaningful land reform in South Vietnam. The main provisions are as follows:

First, that U.S. support be authorized at a level of \$80 million a year for 4 years, for a total of \$320 million, such funds to be used for the purchase of certain U.S. nonluxury commodities—principally agricultural goods such as seed, fertilizer, and farm machinery, as approved by the President. Specified commodities are to be used in direct exchange for those bonds issued by the South Vietnamese Government as compensation for confiscated lands.

Second, that small landowners have access to the bonds on a basis proportionately equal to the larger landowners.

Third, that import duties and other taxes on imported goods be waived for commodities brought in under this amendment, as well as permits or licenses to import.

The total cost of my proposal is equal to the cost of about 4 days of the present war in Vietnam. A successful land reform program could shorten the war by many more than 4 days.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to support this proposal. It has been my conviction for a long time, one which I have expressed from time to time on the floor of the Senate, that we cannot really wind this war down unless in some way we can find a political solution to the problem represented by South

Vietnam. I think that a political solution involves inevitably a broadening of the base of political support for the Government of South Vietnam—the present one or one which succeeds it as a result of free elections. I think land reform which would give the people of South Vietnam a stake in things as they are could do a great deal to encourage and promote the development of a viable political solution.

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

EXHIBIT 1

AMENDMENT NO. 422

On page 87 insert:

"SEC. 108. VIETNAMESE LAND REFORM.—(a) The success of land reform programs in Vietnam is a material factor in the future political and economic stability of that nation, and the speed with which such programs are given effect may have consequences with regard to the termination of hostilities there. In order to support and encourage Vietnamese land reform programs, the President may make grants to the Government of Vietnam, out of funds appropriated pursuant to this section, for the purchase and shipment to Vietnam of goods and commodities, manufactured or produced in the United States, which, by their introduction into the Vietnamese economy, will contribute to sound economic development in Vietnam. Such goods and commodities (1) shall be of a type approved by the President for such programs; (2) shall include goods suitable for business inventories in nonluxury enterprises; (3) shall be exchanged for bonds issued by the Government of Vietnam to compensate landowners whose lands are transferred to other persons under such programs; and (4) shall be selected by any such landowner to whom a bond has been issued or by any other person or entity validly holding, according to Vietnamese law, any such bond.

"(b) In order to carry out the provisions of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated \$80,000,000 for the fiscal year 1970, and the same amount for each of the three succeeding fiscal years.

"(c) The provisions of this section shall not be effective unless—

"(1) on or before February 1, 1970, there is enacted by the Government of Vietnam a law providing for the transfer of substantially all land used for the cultivation of rice, which is not under cultivation by the owner thereof from the owner of such land to the person who lives on such land actively cultivates it, or, if the land is suitable for such cultivation but is not being cultivated, to the person living on such land;

"(2) on or before February 10, 1970, the President certifies to the Congress that such Vietnamese law or decree is in such form and is being administered in such manner that the substantial proportion of rents otherwise collectible in connection with the Mekong Delta rice harvest from December, 1969, through February, 1970, will not be collected;

"(3) the Vietnamese law or decree carrying out the program set out in paragraph (1) of this subsection provides a means of compensating, at the fair market value, those landowners whose lands are transferred under the provisions of such law to other persons, such compensation to include bonds redeemable for goods and commodities as provided under subsection (a) and such bonds, whether all or part of the compensation provided, are being made available on a nondiscriminatory basis, as to maturity dates and forming the same percentage of compensation paid to such landowners having holdings of various sizes;

"(4) all import duties and other taxes on imported commodities are waived or suspend-

ed by the Government of Vietnam with regard to goods and commodities brought into Vietnam under the authority of this section; and

"(5) no permit or license to import is required, in connection with such goods and commodities, of former land owners who hold bonds issued in accordance with paragraph (3) of this subsection."

On page 87, line 11, strike out "Sec. 108." and insert in lieu thereof "Sec. 109."

EXHIBIT 2

LAND REFORM IN VIETNAM

(By Roy L. Prosterman, associate professor of law, University of Washington School of Law)

It should be in no way surprising that in a country where the bulk of the population—still 60 per cent today—is dependent on the land as its sole source of livelihood (as has been the case in Vietnam for at least 2,000 years) the question of land tenure should assume gigantic proportions.* Tenure imbalance strikes at the very base of the country's economic and political stability. Historically, breaking up large holdings and transferring them to individual small owners was a means of power consolidation by new Vietnamese royal dynasties. Even as late as the first decades of the nineteenth century, Nguyen Anh, who founded the last dynasty, set about breaking up large feudal landholdings in Vietnam. This policy was pursued by his successor, who acceded to the throne in 1820. The advent of French colonialism in the 1860's was accompanied by dramatic changes.

It is estimated that between 1880 and 1930 the land area devoted to rice in the fertile, southern region of Vietnam then known as Cochinchina (which included, in particular, the Mekong Delta region south of Saigon), grew by at least 400 per cent, with resulting increased yields. Yet, by 1930, the position of the Vietnamese peasant in the economy had so deteriorated that his situation was worse than it had been prior to French intrusion. Land was sold at absurdly cheap prices to colonialists who amassed vast holdings; the rice that could have put an end to peasant starvation was extracted through land rents and was exported, rather than made available to the indigenous population. The rough figures that are available indicate that during the 1930's some 57 per cent of the rural population of Cochinchina was landless.

As Joseph Buttinger, a leading Western historian of Vietnam, summed it up in *Vietnam: A Dragon Embattled*,¹ "the rural masses became as dependent on the rich landowners as the serfs of medieval Europe had been on their feudal lords."

After a third visit to Vietnam, in September, 1969, I had to conclude that the final word on success or failure of land reform as a program bearing on the conflict could not—quite—be written yet. Like Pearl lashed to the rail, and then rescued, this quintessential program had been up and down again so many times over the last 15 years that even a week's lead time before publication might find one badly out of date. But at least for one sparkling moment, starting in May, 1969, and lasting at least through midfall, land reform was definitely "up" again. Whether or not the Vietnamese Senate or President Nguyen Van Thieu himself utilizes far reaching amendment powers to restore Thieu's genuinely excellent legislative proposal (after its evisceration at the hands of the lower house at the start of

September), it would still be true that 1969 was the best year ever for South Vietnamese land reform. Unfortunately, this is not really saying much. Without a good bill to effect the transfer of privately owned lands, plus vigorous enforcement of the legislation and of programs begun earlier this year, South Vietnam will lose what is very likely her last chance to make sense out of this most basic of all "pacification" programs, and to acquire the leverage this might supply for a political settlement broadly satisfactory to various shades of American opinion.

LAND TENURE PATTERN

That the land problem is near the root of the conflict—as it was, for example, in China and in Cuba—has long been clear to most careful and scholarly observers; it is a point on which there has been close agreement among Bernard Fall (land reform is "as essential to success as ammunition for howitzer's—in fact, more so"), Buttinger, Douglas Pike, and many, many others. Today, at least three-fifths of South Vietnam's population of about 17 million is rural and derives a livelihood chiefly from rice farming. About three-fifths of this rural population lives in the Mekong Delta, south of Saigon, where 80 per cent of the country's rice is produced. Most of the remaining two-fifths of the farmers live in a narrow belt of rice-land running up the coast—the area known as the Central Lowlands.

The tenure pattern under which the bulk of these farmers live and gain their sustenance is not fundamentally changed from that shown in the 1960–1961 Agricultural Census of South Vietnam, as confirmed by field work by the Stanford Research Institute (S.R.I.) in which I participated at the end of 1967. During the critical period of the conflict's development in the early 1960's only 257,000 out of 1,175,000—or 23 per cent—of the Mekong Delta's farming families owned all the land they worked. Their average holding was four and one-half acres. Another 334,000 families, or 28.5 per cent of the total, tilled six acres—four of which were rented, while 521,000 families, roughly 44 per cent, farmed an average of three and one-half acres of land that was *totally* rented. Thus, in the Delta, more than seven farming families out of 10 (44 per cent+28.5 per cent=72.5 per cent) were substantially dependent on tenant farming.

The massive dislocation of the war has reduced the rural population from 75 to 80 per cent to the current 60 per cent figure, and the exodus to the cities was probably proportionately greater among those who had no land of their own. But the 1967 field work showed that at least 60 per cent of the Delta's agricultural population, in the relatively secure areas (where the field work could be carried on), remained without ownership of land, and the size of holdings and conditions of tenure remained unchanged. In its percentage of landlessness, the Mekong Delta thus qualified as one of the four worst areas of the world—along with the Huk country of Central Luzon, Java, and north-eastern Brazil—and equalled or exceeded pre-revolutionary China, Russia and Cuba.

The S.R.I. field work—the major portion of which consisted of nearly one thousand hour-long interviews with Mekong Delta residents, carefully randomized, and using an extensively pretested set of questions and Vietnamese interviewers under American supervisors—uncovered further details, although most of these simply confirmed the accurate appraisals which had already been available for more than a decade. In the Delta, landlords supply virtually no inputs: no credit, seeds, implements, fertilizer or advice. They collect rents—typically one-third to one-half of the gross crop, and sometimes even more. The landlords of roughly half the tenanted land are absentees, so rent collection becomes an annual foray either by them or by agents—often local officials or

military men who get a cut of what they collect.

Tenants can usually be evicted at will. They are held responsible for most, or all, of the rent even when their crops fail, for the rent is calculated in advance on an *estimate* of the gross crop. Thus, after major flooding reduced the harvest of 1966–1967—the Delta harvest period is from December to February—many tenants were held for rents that exceeded 75 per cent of their actual production. Should a tenant be unable to pay his rent, he is confronted with interest rates on the unpaid portion that *average* 60 per cent a year, and which in one case out of five exceed 120 per cent a year.

The situation is no better in the Central Lowlands. As the 1960–1961 census showed, the typical family—403,000 out of 695,000—lived on a two-acre farm, one acre of which was rented. About 74,000 families held rented land only, their average holding being one and one-tenth acres. Rents on the tenanted or share-cropped portion of lands in the Central Lowlands generally are 50 per cent of the gross crop, although here the actual crop is the measure more often than an estimate made in advance. Security of tenure, however, is as nonexistent as it is in the Delta.

These land-tenure figures can be given some perspective by noting that South Vietnamese calculations indicate that once the rents go much above one-fifth of the crop, even a three and one-half acre Delta plot (the average for the 44 per cent of families that the census showed to be living wholly on rented land) does not produce enough rice to keep the average six-person household at recommended minimum sustenance levels.

The typical Central Lowlands mixed-tenure holding, as indicated, averages only two acres, one-half of which is rented.

A further finding of the S.R.I. study, contrary to a vast amount of conventional wisdom found in Saigon offices (but generally not found out in the field), was that the tenant farmers of the Mekong Delta—in an open-ended question with multiple responses allowed—regarded land ownership as a paramount concern five times as frequently as they regarded physical security as a paramount concern, and rated agricultural credit as a paramount concern four times as frequently as security.

THE VIETCONG PROGRAM

All the above data, however, relates to "tenancy" as it exists in areas under South Vietnamese government control. In areas where the Vietcong are in control, they have offered only one substantive program: land reform. The program has deep roots, adumbrated in the Joseph Alsop quotation that begins this article.

By the time that the Geneva Conference was convened in 1954, the Vietminh ruled 60 to 90 per cent of what is now South Vietnam. Their support by the rural population had accounted in substantial part for the crucial advantage that had enabled them to overcome the superior arms and manpower of the French. In their struggle, they had built their broad base of support on the strong foundation of anticolonial nationalism, and they had added to this (even more concretely than the Algerian rebels were to do a few years later) the attraction of land-tenure reform for the mass of the peasantry.

Beginning in 1945, in areas that they controlled, the Vietminh had enforced strict limitations on rent and interest rates. Lands held by the French, communal lands, and the land of "traitors" were confiscated and given to the poorer peasants. Beginning in 1953, the Vietminh undertook the second, more sweeping phase of their land reform program, under a classification system similar to that which had been employed by the Communist Chinese ("landlord," "rich peasant," "middle peasant," "poor peasant" and

*The author has just returned from his third extended trip to Vietnam to review progress in the land-reform area. This trip was taken under private grant, while the two earlier ones were made as the land-law consultant to the Stanford Research Institute survey of land tenure in Vietnam, undertaken for AID in 1967–1968.

¹ (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1967).

"agricultural worker"). In its first stage of implementation this system was aimed at taking land from the first two groups and giving it to the last two. Wherever it was applied, the program utterly transformed the village social structure.

The sad history of the post-1954 years can only be briefly sketched here. The North Vietnamese moved to a stage featuring bloody village "trials" of the landlords and—very broadly defined—"rich peasants" (100,000 died, according to the best estimates), and then to collectivization. President Ngo Dinh Diem missed the chance to carry out a competitive democratic land reform, on models such as those of Mexico, Japan, Taiwan, Bolivia or South Korea (all of which had inaugurated sweeping land reforms before 1954). Instead, he adopted a law that was blatantly impossible to administer, attempting to control the landlord-tenant relationship—actually restoring the landlord-tenant relationship for hundreds of thousands of families in formerly Vietminh-controlled areas who had thought the land was now theirs—plus an extremely mild law regulating the acquisition of large holdings. The latter allowed retention of 247 acres (eventually raised to 284 in most cases), which was at least 30 times greater than the "retention limits" in the successful Asian land reform programs of Japan, South Korea and—ten years too late—Taiwan. It also suffered from multiple administrative defects.² Diem's program ground to a final halt in 1961, with benefits for only one out of ten tenant families. Local officials were allowed to retain and rent out the best of the acquired lands.

This left two great groups identifying the Communists with land reform and Saigon with the interests of the landed oligarchy:

About one million peasants who remained under Vietminh control even in Diem's heyday, and who continued to live under the economic and social transformations wrought by "first stage" (i.e., precollectivization) Communist land reform.

The great mass of tenant farmers who returned to Diem's control, who not only gained no benefits from Diem's unworkable laws, but actually found the government reestablishing a relationship that the Vietminh had already sundered.

Under the circumstances, it was not only logical but virtually inevitable that at the end of the 1950's the Vietcong should become the active successors of the Vietminh, building popular support throughout the countryside with the promise of the maintenance and extension of the Vietminh land reforms.

Saigon's response, from 1961 onward, not only totally omitted any competitive land reform measures, but from late 1965 onward actually involved the elaboration of decrees which justified the ultimate, very common "pacification" process by which the American innocents, having "secured" a village and moved on, were followed by the landlords riding in one the jeeps with "ARVN" (the South Vietnamese Army) to reassert control over their former lands. Not surprisingly, but very tragically indeed, many Americans have died at the hands of enraged peasants who have associated them with "pacification" in this, its completed, sense.

Unfortunately, the role of AID³ and the United States State Department in all of this

² One example: regulations ultimately gave landlords eight years in which to prove "pre-ordinance" transfers to others that brought their holdings below the point where the law took hold; transfers to relatives and strawmen were common; and the author has met Vietnamese who openly admit that they still "own" over 2,000 acres.

³ The United States Agency for International Development.

was pusillanimous. Starting with clear marching orders from President Dwight Eisenhower and those at the top in 1954 that made support for land reform a matter of high priority, working-level officials allowed themselves to be backed off step by step from a workable program by the clear signs of hostility emanating from major segments of the ruling elite. During 1960-1965, the United States Mission obligingly failed to have present in Vietnam even one full-time official dealing with the land reform problem, and a plethora of rationalizations sprang up about the need to rely on the landlord class for political stability. In the case of some officials, all these rationalizations stubbornly failed to give way even when the house of cards collapsed in the early 1960's and the preeminent role of the peasants in supporting the rebellion became clear.

TABLE I.—ENEMY STRENGTH

	National intelligence estimate	CIA estimate
(1) Main force units.....	118,000	2150,000
(2) Village guerrilla platoons and squads.....	70,000-90,000	100,000-120,000
(3) "Irregular" or self-defense militia.....	150,000	100,000
(4) Administrative and logistic apparatus.....	35,000-40,000	75,000-80,000
(5) Political cadres.....	75,000-85,000	80,000-120,000

¹ 54,000 North Vietnamese; 64,000 Vietcong.
² 80,000 North Vietnamese; 80,000 Vietcong.

PEASANT SUPPORT FOR THE WAR

It is this deeply rooted peasant support which has given the Vietnamese conflict the very strong "insurrection" or "civil war" flavor which it still retains, despite the highly publicized infusions of manpower from the North which began in 1965. The measures of this peasant support are not hard to find. In March, 1968, *The New York Times* noted that the Vietcong had been steadily able to recruit 5,000 to 7,000 men a month. Lieutenant Colonel William Corson, former head of the Marine's Combined Action Platoons (CAP) program, writing in the summer of 1968, noted that some three-fifths of these Vietcong recruits could be regarded as volunteers or "soft-sell" enlistees. The common appeal in wide areas where Vietcong land reform was in effect was "The movement has given you land, give us your son."

Newsweek, on January 1, 1968, reported that 377,000 men were bearing arms against the United States and South Vietnamese forces, of whom only one-sixth were North Vietnamese. *The New York Times* on March 19, 1968, offered official estimates of all five categories of enemy strength, in which the North Vietnamese were said to play an even smaller role (see Table I).

Estimates made during my 1969 visit were that the North Vietnamese "main force" component was up, and that of southern recruits was down; on the local level southerners were still functioning in large numbers. The vitally important category of southern "cadres" or "V.C.I." (Vietcong infrastructure) had been somewhat depleted by the Communists' chosen tactics during *Tet*, but since then had hardly been touched. These V.C.I. do the recruiting, arrange the reconnaissance, obtain the porters and, by establishing supply and ammunition depots at intervals of about a day's march, prepare the way for main force actions—a *sine qua non* of these actions, since the main force units cannot carry with them the supplies and ammunition needed for their attacks. Moreover, despite well-reported "battles," it was doggedly, tragically true that over one-half of American casualties were the result of such essentially local guerrilla activities as the planting of mines and booby traps (and the mute silence of the villagers as they watched Americans walk into them).

The one bright spot in the picture was that fresh Vietcong recruitment had fallen to about 3,500 men a month, apparently through a combination of the loss of senior cadres at *Tet*, the spread of knowledge that main force units have been using southern recruits as the "first wave," and the first important stirrings of land reform under Nguyen Van Thieu, including an important effort to prevent landlords from returning to reclaim their lands in "pacified" villages.

The final part of this history—which was still undergoing almost daily changes as I was writing this—has involved the process by which the Thieu government appears, at last, and perhaps too late, to have embraced a really sweeping and workable program of land reform. The bizarre reality, of course, is that while the Communists have successfully billed themselves in Vietnam (and elsewhere) as "land reformers," genuine democratic land reform does not take a back seat to Communist land reforms by any means. Quite the contrary; the collectivization which has been the universal "second stage" of Communist land reform promises that have led to successful revolutions has been an economic disaster vastly distasteful to the peasantry, while the half-dozen successful non-Communist land reforms of this century⁴ have led to major increases in agricultural production and have furnished a bulwark of political stability—including assistance in defeating attempts to start guerrilla movements in Bolivia and South Korea by depriving the would-be revolutionaries of their "gut" issue.

THIEU'S LAND REFORM PROGRAM

The first signs of real movement came from the South Vietnamese. President Thieu, speaking to a gathering of provincial land-affairs officials on January 18, 1968, just before the *Tet* offensive, had made the statement quoted at the beginning of this article.

Over the following months, the *Tet* offensive, the Johnson announcement of a bombing halt, the start of talks in Paris and the presidential campaign of Minnesota Senator Eugene McCarthy all supplied additional shocks to the Vietnamese, and major elements of land reform program began to take shape.

First of all, distribution of the choice lands taken by Diem but never distributed began in earnest. Procedures were simplified with the help of United States land reform advisers so that village-level committees could approve the applications made by the present cultivators and hand out deeds in under a week, and a tremendous boost was given the program when President Thieu decreed at the start of July, 1969, that henceforth the distribution would be free and that former recipients would be freed from their payment obligations. The distribution over the two years sharply accelerated:

TABLE II.—Land Distribution, 1968-69

[Acres distributed]	
January to June 1968.....	20,000
July to December 1968.....	40,000
January to August 1969.....	90,000
September to December 1969 (estimate).....	90,000

In 1969, an estimated 50,000 families will receive these government-owned lands.

Second, a temporary end, at least, was brought to "negative land reform." In September, 1968, Thieu declared that the processes by which landlords evicted occupants and collected rents in newly "secured" areas would be ended. Very likely, he had the forthcoming "accelerated pacification" drive in mind: if the process of planting the flag, at least in daytime, in additional villages, were to be accompanied by the customary

⁴ In Mexico, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Bolivia and Iran, in that order, perhaps soon to be followed by Peru.

inflow of returning landlords, the results for Saigon would be politically—and perhaps militarily—disastrous. This declaration was followed by three decrees:

One in November, 1968, that prohibited officials or soldiers in newly secured villages from reinstalling landlords or helping to collect rents;

A second in February, 1969, that extended the prohibition to the private landlords themselves and made it effective until February, 1970;

And a third in April, that made the earlier prohibitions countrywide, apparently in anticipation that landlords in more secure areas might try to evict tenants and resume personal occupation in contemplation of further land reform measures.

My just-concluded field work persuades me that the countrywide occupancy "freeze" is being widely adhered to. It has been well publicized; it involves a highly visible action if it is violated; and in areas where the new local-force units ("Popular Forces," "Regional Forces," and "Local Self Defense Forces") have received some 500,000 rifles, the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) can no longer trample on peasants' legal rights with impunity. The rent "freeze" (supposedly at a zero level in newly secured areas) involves more clandestine violations, and appears to be only spottily effective.

Third, there was an almost disastrous decision in February, 1969, to design the biggest, final part of the program—involving transfer of some, most, or all of the 3,000,000 acres of privately owned lands that are farmed by tenants—as a "voluntary" purchase program. This would have merely urged landlord transfers for 2 to 3 years and then would have "required" them only when the administrators could determine (with the land records for three out of eight villages totally destroyed) that a landlord held more than 37, or perhaps 75, acres. Fortunately, President Thieu took a personal hand, which resulted in the scrapping of the "voluntary" plan, the sacking of the land reform minister, and the drafting of the sweeping "Land to the Tiller" bill and its presentation, in early July, to the lower house. This bill would affect all of the 3,000,000 acres of land that are cultivated by tenants or non-owners, and would make all Vietnamese peasants the owners of the land they till. The regime of tenant farming for a million families would be ended in a drastically simplified and rapid way.

All land not tilled by the owner would be affected (so there would be no need to apply a "retention limit" under which each owner would have to make a "declaration" of how much he owns, with the onus on the administrators to find out if he is lying).

The peasant tilling the land would receive it free (so there would be no occasion for corrupt administrators to dun the peasant for payments and the message would be the simplest possible: you don't pay anything to anybody).

The effect would be nationwide (so that peasants tilling land in insecure areas could nevermore be goaded to support the Vietcong with the threat that landlords would otherwise return: "negative land reform" would be gone for good).

Confirmation of title would come via a highly simplified village-level application procedure, involving only a few days' delay, and requiring neither the shifting of families, the shifting of present boundaries, nor the resurveying of the land.

Landlords would be fully compensated (20 percent in cash, 80 percent in 8-year inflation-adjusting bonds). The total cost would be \$400 million, equal to between five and six days' cost of the war.

The bill, in fact, represents one of the great non-Communist land reforms of the twentieth century, even more sweeping, for example, than those of Japan and South Korea. The "Land to the Tiller" program,

however, is now in deep political trouble, the basic difficulty being that the South Vietnamese landlords do not trust the bonds. Because of this, they combined their influence in the lower house with another group that sees opposition (shortsightedly would be an understatement) as a way of preventing Thieu from increasing his political power. This combined opposition eviscerated the bill—putting in a 37-acre "retention limit" and adding that only "legal" occupants could receive land—and even then added a provision boosting the cash portion of compensation for the landlords from 20 percent to 60 to 70 percent.

Now the upper house is considering the bill. In a heartening demonstration of firmness, President Thieu has asked to have it amended to its original strong version. Under Vietnamese law, the upper house amendments, if any, will prevail unless overridden by two-thirds of the total membership of the lower house. Even then President Thieu can amend and will prevail, unless his amendments are overridden by a majority of the joint membership of the two houses. Thus, for the moment, with President Thieu's continued exhibition of firmness, land reform is "up" again after its lower house drubbing.

But whether the upper house amends and—if not—whether President Thieu amends and is not overridden, now depend crucially on the credibility of the compensation to the landlords.

As this was written, pressures appeared to be building for a United States declaration of financial support for the program—consistent with President Richard Nixon's strong general statement of support for the program in the Midway communique of June, 1969. Whether such a statement is made may well be decisive in determining whether, as this is being read, the mass of South Vietnamese peasants are finally becoming owner-farmers, or whether the chance to achieve an impact during the 1969 main Delta harvest period (December to February) has been missed. If, finally, land reform goes "down" again, it may well be for the final count.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if I had not heard the Senator from Maine read the proposed amendment, I would not have believed it; because I had been told for the last 6 or 8 years, through the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations, that the purpose of our presence in South Vietnam was to provide self-determination for the people of that country. It was for that purpose, we sent in nearly 550,000 American military men.

I do not believe we can give the South Vietnamese self-determination by writing their legislation for them almost in detail. Of course, they need land reform. So do many other countries in the world—some not too far from South Vietnam. But unless we are willing to keep an enormous Army there for the foreseeable future, we cannot force self-determination on South Vietnam, according to our ideas of what self-determination should be.

As a matter of fact, the Legislature of South Vietnam now has land reform legislation before it. They expected to have it consummated by the first of January. I understand that February will be a more likely date for the completion of this land reform program.

It seems almost the acme of arrogance for us to undertake to tell the South Vietnamese people in what way they should divide their land among the producers, what the customs duties or the taxes should be, what they export, and so forth. It would be almost—well, in

fact, it would be total insolence on our part, when we are there for the purpose of securing for them the right of self-determination, to say now, "We will write your laws; we will tell you how you are going to do this, how you are going to do that."

Unless we want to keep a half million men there for a long, long time, we had better let them decide for themselves what they want to do, because we cannot force them. We have prevented self-determination in South Vietnam by the presence of a half million American soldiers, and I do not want to go any further in that direction.

In another area some of our people believe we should tell Greece what it should do and how it should run its government. Others say we have to tell Sweden how it should run its affairs; otherwise, we will find a way to punish Sweden through some of our legislation. Some people would like to use our Committee on Foreign Relations for that purpose.

I will have a little more to say on this subject tomorrow, if we do not finish this bill tonight.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I want to ask the Senator from Maine some questions.

Mr. MUSKIE. May I respond first to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have the utmost respect for my distinguished colleague from New England, the Senator from Vermont, but it is obvious to me, from the criticisms he has enunciated, that he did not listen to what I was saying.

The proposal I have made is not a proposal to dictate legislation to the assembly of South Vietnam. My proposal is geared to the fact—which is substantiated by the Senator's observation—that legislation is pending in the legislature of South Vietnam. It is my purpose to encourage the enactment of this legislation. Whether they do or not is, of course, for them to decide.

Mr. President, I wish to say to my good friend from Vermont that we spend hundreds of millions of dollars every year to assist the Government of South Vietnam and the people of South Vietnam to shore up their economy, to shore up their currency so that it does not run away completely, to provide food, and to pay for food. I assume that as long as we are there we will be spending more than the \$80 million a year I am talking about. All I am saying in the amendment is, "Let us use this \$80 million a year to provide a way for the South Vietnamese to reassure the landlords, who are the object of their own legislation, that what they offer will be paid for." It would be American money in any case.

I am undertaking to do two things: First, to express our concern that the South Vietnamese Government will move ahead with land reform; and second, to funnel a small portion of the aid we give them anyway to provide them means for paying the landlords under their land reform legislation.

I have not dictated anything here. Anyone who reads force into this meas-

ure cannot read the English language. There is nothing compulsory or compulsive about the legislation in any way. Nothing would spell out the kind of land reform they should have. This amendment is entirely geared to the proposal for land reform which is now pending in the assembly in Saigon, which one house has already considered and defeated, and which the other house may very well defeat because there is not a credible means for payment to the landlords. This is why the landlords organized to defeat the legislation. I would like to see that legislation pass, if the assembly wishes to pass it. The only roadblock is a credible means of paying the landlords.

I suggest this means, which they can take advantage of or not if they wish, would establish a credible way to proceed.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator think we should give them \$80 million regardless of the nature of the land reform program, or does the Senator from Maine think we should just give the South Vietnamese the money and let them carry out land reform as they saw fit, regardless of what their land reform program might be?

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not know what the Senator means by "regardless."

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the Senator. Mr. MUSKIE. May I say to the Senator from Vermont—

Mr. AIKEN. Surely.

Mr. MUSKIE. We have geared this explicitly to the bill that is pending there. We are not trying to write another one. We have geared this to the bill pending there.

Mr. AIKEN. Regardless of what the South Vietnamese legislature decides on?

Mr. MUSKIE. If they take away its substance, I assume we would not be interested in paying for it. We are not dictating what it should be, but we have the right to pass judgment on what money we pay to support it.

Mr. AIKEN. We have? I read the amendment and it is clearly inferred if the South Vietnam legislators enact the kind of land reform we approve they would get the \$80 million; but if they do not suit us they do not get the \$80 million.

If that is not one of the worst forms of aggression we could practice in a small country I do not know what it would be. We tell them what kind of legislation to enact and at the same time we hold out self-determination for them as the reason we have 500,000 men there and when we did have 500,000 men there there was no possible chance for self-determination because we determined everything for them. I would like to get away from the state of affairs where we prevent self-determination through the weight of our intervention.

Mr. MUSKIE. If the Senator were to project the principle which he just enunciated to the fullest extent, he would vote against any appropriation bill to provide a dollar in support of our military effort in South Vietnam. He would vote against any appropriation bill for any of the economic purposes for which we give aid to South Vietnam because in these two ways we are making an impact on that country which deprives them of the option they would have if we were not

there. We are there, and we are making an impact every day at the rate of millions for the cost of the war and other appropriations that deprive them of options.

All I say to the Senate and to the distinguished Senator from Vermont is that now we be a little more precise in indicating the ways in which our money should be used. We would like to encourage land reform. We would like to encourage the kind of land reform that is represented by their present bill.

With the proper encouragement it can be enacted. As I understand from reports I get back from South Vietnam, it could be enacted this month or next month. If it is enacted this month or next month before the harvest has to be shared with landlords, this might expedite the end of the fighting there.

Already we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in ways that the South Vietnamese do not control in South Vietnam, militarily and economically. I do not see why we should have this sudden surge of conscience today, in connection with a little more precise indication of our hopes for them than is represented in the bill.

Mr. AIKEN. Until we can be a little more effective in bringing out reforms here in our own country, we better not be too insistent on reforms in other countries. We had a chance, in the last 2 weeks, to enact a reform in this country and we did not do a very good job.

If I had my way, we would never have sent 500,000 men there to enforce self-determination on the South Vietnamese, but I did not have my way. In fact, after I advised President Johnson that he should change his policy, he sent 230,000 more men there instead of taking my advice. He thought he was doing the right thing at the time, but it turned out he was not. The worst thing we can do now is to undertake to tell people or governments of a hundred small countries how they should run their affairs in detail.

Mr. MUSKIE. I am not telling 100 small countries.

Mr. AIKEN. When it is said, "You do not get the money unless you approve what we approve," that is aggression.

Mr. MUSKIE. On the floor of the Senate every day we give advice to the Government of South Vietnam to broaden their bases, to get rid of that group, or respond to another group. They have been the recipients of free advice from us, who control the purse strings, for many, many years, not only with respect to minor political actions as this one, but in much broader areas.

We are confronted with a condition, not a theory. Our obligation is to get out. The Senator from Vermont has not supported the idea of unilateral withdrawal from Vietnam. He has recognized in the many statements he makes that our problem is to phase out in an orderly withdrawal as quickly as possible. Our orderly withdrawal means having some impact on decisions they make as well as decisions we make.

The Vietnamization policy is an American decision which we are imposing on them. We are saying to them: Prepare to take over this war militarily, because we

are pulling out. As far as I know, the Senator from Vermont has not opposed the Vietnamization policy of this administration. If that does not represent pressure on South Vietnam with respect to the way they conduct the war and end it, then I should like to know what it is.

All I am asking is a relatively minor amendment to try to move, by inducement and not force, the South Vietnamese Government along the road toward justice for South Vietnamese peasants. The Vietnamization policy is not going to work unless the government we leave behind is prepared to do justice to its people. If we can apply pressure to that government to take over the military conduct of the war, then, it seems to me, it is legitimate for us to offer an inducement to that government to broaden its political base. Why the one is so acceptable and this one is so abhorrent to the Senator from Vermont, I find difficult to understand.

Mr. AIKEN. I think it would be better if we devoted our energies toward getting approval of the Dickey-Lincoln Dam, which is far more important in New England than the land reform program.

Mr. MUSKIE. It is important to my people in New England that we stop the killing and the dying in South Vietnam. If we are going to do that, we have got to be concerned not only with the Vietnamization of the military efforts of the South Vietnamese but also with whether what we leave behind will be a viable political situation for the people of South Vietnam. That means concerning ourselves not only with the fighting in the war, until our troops can come home, but to get down to work with them to develop an economy in South Vietnam.

I think we are inevitably involved in this decision. I would be amazed if we did not have something to do through our ambassador there, through our foreign aid mission there, with the fact that there is a bill dealing with land reform now pending in the South Vietnamese Assembly. I would be amazed if we did not have something to do with that, because we have been pressing, under the Kennedy administration, under the Johnson administration, and now under this administration, our political points of view upon the government in Saigon. This is just another one.

Mr. AIKEN. Well, there is a difference between withdrawing troops and sending men in, that is all I would say.

Mr. MUSKIE. We are telling them what to do with their own troops. We are telling them that they had better get ready for our withdrawal. That is the way I understand the Vietnamization policy of the present administration.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I hesitate to get involved in this discussion between two very articulate and learned New Englanders. Maybe I should be quiet, but I thought, if the Senator will allow just a question or two, that I would like to point out there is \$420 million for supporting assistance in the bill. The lion's share of these funds is to be used for the Vietnamization program. If this is a matter in which they are seriously in-

terested, why can that money not be used for this purpose?

I must say that I share somewhat the Senator's concern about intervening in Vietnam. If we are seriously getting out—and I would like to say to the Senator that I am serious about getting out—I did not propose Vietnamization and I am not at all convinced that Vietnamization means that we will be able to get out, but I do not question the motives or the sincerity of the administration. I merely question the judgment, taking into account all the circumstances of human nature, and so forth, and whether this can result in what they think they can achieve by it. That is not to say that they do not mean what they say. I am not trying to put it on that basis. I am simply putting it as a political matter; namely, will it result in a situation in which we can withdraw?

My objective is to withdraw.

As to land reform in Vietnam, one of the first men I ever talked to was Gen. Edward Lansdale. There were others. There was one man there before him named Wolf Ladažinsky? This is not a new subject they have been playing around with. My understanding is that the dominant political figures in South Vietnam politics are landlords, and, therefore, they are not very sympathetic to this subject. I would really question as a practical matter, in a sense, our holding out a special bait for them. If they have any desire to do it, why can they not do it out of the money already in the bill? That money is there to assist them.

Please understand that I am not advocating this. I do not like this bill. I am only asking a question, for the Senator to explain what his attitude is toward it. I do not like the continuation of this program in Vietnam. I would like to take those measures which would bring about a political solution at the earliest possible moment, a solution modeled after the French solution in Vietnam in 1954. But the administration is choosing a different route. They think they have the support to do it.

I only say this by way of making my own position clear, that I would like to do anything to promote our leaving Vietnam, and to do any reasonable thing to bring that about. The Senator seems to be saying that this would hasten the time when we could depart. I do not quite understand that connection at all. I wish the Senator would enlighten me a little more about these points.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, if I used the word "would," and I might have, but I do not recall that I expressed a certainty I do not feel.

I do not know how anyone can feel any certainty about what is going to happen in South Vietnam. In my judgment, and in the judgment of many Senators in this Chamber, and those who have been close to the Vietnamese story for a long time, land reform is the critical element in the development of a popularly based—not popularly chosen—but a popularly based government in South Vietnam.

I remember, when I first went to Vietnam on a mission, which included the

distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) in October and November of 1965, that Ambassador Lodge was our Ambassador there. He met us at Bangkok and flew down with us to Saigon. On the way, he briefed us on the critical situation in Vietnam. Ky and Thieu had just taken over the government within a few weeks of that time.

I remember what Ambassador Lodge emphasized most was the need for land reform in Vietnam. He certainly undertook the political education of Ky and Thieu and made it the top of the agenda. That was true not only of Ambassador Lodge, but also of the American AID team and everyone concerned with the problem of developing the economic and political viability of South Vietnam.

"Land reform. Achieve land reform" was the cry, and we would at least make a start along the road toward political viability in South Vietnam. Ever since that time, land reform has been the top agenda for everyone concerned with building political viability there.

The second point I should like to make, in responding to the Senator's question, is that maybe there are sums in the bill other than this one, that could be used. If there are, I would have no objection to setting them safely in the bill, but tied to the objective stated in my amendment.

It is my impression that this bill represents the rock bottom figure for foreign aid and that it probably represents a pretty tight list of projects and priorities.

I am not a member of the Senator's committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is much too much money for the military, I fear, but that is another matter.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not know what the point is. I do not know what the list of priorities is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is too much money for the military. There is no doubt of that, but—

Mr. MUSKIE. I could be persuaded by the Senator—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps I have not made myself clear. I have not questioned what our Ambassador said; but why is it, if this has been true and if it has any substance, that the Vietnamese have not done anything about land reform? We have poured an awful lot of money in there over the past few years.

Mr. MUSKIE. One of the greatest criticisms I have directed at the government in Saigon, as well as the distinguished Senator from Arkansas himself, and others, is that that government is not responsive to its people.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. That is right.

Mr. MUSKIE. I must say I have shared that conviction. So if it has not moved in this field, one of the reasons may well be a lack of feeling of urgency about this objective. That does not make it a less valid objective. This may be part of the reason why some of the money we have sent there in the past has not been devoted to this purpose. We are faced with the choice of doing it through political instruments of our own choice. The question we have to face—the one I faced as I considered this amendment—is whether, notwithstanding the shortcomings of

the Government and the difficulties of achieving social justice, we should not make this effort at least to try to stimulate the Government to move in that direction, especially in view of the fact that, at long last, after a lot of argument about it, there is a bill pending in the legislature in South Vietnam that our experts on Vietnamese land reform tell me is sound.

With that bill pending, with the South Vietnamese having taken the initiative, and the one obstacle being the reluctance on the part of landlords because of lack of credibility in the means to pay for it, it appeared to me the foreign aid bill might be one way to nail down that credibility on a step that has come so slowly and so late in South Vietnam.

I do not expect to sell any proposition dealing with Vietnam quickly. We divide very quickly and very deeply and very violently on this subject, in so many ways.

I did not really believe the subject of land reform would be a subject of deep division here, but maybe it will be, even here on the Senate floor. And I am not wedded to this formula—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator misunderstood my question. I am not arguing the value of land reform. I very deeply question our Government, under these circumstances, or any other circumstances, undertaking any land reform development over there. My objective is to leave Vietnam to the Vietnamese at the earliest possible moment. I thought the Senator suggested—maybe I used the wrong word—that perhaps this would in some way speed up the process. If that is not true, I misunderstood.

If it had any validity, I would be much more interested. If, on the other hand, it is the beginning of a process of giving them this idea and paying them to take it, I would question very much that kind of an approach, because I do not think we have a long-term role to play there as a guiding mentor. I do not think that is the proper role for us there.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not think this needs any long-term role—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said 4 years.

Mr. MUSKIE. The action, if any, taken could be taken in the next month or two. Thereafter, it would be a question of meeting our payments.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator wants to make a commitment that goes on for 4 years. Did he not say so?

Mr. MUSKIE. I take it the commitment was made by President Johnson in his Johns Hopkins speech to commit \$1 billion of American money for the development of all Vietnam at the end of the war. I do not know whether that commitment has any validity. I know the Senator has very deep reservations about commitments, and I joined in the resolution which his committee produced to inhibit that sort of thing.

Nevertheless, it seems to me, looking toward the end of the war in South Vietnam—and we hope it will end before our troops are withdrawn, but that ought not to delay their withdrawal—the resolution of present difficulties in Vietnam is inevitably going to involve economic as-

sistance on our part after the fighting ends.

I may be wrong. The Senator is chairman of a committee that has great influence in this area and maybe we can get out without spending another nickel—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; I do not think that is advisable.

Mr. MUSKIE. If it is not, if we are going to talk about economic commitment after the war, then the Senator's question directed at my amendment is irrelevant.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not think the Senator should be quite so impatient. I do not believe the Senator submitted this amendment to the committee. As a matter of fact, the first time I heard of the Senator's sponsorship was in a letter received today. Does the Senator really expect us to receive and accept an amendment of such far-reaching importance without any hearings or consideration other than a short debate on this floor?

Mr. MUSKIE. The Senator from Maine has been in this body long enough not to expect anything. I am simply responding to the Senator's question. Does the Senator expect to ask a question and not get an answer? The Senator asked me whether this amendment, because it involves a payout over 4 years, did not commit us to a long-term commitment in Vietnam. I say no, not militarily. This does not have the effect of prolonging our military involvement. All it does is set in motion, or try to set in motion, an economic policy in South Vietnam which might contribute to a resolution of the war and of political difficulties which have divided the country. There is no guarantee that it will. But it certainly does not add to our long-term military commitment. It does not tend to stretch it out. All it does, and all that it is intended to do, is to stimulate certain activities in South Vietnam on land reform and to encourage them.

I know it is going to be difficult to sell it to the Senate. I have already today picked up six cosponsors. I would like to have had the amendment ready to submit to the Foreign Relations Committee, but, unfortunately, the idea was not suggested early enough for me to do it. I wanted to get the advice of people who know the land situation in South Vietnam, and we just finished drafting the amendment in the last few days.

I understand the difficulty of selling it, and I probably will not succeed; but I hope I am offering it to focus the attention of the government in Saigon, at least, on the concern of at least seven Senators that they move ahead with the land reform program.

If the U.S. Senate is enough taken by this suggestion to approve it, fine. I would feel a certain satisfaction in this effort. I do not have any exaggerated ideas about the possibility of selling it, but I am going to do my best to sell it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is within his rights to offer any amendment he wants, and the objective is a worthy one. May I ask the Senator to illustrate what he has in mind? How much does he expect to pay for the land and

how is he going to see to it that the money goes for this purpose and is not siphoned off for another purpose? In the course of the pacification program in the past, I am quite sure efforts were made to bring about land reform, but I have never heard any good, solid evidence that any success was achieved in that direction.

Mr. MUSKIE. I have not suggested, nor do I think I would be in a position to suggest, what the price per unit of land might be. The estimates as to the overall cost were given to me. Incidentally, may I suggest to the Senator from Arkansas that he read an article I placed in the RECORD earlier, written by Roy L. Prosterman, and published in the magazine Southeast Asia? Mr. Prosterman is associate professor of law in the University of Washington School of Law. The article contains a great deal of useful information. I thought it might answer some of the Senator's questions.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is not he the one who suggested the multinational guarantee of bonds to be issued, not by the United States, but by a multinational agency, such as the World Bank? That is a very different proposal from our undertaking, which is a part of the bill.

Mr. MUSKIE. I do not recall that point. I am not suggesting that my amendment is a Prosterman amendment. All I am saying is that the insights with respect to the land reform program, contained in his article, are, I think, of interest and are useful. If I had some way of promoting multilateral guarantees of these bonds, I would use this means. The only means available to me is the foreign aid bill.

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

Mr. MUSKIE. I yield.

Mr. PELL. One thought went through my mind as I was reading the amendment of the Senator from Maine. I was wondering whether, instead of having \$80 million of new funds authorized, he would consider a perfecting amendment to include his item in the \$440 million of support money already programed for Vietnam. That would mean no new funds.

Mr. MUSKIE. As I said earlier in colloquy with the Senator from Arkansas, it may be that funds are already provided in the bill that could be applied to this purpose. I would have no objection to undertaking to go along with that. However, the Senator from Rhode Island, being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, would know better than I whether the funds to which he refers are already committed to specific projects of high priority. If not, I would be perfectly happy to go along with his suggestion.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I think the administration is of the view that it has already earmarked all the authorized funds. However, Congress can and should declare its intent and its priorities, such a statement of priorities, in this regard would afford help and guidance to the administration. But I would leave this thought with the proposer of the amendment.

Mr. MUSKIE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 424

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in behalf of myself and other Senators—I think the total number is 18—I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD, and I will soon submit a short statement explaining the details of the amendment, under the subtitle "Overseas Private Investment Corporation."

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

The amendment (No. 424) is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 424

Insert, after line 24 on page 85, the following new section 105, and renumber subsequent sections accordingly:

"Sec. 105. Chapter 2 of part I of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to Development Assistance is amended by deleting Title III and Title IV and substituting in lieu thereof the following new Titles therefor:

"TITLE III—HOUSING GUARANTIES

"HOUSING GUARANTIES

"Sec. 221. In order to facilitate and increase the participation of private enterprise in furthering the development of the economic resources and productive capacities of less developed friendly countries and areas, and promote the development of thrift and credit institutions engaged in programs of mobilizing local savings for financing the construction of self-liquidating housing projects and related community facilities, the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible investors as defined in section 328(c), assuring against loss of loan investments for self-liquidating housing projects. The total face amount of guaranties issued hereunder, outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed \$130,000,000. Such guaranties shall be issued under the conditions set forth in section 222(b).

"HOUSING PROJECTS IN LATIN AMERICAN COUNTRIES

"Sec. 222. (a) The President shall assist in the development in the American Republics of self-liquidating housing projects, the development of institutions engaged in Alliance for Progress programs, including cooperatives, free labor unions, savings and loan type institutions, and other private enterprise programs in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, the construction of homes for lower income persons and families, the increased mobilization of savings and improvement of housing conditions in Latin America.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the President is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as he shall determine, to eligible investors, as defined in section 238(c), assuring against loss of loan investment made by such investors in—

"(1) private housing projects in Latin America of types similar to those insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development and suitable for conditions in Latin America;

"(2) credit institutions in Latin America engaged directly or indirectly in the financing of home mortgages, such as savings and loan institutions and other qualified investment enterprises;

"(3) housing projects in Latin America

for lower income families and persons, which projects shall be constructed in accordance with maximum unit costs established by the President for families and persons whose incomes meet the limitations prescribed by the President;

"(4) housing projects in Latin America which will promote the development of institutions important to the success of the Alliance for Progress, such as free labor unions, cooperatives, and other private enterprise programs; or

"(5) housing projects in Latin America 25 per centum or more of the aggregate of the mortgage financing for which is made available from sources within Latin America and is not derived from sources outside Latin America, which projects shall, to the maximum extent practicable, have a unit cost of not more than \$8,500.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued hereunder or heretofore under Latin American housing guaranty authority repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, outstanding at any one time, shall not exceed \$550,000,000: *Provided*, That \$325,000,000 of guaranties may be used only for the purposes of subsection (b) (1).

"GENERAL PROVISIONS

"SEC. 223. (a) A fee shall be charged for each guaranty issued under section 221 or section 222 in an amount to be determined by the President. In the event the fee to be charged for such type of guaranty is reduced, fees to be paid under existing contracts for the same type of guaranty may be similarly reduced.

"(b) The amount of \$50,000,000 of fees accumulated under prior investment guaranty provisions repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, together with all fees collected in connection with guaranties issued hereunder, shall be available for meeting necessary administrative and operating expenses of carrying out the provisions of this Title and of prior housing guaranty provisions repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 (including, but not limited to expenses pertaining to personnel, supplies, and printing), subject to such limitations as may be imposed in annual appropriation Acts; for meeting management and custodial costs incurred with respect to currencies or other assets acquired under guaranties made pursuant to section 221 or section 222 or heretofore pursuant to prior Latin American and other housing guaranty authorities repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, and to pay the cost of investigating and adjusting (including costs of arbitration) claims under such guaranties; and shall be available for expenditure in discharge of liabilities under such guaranties until such time as all such property has been disposed of and all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired, or until all such fees have been expended in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b).

"(c) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under section 221 or section 222 or heretofore under prior Latin American or other housing guaranty authorities repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, shall be paid first out of fees referred to in subsection (b) (excluding amounts required for purposes other than the discharge of liabilities under guaranties) as long as such fees are available, and thereafter shall be paid out of funds, if any, realized from the sale of currencies or other assets acquired in connection with any payment made to discharge liabilities under such guaranties as long as funds are available, and finally out of funds hereafter made available pursuant to subsection (e).

"(d) All guaranties issued under section 221 or section 222 or heretofore under prior Latin American or other housing guaranty authority repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 shall constitute obligations, in accordance with the terms of such guaran-

ties, of the United States of America and the full faith and credit of the United States of America is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations.

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President such amounts, to remain available until expended, as may be necessary from time to time to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(f) In the case of any loan investment guaranteed under section 221 or section 222, the agency primarily responsible for administering part I shall prescribe the maximum rate of interest allowable to the eligible investor, which maximum rate shall not be less than one-half of 1 per centum above the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In no event shall the agency prescribe a maximum allowable rate of interest which exceeds by more than 1 per centum the then current rate of interest applicable to housing mortgages insured by such Department. The maximum allowable rate of interest under this subsection shall be prescribed by the agency as of the date the project covered by the investment is officially authorized and, prior to the execution of the contract, the agency may amend such rate at its discretion, consistent with the provisions of subsection (f).

"(g) Housing guaranties committed, authorized or outstanding under prior housing guaranty authorities repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 shall continue subject to provisions of law originally applicable thereto and fees collected hereafter with respect to such guaranties shall be available for the purposes specified in subsection (b).

"(h) No payment may be made under any guaranty issued pursuant to this Title for any loss arising out of fraud or misrepresentation for which the party seeking payment is responsible.

"(i) The authority of section 221 and subsection 222 shall continue until June 30, 1972.

"TITLE IV—OVERSEAS PRIVATE INVESTMENT CORPORATION

"CREATION, PURPOSE, AND POLICY

"SEC. 231. To mobilize and facilitate the participation of United States private capital and skills in the economic and social progress of less developed friendly countries and areas, thereby complementing the development assistance objectives of the United States, there is hereby created the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (hereinafter called the Corporation), which shall be an agency of the United States under the policy guidance of the Secretary of State.

"In carrying out its purpose, the Corporation, utilizing broad criteria, shall undertake—

"(a) to conduct its financing operations on a self-sustaining basis, taking into account the economic and financial soundness of projects and the availability of financing from other sources on appropriate terms;

"(b) to utilize private credit and investment institutions and the Corporation's guaranty authority as the principal means of mobilizing capital investment funds;

"(c) to broaden private participation and revolve its funds through selling its direct investments to private investors whenever it can appropriate do so on satisfactory terms;

"(d) to conduct its insurance operations with due regard to principles of risk management including, when appropriate, efforts to share its insurance risks;

"(e) to utilize, to the maximum practicable extent consistent with the accomplishment of its objectives, the resources and skills of small business and to provide facilities to

encourage its full participation in the programs of the Corporation;

"(f) to encourage and support only those private investments in less developed friendly countries and areas which are sensitive and responsive to the special needs and requirements of their economies, and which contribute to the social and economic development of their people;

"(g) to consider in the conduct of its operations the extent to which less developed country governments are receptive to private enterprise, domestic and foreign, and their willingness and ability to maintain conditions which enable private enterprise to make its full contribution to the development process;

"(h) to foster private initiative and competition and discourage monopolistic practices;

"(i) to further to the greatest degree possible, in a manner consistent with its goals, the balance of payments objectives of the United States;

"(j) to conduct its activities in consonance with the activities of the agency primarily responsible for administering part I and the international trade, investment and financial policies of the United States Government;

"(k) to advise and assist, within its field of competence, interested agencies of the United States and other organizations, both public and private, national and international, with respect to projects and programs relating to the development of private enterprise in less developed countries and areas.

"CAPITAL OF THE CORPORATION

"SEC. 232. The President is authorized to pay in as capital of the Corporation, out of dollar receipts made available through the appropriation process from loans made pursuant to this part or pursuant to predecessor authority contained in provisions repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969 and from loans made under the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, for the fiscal year 1970, not to exceed \$20,000,000 and for the fiscal year 1971 not to exceed \$20,000,000. Upon the payment of such capital by the President, the Corporation shall issue an equivalent amount of capital stock to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

"SEC. 233. (a) STRUCTURE OF THE CORPORATION.—The Corporation shall have a Board of Directors, a President, an Executive Vice President, and such other officers and staff as the Board of Directors may determine.

"(b) BOARD OF DIRECTORS.—All powers of the Corporation shall vest in and be exercised by or under the authority of its Board of Directors ("the Board") which shall consist of eleven Directors, including the Chairman, with six Directors constituting a quorum for the transaction of business. The Administrator of the Agency for International Development shall be the Chairman of the Board, ex officio. Six Directors (other than the President of the Corporation, appointed pursuant to subsection (c) who shall also serve as a Director) shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and shall not be officials or employees of the Government of the United States. At least one of the six Directors appointed under the preceding sentence shall be experienced in small business, one in organized labor, and one in cooperatives. Each such Director shall be appointed for a term of no more than three years. The terms of no more than two such Directors shall expire in any one year. Such Directors shall serve until their successors are appointed and qualified and may be reappointed.

"The other Directors shall be officials of the Government of the United States, designated by and serving at the pleasure of the President of the United States.

"All Directors who are not officers of the Corporation or officials of the Government of the United States shall be compensated at a rate equivalent to that of level IV of the Executive Schedule (5 U.S.C. 5315) when actually engaged in the business of the Corporation and may be paid per diem in lieu of subsistence at the applicable rate prescribed in the standardized Government travel regulations, as amended from time to time, while away from their homes or usual places of business.

"(c) PRESIDENT OF THE CORPORATION.—The President of the Corporation shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall serve at the pleasure of the President. In making such appointment, the President shall take into account private business experience of the appointee. The President of the Corporation shall be its Chief Executive Officer and responsible for the operations and management of the Corporation, subject to bylaws and policies established by the Board.

"(d) OFFICERS AND STAFF.—The Executive Vice President of the Corporation shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall serve at the pleasure of the President. Other officers, attorneys, employees, and agents shall be selected and appointed by the Corporation, and shall be vested with such powers and duties as the Corporation may determine. Of such persons employed by the Corporation, not to exceed thirty-five may be appointed, compensated or removed without regard to the Civil Service laws and regulations: *Provided*, That under such regulations as the President of the United States may prescribe, officers and employees of the United States Government who are appointed to any of the above positions may be entitled, upon removal from such position, except for cause, to reinstatement to the position occupied at the time of appointment or to a position of comparable grade and salary. Such positions shall be in addition to those otherwise authorized by law, including those authorized by section 5108 of title 5 of the United States Code.

"INVESTMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

"Sec. 234. The Corporation is hereby authorized to do the following:

"(a) INVESTMENT INSURANCE.—(1) To issue insurance, upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, to eligible investors assuring protection in whole or in part against any or all of the following risks with respect to projects which the Corporation has approved—

"(A) inability to convert into United States dollars other currencies, or credits in such currencies, received as earnings or profits from the approved project, as repayment or return of the investment therein, in whole or in part, or as compensation for the sale or disposition of all or any part thereof;

"(B) loss of investment, in whole or in part, in the approved project due to expropriation or confiscation by action of a foreign government; and

"(C) loss due to war, revolution or insurrection.

"(2) Recognizing that major private investments in less developed friendly countries or areas are often made by enterprises in which there is multinational participation, including significant United States private participation, the Corporation may make such arrangements with foreign governments (including agencies, instrumentalities or political subdivisions thereof) or with multilateral organizations for sharing liabilities assumed under investment insurance for such investments and may in connection therewith issue insurance to investors not otherwise eligible hereunder: *Provided, however*, That liabilities assumed by the Corporation under the authority of this

subsection shall be consistent with the purposes of this title and that the maximum share of liabilities so assumed shall not exceed the proportionate participation by eligible investors in the total project financing.

"(3) Not more than 10 per centum of the total face amount of investment insurance which the Corporation is authorized to issue under this subsection shall be issued to a single investor.

"(b) INVESTMENT GUARANTIES.—To issue to eligible investors guaranties of loans and other investments made by such investors assuring against loss due to such risks and upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine: *Provided, however*, That such guaranties on other than loan investments shall not exceed 75 per centum of such investment: *Provided, further*, That except for loan investments for credit unions made by eligible credit unions or credit union associations, the aggregate amount of investment (exclusive of interest and earnings) so guaranteed with respect to any project shall not exceed, at the time of issuance of any such guaranty, 75 per centum of the total investment committed to any such project as determined by the Corporation, which determination shall be conclusive for purposes of the Corporation's authority to issue any such guaranty: *Provided, further*, That not more than 25 per centum of the total face amount of investment guaranties which the Corporation is authorized to issue under this subsection shall be issued to a single investor.

"(c) DIRECT INVESTMENT.—To make loans in United States dollars repayable in dollars or loans in foreign currencies (including, without regard to section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, such foreign currencies which the Secretary of the Treasury may determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may allocate) to firms privately owned or of mixed private and public ownership upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine. The Corporation may not purchase or invest in any stock in any other corporation, except that it may (1) accept as evidence of indebtedness debt securities convertible to stock, but such debt securities shall not be converted to stock while held by the Corporation, and (2) acquire stock through the enforcement of any lien or pledge or otherwise to satisfy a previously contracted indebtedness which would otherwise be in default, or as the result of any payment under any contract of insurance or guaranty. The Corporation shall dispose of any stock it may so acquire as soon as reasonably feasible under the circumstances then pertaining.

"No loans shall be made under this section to finance operations for mining or other extraction of any deposit of ore, oil, gas, or other mineral.

"(d) INVESTMENT ENCOURAGEMENT.—To initiate and support through financial participation, incentive grant, or otherwise, and on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, the identification, assessment, surveying and promotion of private investment opportunities, utilizing wherever feasible and effective the facilities of private organizations or private investors: *Provided, however*, That the Corporation shall not finance surveys to ascertain the existence location, extent or quality, or to determine the feasibility of undertaking operations for mining or other extraction, of any deposits of ore, oil, gas or other mineral. In carrying out this authority, the Corporation shall coordinate which such investment promotion activities as are carried out by the Department of Commerce.

"(e) SPECIAL ACTIVITIES.—To administer and manage special projects and programs, including programs of financial and advisory

support which provide private technical, professional or managerial assistance in the development of human resources, skills, technology, capital savings and intermediate financial and investment institutions and cooperatives. The funds for these projects and programs may, with the Corporation's concurrence, be transferred to it for such purposes under the authority of section 632(a) or from other sources, public or private.

"ISSUING AUTHORITY, DIRECT INVESTMENT FUND AND RESERVES

"Sec. 235. (a) (1) The maximum contingent liability outstanding at any one time pursuant to insurance issued under section 234(a) shall not exceed \$7,500,000,000.

"(2) The maximum contingent liability outstanding at any one time pursuant to guaranties issued under section 234(b) shall not exceed in the aggregate \$750,000,000, of which guaranties of credit union investment shall not exceed \$1,250,000: *Provided*, That the Corporation shall not make any commitment to issue any guaranty which would result in a fractional reserve less than 10 per centum of the maximum contingent liability then outstanding against guaranties issued or commitments made pursuant to section 234(b) or similar predecessor guaranty authority.

"(3) The Congress, in considering the budget programs transmitted by the President for the Corporation, pursuant to section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, may limit the obligations and contingent liabilities to be undertaken under section 234(a) and (b), as well as the use of funds for operating and administrative expenses.

"(4) The authority of section 234(a) and (b) shall continue until June 30, 1974.

"(b) There shall be established a revolving fund, known as the Direct Investment Fund, to be held by the Corporation. Such fund shall consist initially of amounts made available under section 232, shall be available for the purposes authorized under section 234(c), shall be charged with realized losses and credited with realized gains and shall be credited with such additional sums as may be transferred to it under the provisions of section 236.

"(c) There shall be established in the Treasury of the United States an Insurance and Guaranty Fund, which shall have separate accounts to be known as the Insurance Reserve and the Guaranty Reserve, which reserves shall be available for discharge of liabilities, as provided in section 235(d), until such time as all such liabilities have been discharged or have expired or until all such reserves have been expended in accordance with the provisions of this section. Such Fund shall be funded by: (1) the funds heretofore available to discharge liabilities under predecessor guaranty authority (including housing guaranty authorities), less both the amount made available for housing guaranty programs pursuant to section 223(b) and the amount made available to the Corporation pursuant to section 234(e); and (2) such sums as shall be appropriated pursuant to section 235(f) for such purpose. The allocation of such funds to each such Reserve shall be determined by the board after consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury. Additional amounts may thereafter be transferred to such reserves pursuant to section 236.

"(d) Any payments made to discharge liabilities under investment insurance issued under section 234(a) or under similar predecessor guaranty authority shall be paid first out of the insurance reserve, as long as such reserve remains available, and thereafter out of funds made available pursuant to section 235(f). Any payments made to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under section 234(b) or under similar predecessor guaranty authority shall be paid first out of the guar-

anty reserve as long as such reserve remains available, and thereafter out of funds made available pursuant to section 235(f).

"(e) There is hereby authorized to be transferred to the Corporation at its call, for the purposes specified in section 236, all fees and other revenues collected under predecessor guaranty authority from December 31, 1968, available as of the date of such transfer.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Corporation, to remain available until expended, such amounts as may be necessary from time to time to replenish or increase the Insurance and Guaranty Fund or to discharge the liabilities under insurance and guaranties issued by the Corporation or issued under predecessor guaranty authority.

"INCOME AND REVENUES

"SEC. 236. In order to carry out the purposes of the Corporation, all revenues and income transferred to or earned by the Corporation, from whatever source derived, shall be held by the Corporation and shall be available to carry out its purposes, including without limitation—

"(a) payment of all expenses of the Corporation, including investment promotion expenses;

"(b) transfers and additions to the insurance or guaranty reserves, the Direct Investment Fund established pursuant to section 235 and such other funds or reserves as the Corporation may establish, at such time and in such amounts as the board may determine; and

"(c) payment of dividends, on capital stock, which shall consist of and be paid from net earnings of the Corporation after payments, transfers and additions under subsections (a) and (b) hereof.

"GENERAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO INSURANCE AND GUARANTY PROGRAMS

"SEC. 237. (a) Insurance and guaranties issued under this title shall cover investment made in connection with projects in any less developed friendly country or area with the government of which the President of the United States has agreed to institute a program for insurance or guaranties.

"(b) The Corporation shall determine that suitable arrangements exist for protecting the interest of the Corporation in connection with any insurance or guaranty issued under this title, including arrangements concerning ownership, use, and disposition of the currency, credits, assets, or investments on account of which payment under such insurance or guaranty is to be made, and any right, title, claim or cause of action existing in connection therewith.

"(c) All guaranties issued prior to July 1, 1956, all guaranties issued under sections 202(b) and 413(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, all guaranties heretofore issued pursuant to prior guaranty authorities repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, and all insurance and guaranties issued pursuant to this title shall constitute obligations, in accordance with the terms of such insurance or guaranties, of the United States of America and the full faith and credit of the United States of America is hereby pledged for the full payment and performance of such obligations.

"(d) Fees shall be charged for insurance and guaranty coverage in amounts to be determined by the Corporation. In the event fees to be charged for investment insurance or guaranties are reduced, fees to be paid under existing contracts for the same type of guaranties or insurance and for similar guaranties issued under predecessor guaranty authority may be reduced.

"(e) No insurance or guaranty of an equity investment shall extend beyond twenty years from the date of issuance.

"(f) No insurance or guaranty issued under this title shall exceed the dollar value, as of the date of the investment, of the in-

vestment made in the project with the approval of the Corporation plus interest, earnings or profits actually accrued on said investment to the extent provided by such insurance or guaranty.

"(g) No payment may be made under any guaranty issued pursuant to this title for any loss arising out of fraud or misrepresentation for which the party seeking payment is responsible.

"(h) Insurance or guaranties of a loan or equity investment of an eligible investor in a foreign bank, finance company or other credit institution shall extend only to such loan or equity investment and not to any individual loan or equity investment made by such foreign bank, finance company or other credit institution.

"(i) Claims arising as a result of insurance or guaranty operations under this title or under predecessor guaranty authority may be settled, and disputes arising as a result thereof may be arbitrated with the consent of the parties, on such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine. Payment made pursuant to any such settlement, or as a result of an arbitration award, shall be final and conclusive notwithstanding any other provision of law.

"(j) Each guaranty contract executed by such officer or officers as may be designated by the board shall be conclusively presumed to be issued in compliance with the requirements of this Act.

"(k) In making a determination to issue insurance or a guaranty under this title, the Corporation shall consider the possible adverse effect of the dollar investment under such insurance or guaranty upon the balance of payments of the United States.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 238. As used in this title—

"(a) the term "investment" includes any contribution of funds, commodities, services, patents, processes, or techniques, in the form of (1) a loan or loans to an approved project, (2) the purchase of a share of ownership in any such project, (3) participation in royalties, earnings, or profits of any such project, and (4) the furnishing of commodities or services pursuant to a lease or other contract;

"(b) the term "expropriation" includes, but is not limited to, any abrogation, repudiation, or impairment by a foreign government of its own contract with an investor with respect to a project, where such abrogation, repudiation, or impairment is not caused by the investor's own fault or misconduct, and materially adversely affects the continued operation of the project;

"(c) the term "eligible investor" means: (1) United States citizens; (2) corporations, partnerships, or other associations including nonprofit associations, created under the laws of the United States or any State or territory thereof and substantially beneficially owned by United States citizens; and (3) foreign corporations, partnerships, or other associations wholly owned by one or more such United States citizens, corporations, partnerships, or other associations; *Provided, however,* That the eligibility of such foreign corporation shall be determined without regard to any shares, in aggregate less than 5 per centum of the total of issued and subscribed share capital, required by law to be held by other than the United States owners; *Provided further,* That in the case of any loan investment a final determination of eligibility may be made at the time the insurance or guaranty is issued; in all other cases, the investor must be eligible at the time a claim arises as well as at the time the insurance or guaranty is issued; and

"(d) the term "predecessor guaranty authority" means prior guaranty authorities (other than housing guaranty authorities) repealed by the Foreign Assistance Act of 1969, sections 202(b) and 413(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and section 111(b)(3) of the Economic Co-

operation Act of 1948, as amended (exclusive of authority relating to informational media guaranties).

"GENERAL PROVISIONS AND POWERS

"SEC. 239. (a) The Corporation shall have its principal offices in the District of Columbia and shall be deemed, for purposes of venue in civil actions, to be a resident thereof.

"(b) The President shall transfer to the Corporation, at such times as he may determine, all obligations, assets and related rights and responsibilities arising out of, or related to, predecessor programs and authorities similar to those provided for in section 234 (a), (b), and (d). Until such transfer, the agency heretofore responsible for such predecessor programs shall continue to administer such assets and obligations, and such programs and activities authorized under this title as may be determined by the President.

"(c) The Corporation shall be subject to the applicable provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, except as otherwise provided in this title.

"(d) To carry out the purposes of this title, the Corporation is authorized: To adopt and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to sue and be sued in its corporate name; to adopt, amend, and repeal bylaws governing the conduct of its business and the performance of the powers and duties granted to or imposed upon it by law; to acquire, hold or dispose of, upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may determine, any property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, or any interest therein; to invest funds derived from fees and other revenues in obligations of the United States and to use the proceeds therefrom, including earnings and profits, as it shall deem appropriate; to indemnify directors, officers, employees and agents of the Corporation for liabilities and expenses incurred in connection with their Corporation activities; to require bonds of officers, employees, and agents and pay the premiums therefor; notwithstanding any other provision of law, to represent itself or to contract for representation in all legal and arbitral proceedings; to purchase, discount, rediscount, sell, and negotiate, with or without its endorsement or guaranty, and guarantee notes, participation certificates, and other evidence of indebtedness (provided that the Corporation shall not issue its own securities, except participation certificates for the purpose of carrying out section 231 (c)); to make and carry out such contracts and agreements as are necessary and advisable in the conduct of its business; to exercise the priority of the Government of the United States in collecting debts from bankrupt; insolvent or decedents' estates; to determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to provisions of law specifically applicable to Government Corporations; to take such actions as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the powers herein or hereafter specifically conferred upon it.

"(e) The Auditor-General of the Agency for International Development (1) shall have the responsibility for planning and directing the execution of audits, reviews, investigations, and inspections of all phases of the Corporation's operations and activities and (2) shall conduct all security activities of the Corporation relating to personnel and the control of classified material. With respect to his responsibilities under this subsection, the Auditor-General shall report to the Board of Directors of the Corporation. The agency primarily responsible for administering part I shall be reimbursed by the Corporation for all expenses incurred by the Auditor-General in connection with his responsibilities under this subsection.

"(f) In order to further the purposes of the Corporation there shall be established an Advisory Council to be composed of such representatives of the American business community as may be selected by the chairman of the board. The president and the board of the Corporation shall, from time to time, consult with such Council concerning the objectives of the Corporation. Members of the Council shall receive no compensation for their services but shall be entitled to reimbursement in accordance with section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their functions under this section.

"AGRICULTURAL CREDIT AND SELF-HELP COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

"Sec. 240. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that in order to stimulate the participation of the private sector in the economic development of less developed countries in Latin America, the authority conferred by this section should be used to establish pilot programs in not more than five Latin American countries to encourage private banks, credit institutions, similar private lending organizations, cooperatives, and private non-profit development organizations to make loans on reasonable terms to organized groups and individuals residing in a community for the purpose of enabling such groups and individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. Agricultural credit and assistance for self-help community development projects should include, but not be limited to, material and such projects as wells, pumps, farm machinery, improved seed, fertilizer, pesticides, vocational training, food industry development, nutrition projects, improved breeding stock for farm animals, sanitation facilities, and looms and other handicraft aids.

"(b) To carry out the purposes of subsection (a), the Corporation is authorized to issue guaranties, on such terms and conditions as it shall determine, to private lending institutions, cooperatives, and private non-profit development organizations in not more than five Latin American countries assuring against loss of not to exceed 25 per centum of the portfolio of such loans made by any lender to organized groups or individuals residing in a community to enable such groups or individuals to carry out agricultural credit and self-help community development projects for which they are unable to obtain financial assistance on reasonable terms. In no event shall the liability of the United States exceed 75 per centum of any one loan.

"(c) The total face amount of guaranties issued under this section outstanding at any one time shall not exceed \$15,000,000. Not more than 10 per centum of such sum shall be provided for any one institution, cooperative, or organization.

"(d) The Inter-American Social Development Institute shall be consulted in developing criteria for making loans eligible for guaranty coverage under this section.

"(e) The guaranty reserve established under section 325(c) shall be available to make such payments as may be necessary to discharge liabilities under guaranties issued under this section.

"(f) Notwithstanding the limitation contained in subsection (c) of this section, foreign currencies owned by the United States and determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be excess to the needs of the United States may be utilized to carry out the purposes of this section, including the discharge of liabilities incurred under this subsection. The authority conferred by this subsection shall be in addition to authority conferred by any other provision of law to implement guaranty programs utilizing excess local currency.

"(g) The Corporation shall, on or before January 15, 1972, make a detailed report to the Congress on the results of the pilot program established under this section, together with such recommendations as it may deem appropriate.

"(h) The authority of this section shall continue until June 30, 1972.

"REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

"Sec. 240A. (a) After the end of each fiscal year, the Corporation shall submit to the Congress as complete and detailed report of its operations during such fiscal year.

"(b) Not later than March 1, 1974, the Corporation shall submit to the Congress an analysis of the possibilities of transferring all or part of its activities to private United States citizens, corporations or other associations.

"Sec. 2. Chapter I of part II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, which relates to general provisions is amended in Section 610, which relates to transfers between accounts, as follows:

"(1) In paragraph (a) insert after the words "funds made available for any provision of this Act" the first time they appear the words "(except funds made available pursuant to title IV of chapter 2 of part I)".

"Sec. 3. Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (59 Stat. 597; 31 U.S.C. 846), is amended by deleting "Development Loan Fund;" and substituting therefor "Overseas Private Investment Corporation;"

"Sec. 4. Chapter 53, subchapter II of title 5 of the United States Code is amended as follows:

"(a) Section 5314, which relates to level II of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(54) President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation."

"(b) Section 5315, which relates to level IV of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(92) Executive Vice President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation."

"(c) Section 5316, which relates to level V of the Executive Schedule, is amended by adding thereto the following: "(128) Auditor-General of the Agency for International Development; (129) Vice Presidents, Overseas Private Investment Corporation (3)."

Mr. JAVITS. The sponsors, in addition to myself, are the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), my colleague from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT and Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. President, I shall not endeavor to discuss this amendment in detail tonight, except to state that I told the cosponsors I would call the amendment up if the question of substantive amendments was opened in connection with the bill, as it apparently has been now, since I am a member of the committee.

This amendment was submitted to the committee. It was very completely discussed and, by an evenly divided vote, the committee decided not to include it in the bill as brought to the floor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. PELL. I have great sympathy, as a cosponsor, for the amendment of the Senator from New York. It is an adventurous, exciting new idea for trying to harness the forces of private business. The concept seems very valid, and I am happy to support the Senator's amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. I am grateful to my colleague from Rhode Island.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JAVITS. Certainly.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We all know the circumstances under which we were operating. I was wondering, if the Senator is not prepared to do it now, whether tomorrow we could obtain some limitation of time on all amendments, in order to try to accommodate the leadership and all of the necessities. Since the Senator's is one of the important amendments, I inquire at this point what his thoughts are about it. Would he be willing to agree to a limitation of time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I could not at this moment, for this reason: I would have to canvass the cosponsors to find out how much time they would want, if any.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would be willing to do that, because, obviously, as the Senator well knows, we are getting into difficulties.

I am only inquiring now if all those who do have amendments would try to come to some agreement tomorrow. The majority leader will make the formal request, I suppose.

Mr. AIKEN. It is almost going to be necessary to complete action on this measure tomorrow, if we are to get a bill this year, I would think.

Mr. JAVITS. I think my colleagues know my feeling about that, and I shall do my utmost to cooperate, but I do need to canvass the cosponsors to find out who needs time.

Mr. President, we will discuss this matter in depth tomorrow, but I do urge Senators to look at the RECORD and consider this proposal.

One further point: I have submitted the amendment in precisely the form in which it passed the other body, without any changes whatever, so that there need be no argument on the question of whether or not there is any difference between the concept as presented here and as it emerged from the committee and went to the floor and was passed by the House of Representatives, precisely based upon the rather extensive hearings which they held. That is why I have submitted their version exactly as it is in the House bill.

I might also add that no new appropriations for this matter are required, other than capital for investment guarantee. Experience and history have shown that this is strictly capital, and that the operation makes money rather than losing it.

There is a capital fund of \$40 million provided, which is only a reuse of money which is repaid from indebtedness contracted in development loans under the foreign aid bill, and reuse of

those repayments should be all of the capitalizing required.

S. 3238—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AMENDING THE NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES ACT OF 1965, AS AMENDED

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the legislation sent to the Congress by the administration to extend the authority of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities for an additional 3 years after its expiration on June 30, 1970. Joining in the sponsorship of this measure are the distinguished chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities (Mr. PELL) the other members of that subcommittee, Senators CRANSTON, MURPHY, and NELSON.

I am heartened by the fact that the President indicated in his message on this bill, entitled "Expressing the American Spirit," that he is proposing an expenditure of \$40 million in new funds for fiscal year 1971 for the Arts and Humanities Endowments, which is virtually double the current year's level. Such a level of funding will demonstrate that the Nation recognizes the unique qualities of these agencies. They have utilized Federal "seed money" to produce substantial increases in support for the arts and humanities from non-Federal sources. Each Federal dollar for the arts, for example, has produced nearly \$3 overall, in private, State, and local government support.

The Arts and the Humanities Endowments, which comprise the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, complement each other in their activities and objectives. They are closely interrelated and merit like emphasis. This bill carries forward that policy established by the Congress in 1965 when the authorizing legislation was first written into law.

As Americans, we hope that our people and our Nation will be recorded in history for more than our accomplishments, excellent as they are, in the fields of space, electronics, and other aspects of scientific and technological accomplishment. The land that produced inventors and scientists, explorers and pioneers, industrialists and builders, also has given the world playwrights and composers, scholars and philosophers, and writers, poets, musicians, and artists of enduring renown. Our memorial to the generations to come will be not alone the magnificent libraries we have constructed, but the books we have written to fill them. We will be remembered not for our splendid museums and concert halls, but for our scholars, our artists, and our musicians whose works are memorialized in them. This legislation gives strength to that legacy.

In addition to extending the authorization for 3 years, the bill also provides:

That the portions of the act relating to the tenure of the chairman of the two endowments are amended so that after his 4-year term has expired, each chairman may continue to serve until his successor has been appointed and qualified;

That an executive committee be established for each endowment;

That advance and progress payments may be made to facilitate the establishment of programs by inadequately funded agencies; and that the humanities endowment have authority to make contracts;

That the compensation of the members of each National Council be increased from \$75 daily to the rate for a GS-18.

I understand that the President's message entitled "Expressing the American Spirit" will automatically be printed in the Record.

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

The bill (S. 3238) to amend the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 3239—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PERMIT GNMA TO PURCHASE SECTION 236 MORTGAGES IN EXCESS OF STATUTORY LIMITS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senator GOODELL, for appropriate reference, a bill which would permit the Government National Mortgage Association to purchase section 236 mortgages in excess of the Association's statutory limits which reflect the effect of local tax abatement programs. Presently, section 221(d)(3) projects are excepted from these unit cost limitations under these circumstances.

Present construction costs are so high in New York City and other high cost areas that the present \$17,500 per unit limit will preclude GNMA from purchasing section 236 mortgages in these areas and will seriously inhibit the flow of funds into the construction of low- and moderate-income housing under this important Federal program.

Under present law low- and moderate-income housing constructed under the below-market interest rate—BMIR—section 221(d)(3) program can exceed the \$17,500 limit if the project is receiving tax abatement and the resulting rents are comparable to those in projects whose per unit cost is under \$17,500. This provision was intended to reflect the reduced rents which occur when a locality established a tax abatement program for low- and middle-income housing, as New York City has. I am advised by the acting administrator of the New York City Housing and Development Administration that without this provision no 221(d)(3) projects would have been constructed in New York City.

The Congress authorized the section 236, rental assistance, program in 1968, and this program of interest subsidies is gradually replacing the 221(d)(3) program as the primary Federal program for low- and moderate-income housing. However, the Congress has not amended the GNMA legislation so as to extend its power to purchase 236 mortgages in excess of the statutory cost limitations when the project receives tax abatement.

Unless this oversight is corrected the private financing and the construction of these projects in high cost areas, where tax abatement programs are established, will be inhibited, for it will not be possible for GNMA to purchase these mortgages from private lenders.

I understand that construction costs in New York City are in excess of \$25,000 per unit. Unless this provision of GNMA legislation is amended in the manner set forth in this bill, GNMA would be unable to purchase these mortgages and the plans of New York City to construct almost 9,000 units under this program will be jeopardized. It should be noted that the provisions in the Senate- and House-passed housing bills of 1969—now in conference—to increase GNMA's purchasing authority to \$20,000 or \$22,000 will adequately not affect this situation.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will be able to act favorably on this important amendment to GNMA's existing authority in the very near future.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 3239) to amend section 302(b) of the National Housing Act, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. GOODELL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 3239

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the second sentence of section 302(b) of the National Housing Act is amended by inserting after "(1)" the following: "is insured under section 236 or".

SERIOUS FINANCIAL CRISIS IN OUR COUNTRY'S MEDICAL SCHOOLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have become increasingly concerned with the serious financial crisis confronting the medical schools of our Nation. At the very time when the shortage of physicians to meet the health needs of our people has become so critical, our medical schools have experienced serious cutbacks in their sources of public funds.

Institutional aid, construction assistance, research, loan and scholarship funds, have all been severely cut back below authorization by the Federal Government. At the same time the rising costs of quality education strain medical resources even further.

I recently introduced for myself and 23 other Senators, S. 3150, a bill that would authorize an additional \$100,000,000 in grants as a form of emergency relief to our Nation's medical and dental schools, many of which are in great financial distress and in danger of being forced to curtail teaching and research programs or to close down altogether.

Many prominent medical educators and organizations—including the Association of American Medical Colleges,

the American Dental Association, and the American Association of Dental Schools—have supported my assertion of the need for such a bill.

The thoughtful testimony of Dr. George James, dean of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine of the City University of New York, before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies on December 2, 1969, speaks, in large part, to the problems of new medical schools. I ask unanimous consent that this testimony be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Despite, I understand, many difficulties, the Mount Sinai School of Medicine will graduate its first class on May 27, 1970, culminating 10 years of planning and hard work by Mr. Gustave L. Levy, chairman of the board of the Mount Sinai Medical Center, Mr. Joseph Klingenstein, chairman emeritus; and many other devoted trustees. The magnitude of their achievement is underscored by the fact that Mount Sinai is only the second school of medicine established under private auspices in New York City since 1897. In 1972, when its Annenberg Building is fully constructed, the Mount Sinai School of Medicine will be in a position to graduate 100 students each year as Mount Sinai's contribution to the Nation's critical shortage of physicians. Its first commencement on May 27, therefore, is an event of considerable importance to our Nation's health and is no small tribute to the high quality of leadership manifested by Dr. George James and the trustees of this vital institution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from the testimony of Dr. George James before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies.

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

EXCERPTS FROM TESTIMONY OF DR. GEORGE JAMES BEFORE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES

I am Dr. George James, President of the Mount Sinai Medical Center and President and Dean of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, of the City University of New York. Before I undertook my present position, I was Commissioner of Health for the City of New York. In 1964-65, I was Chairman of the President's Task Force on Health I have served as President of the National Health Council and Chairman of the Review Committee for Regional Medical Programs. I am here this afternoon to make some comments on the problems relating to the medical care product produced in the United States. I wish to discuss the end to emphasize preventive medical services and the necessity for research in solving our health care problems of today. I wish to emphasize also the need to educate all types of health manpower for the future. All of these goals demand a great deal of support-governmental support. I am especially interested in the problems of medical education, and most anxious to urge governmental support of new private medical schools in the United States.

If we are to achieve our goal of a high quality delivery of health care system we must begin by funding existing health pro-

grams to full authorization. Those programs will open end appropriation should be funded at least 10 percent above last year's figure to allow for inflation. As President Nixon has stated, the nation is faced with a breakdown in the delivery of health care. One way to help prevent this from happening is to adequately fund the programs we have developed and in the process give particular attention to the full funding in the Fall expenditure by the administration of health manpower funds.

I would like to insert for the record an analysis of the health manpower programs and the difficulties they face. In the analysis certain recommendations are made:

(1) That the Senate restore the \$4.7 million in the Health Professions Scholarship Program.

(2) That the Senate fund the full authorization of the \$35 million for Health Professions Student Loan Program.

(3) The Senate restore \$5.5 million in scholarship aid for nurses and add an additional \$4.6 million in loan money to at least equal the loan money available in 1969.

(4) The Senate vote full authorization of \$10 million for Graduate Public Health Traineeships instead of \$8 million, the budget figure which has remained the same since 1967.

(5) The Senate fully fund the Nursing and Allied Health Traineeships.

(6) The Senate fully fund the educational improvement grants of \$117 million rather than accept the \$101.4 million budget request.

(7) The Senate adequately fund Nursing Institutional Aid now authorized at \$35 million rather than the \$7 million House passed figure.

(8) The Senate adequately fund Schools of Public Health. Project Grants are authorized at \$8.5 million for fiscal year 1970, but the House passed figure is \$4.9 million. Formula grants are authorized at \$7 million for fiscal year 1970 and the House passed figure is \$4.5 million.

(9) The Senate adequately fund Allied Health Institutional Aid. Basic Improvement Grants, authorized at \$20 million, have received \$9.7 million in House action. Developmental grants, authorized at \$5 million received \$1.2 million in health acts.

(10) The Senate adequately fund all construction programs in the Health Professions.

I am especially concerned with the problems of new and developing schools of medicine. Mount Sinai faces an enormous task in building excellence into a new school and one of the basic problems is money. I insert for the record a letter I recently sent to Dr. Kenneth M. Endicott who will be very influential in shaping future U.S. Health Manpower Programs.

NOVEMBER 21, 1969.

DR. KENNETH M. ENDICOTT,
Director, National Cancer Institute,
National Institutes of Health,
Bethesda, Md.

DEAR DR. ENDICOTT: In accordance with your verbal request to me at the Cincinnati A.A.M.C. meeting, I am pleased to send you this analysis of the special needs of new privately funded schools.

It is generally agreed that federal funds to support the capital and operating costs of education are needed by medical schools to create economic incentives for the schools to expand enrollment while maintaining or improving their quality of training. As a result of sustained pressure from the federal and state governments as well as from the private sector, many new medical schools have been founded in the United States during the past twenty years. Their development was fostered and stimulated by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, organized medicine, foundations and universities. Most of the schools that were

developed were state schools that were funded and built by their state legislatures with strong financial support from the Federal Government.

Of the seventeen medical schools which opened after 1950, thirteen are state schools. Only four new private medical schools have been created since 1950; University of Miami School of Medicine, in 1952, Albert Einstein College of Medicine of Yeshiva University accepted its first class in 1955, Pennsylvania State University College of Medicine at Hershey in 1967, and Mount Sinai School of Medicine of City University of New York in 1968. Five additional schools have been established but have not as yet accepted students. All of these are state schools.

The small number of new private schools suggests the prohibitive financial investment that must be made to build a school of medicine and the enormous challenge to the private sector. New private schools grapple with the problem of finances as best they can. The medical school at Hershey, Pennsylvania was underwritten by a large endowment from a private foundation. Furthermore, the Pennsylvania State Legislature has committed itself to substantial and continuing support for medical education.

Another route was taken by Mount Sinai. The staff of the Mount Sinai Hospital recognized the need for more doctors and felt that the clinical excellence of their institution could give birth to a new and high quality institution of learning. The trustees of the Mount Sinai Hospital undertook the task of raising private money to begin the medical school, after receiving reasonable assurances that strong financial support from the Federal Government would be forthcoming.

At that time a strong academic affiliation was established with the City University of New York. This was not a financial arrangement but rather a cooperative agreement between the two institutions.

THE PROBLEMS OF A NEW SCHOOL

I can best describe the problems of a new private medical school by using Mount Sinai as an example. Following the usual period of preparation a decision was made to admit small first and third year classes in 1968. Thus a \$7,000,000 building was developed to house these students, and the cost was borne entirely by private contributors. As a result of this decision, in the latter part of 1966, and 1967, Mount Sinai began the recruitment of basic sciences faculty and the development of interim facilities to accept these classes. Coincidentally with this decision a sharp curtailment of funds occurred from both the private and public sectors. The trustees had already committed themselves to construct a large medical school for classes many times the size of its present efforts. The decrease in available funds affected the medical school on four basic levels: Construction, Endowment, Operating Funds and Research Capabilities:

(1) Construction: must be provided if a new school such as Mount Sinai is to succeed. This is in contrast to established institutions where major new construction, while often desirable, is rarely crucial for the maintenance or even the moderate expansion of existing programs.

Although we were awarded a construction grant by the government, this must be matched by millions of dollars of private funds. The state, unlike its great support for state medical schools, awarded us an amount equal to 1/20 of the estimated final cost of the building. Fund raising is more difficult in a time of inflation. Construction costs rise even more rapidly in such a period and seem always to outpace the most strenuous money gathering efforts. It is estimated that construction costs have risen at least 50% in the last few years. However, federal contribution does not increase because of this inflation. It is estimated that the federal grant will cover less than 30% of the final

cost of the building. Thus, the full impact of increased cost at Mount Sinai has to be borne by the private sector.

(2) Endowments of a private medical school: Endowment money is a private medical school's equivalent to a state school's two million to six million annual appropriations. It establishes the required hard money base without which no school can operate. Endowment funds at a new school like Mount Sinai must be raised in addition to, and concurrently with, monies for construction and operations. This source of future "hard money" support, however, must be sought now from the same pool of private contributors whose support is needed for present construction and operations.

(3) Operating funds: The initial years of a new medical school's existence are more costly than those of an established school. Mount Sinai, for example, was compelled to match its very excellent clinical faculty with one which was equally distinguished in the basic sciences. This was done in support of the firm commitment by the Board of Trustees to develop a total institution dedicated to high quality academic medical education. The recruitment of a person of high scientific reputation as chairman or as a senior member of a basic science department, requires extra funds to be provided to allow him to bring his junior colleagues with him. Such an arrangement is essential to the mature scientists who must continue the ongoing scientific investigations of their teams. Since it takes these investigators a while to become established and to apply for independent money, all of their salaries, equipment and supplies must be imposed upon the regular operating budget of Mount Sinai during the first few years. These start-up funds are most difficult to secure from private sources since contributors are more reluctant to give money for intangibles which carry no memorialization, special titles or permanence.

(4) The development of research capabilities: is now overwhelming because of the tightening of NIH funds and the difficulties of transferring grants and equipment from an established to a new institution. At a time when funds are most urgently needed to encourage scientific investigation and to attract promising young scientists into full time positions, the tremendous cutbacks once again make it imperative that Mount Sinai use more of its private funds to pay for faculty and the equipment and supplies they require. These men must be given at least the same quality and quantity of resources at our school as they had at the institutions they left behind.

New schools of medicine are therefore faced with a staggering problem of finding money—big money—for the "start-up" operation of the school, the planning and construction of physical facilities, the maintenance of research, and the establishment of an adequate endowment program to guarantee the continued successful operation of the school.

Therefore, all of the problems relating to financial stringency fall with particular severity upon the private medical schools, as they do not have a ready mechanism for receiving increased appropriations from state legislatures. The trustees at Mount Sinai have already committed themselves to raise at least a hundred million dollars for construction and seed money to begin the operation of a medical school. It is indeed, difficult to expect them at this time to do still more:

The problem of the private giver is further complicated by the uncertainties of the new tax law being debated in Congress. Financial problems are further compounded here since the average yearly cost of educating a medical student is higher in New York City than anywhere else. In addition, Mount Sinai

School of Medicine has undertaken an "all expenses paid" program for black medical students. Of the 40 1st year students admitted in September 1969, 4 are in this program.

As a result of our present inability to meet these increased and unanticipated financial needs through the private sector alone, Mount Sinai has found that it must now borrow from its building fund to cover the day by day operating costs of the medical school. This source of support will not be available when we begin our major building program in the Spring of 1970.

On the national scene private philanthropy may become reluctant to support medical schools if potential private donors feel they will be personally committing themselves to a number of increasing and overwhelming financial obligations. Yet, the need to provide private capital can be one of the most important ingredients in the development of new schools of medicine. There are other hospitals like the Mount Sinai Hospital which could develop medical schools of excellence. These schools would not need to "steal" clinical science faculty from established schools because they could utilize their existing large and high quality cadres of both full time and part time physicians. Nor does the recruitment of a basic science faculty provide obstacles. There is no shortage of basic science faculty who can be recruited, although in some cases the organization of the traditional disciplines may be changed.

We cannot however, expect such new medical schools to develop under private auspices alone. The Federal Government must work closely with the private sector to provide start-up sustenance toward the development and on-going maintenance of the best in modern medical education.

The Delivery of Health Services is another firm commitment of many medical schools. In this spirit, most medical schools have begun to assume a vital leadership role in improving the nation's health care system. The Mount Sinai School of Medicine, for instance, has started to immerse itself more completely in the pressing health needs of its "community patients". Central to this concept is the necessity for an appropriate balance between service, teaching and research activities which are essential to the individual patient—and the community as well—to deliver the finest medical care possible within this university medical setting. The community which surrounds Mount Sinai School of Medicine, East Harlem, with its population of 218 thousand deprived people, regards our medical center as one of the basic resources in time of sickness, accident or emergency. This blighted area with its high percentage of old dilapidated tenement buildings has only 16 practicing physicians. This indeed underscores the wide need for all phases of Mount Sinai's health care programs and personnel. Concomitant with this increase in responsibility to the community are the severe cutbacks in Medicaid payments, and in New York, the provisions of the recently enacted New York State cost control legislation.

We must remember that medical schools almost always are closely intertwined with teaching hospitals. The faculty of the one is largely the medical staff of the other. Financial loss to the one hurts the other; financial benefits to the one, benefit the other. The reason that I stress this point is that of the nearly 100 Schools of Medicine in this country almost all depend—to varying degrees and in differing ways—on the professional fee-earning potential of their clinical faculty for part of their income. At Mount Sinai, Medicare and Medicaid fees make up a significant component of the School's income. The School, having admitted its first student classes in September 1963, is still in its formative period. Admittedly, this is not a truly representative time. Still, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969,

the financial plan was predicated on 30% of school income coming from this source. This is no longer true because of the drastic cuts in Medicaid.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR EDUCATION IN THE HEALTH SCIENCES

The President's Commission on Health Manpower stated that the education of health professionals is more than that of meeting the future manpower requirements of doctors and nurses. They indicated that the great increases in productivity of health professionals have resulted mainly from increased use of ancillary personnel. This fact, coupled with the sharply increasing demand for health care by our citizens requires new priorities for the physician. To make more efficient use of his time he must use large numbers of allied health workers as an extension of his own diagnostic and therapeutic effort.

This automatically expands the possibility of the physician to see that a patient's social, economic, psychological, vocational and other needs are met. It is now well recognized that he cannot meet this tremendous task singlehandedly; that is why there is immediate need to develop many categories of qualified non-physician health personnel, who in cooperation with the physician, will render more comprehensive services in the community.

Thus medical care for the future requires the active collaboration among persons skilled in many disciplines and professions. Schools for allied health professions with close ties to schools of medicine are therefore essential if we are to train our new physicians to work with the allied health professional in new and effective ways in order to meet the manpower needs of comprehensive care. *The Master Plan of the City University of New York*, for instance, indicates a major commitment in the allied health field, and the Mount Sinai School of Medicine is recognized as the apex of this health profession's complex. The numerous programs in the health professions are dependent upon the participation of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine faculty which already is giving several hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of "free" teaching effort per year to this rapidly developing program. The University's arm for baccalaureate education in the health field is the Hunter College Institute of Health Sciences. Several programs have developed at the junior college level, especially Hostos Junior college which will be primarily devoted to training health professionals. A baccalaureate degree program in nursing, and a masters program in Health Care Administration which is now underway are both part of Mount Sinai's role in the education of health professionals.

Continuing medical education is another responsibility of every medical school. The Mills report published in 1966 stated:

"Medical knowledge has been growing so rapidly that no practitioner can safely rely on what he learned as a student, or consider his own resources as adequate for optimal patient care. It is now widely agreed that for a physician to remain highly competent his education must not terminate at the end of a formal residency, but must continue as long as he practices. Yet many physicians isolate themselves from the kind of continuing education that comes from daily contact with other physicians, and far too many fail to take adequate advantage of available refresher courses."

Thus every medical school should have a well planned, well structured curriculum for the post graduate education of the practicing physicians in its community. At Mount Sinai for example, in the '68-'69 academic year, our Post Graduate School conducted 72 courses which were attended by more than 1,400 practicing physicians.

CONCLUSION

New schools of medicine are therefore faced with a staggering problem of finding money for the "start-up" operation of the school, for the planning and construction of physical facilities and for the establishment of an adequate endowment program to guarantee the continued successful operation of the school—all at the same time. New private medical schools for the reason cited throughout this review have an especially difficult problem. The Mount Sinai School of Medicine is one such school. Its experiences will be an indication of what potential private medical schools must expect to face. Collectively, they have the potential to raise hundreds of millions in private capital on behalf of medical education. Their problems however, do need special consideration and attention if they are to have the opportunity to do this.

I will be pleased to answer any questions you would like to raise about this highly significant problem of the adequate federal funding for new medical school with particular reference to new private medical schools.

Sincerely,

GEORGE JAMES, M.D.,
President and Dean.

FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have for several years been the sponsor of legislation to establish a comprehensive system of Federal regulation of private pension plans, again introducing the measure this year as S. 2167.

I am pleased, therefore, that the committee on labor and social security legislation of the Association of the Bar of the city of New York has just issued a report on this subject and concluded that comprehensive legislation in this field is, in fact, needed, much along the lines of my bill.

The general tenor of the committee's report is that:

We therefore support legislation which would establish a more certain correlation between what employees reasonably expect from a pension plan, and what they actually get.

On the subject of vesting, the report concludes:

We therefore recommend the establishment by federal legislation of minimum vesting standards through "graduated vesting" not just for a transition period (as the Wirtz proposal provided) but as a permanent part of the vesting standard. Rather than have a worker's pension vest 100% after 10 or 15 years (but be forfeited entirely if he loses his job one day too soon), we believe his pension should vest to the extent, for example, of 10% after 6 years of work and 10% thereafter—as is provided in the current bill (S. 2167) introduced by Senator Javits.

On the subject of funding, the report supports a minimum standard of 30-year funding, which I think is a good standard, although slightly more liberal than the 25-year standard in my bill.

The report, among other things, also supports the establishment of Federal pension plan reinsurance and Federal fiduciary standards for pension trustees—both features which I have included in my bill.

And most significantly, the report supports the concept of consolidated enforcement:

We endorse, therefore, the concept embodied in both Javits bills that a single agency should handle enforcement of all these requirements, perhaps issuing one qualifying certificate sufficient to establish compliance with all vesting, funding and reinsurance requirements, and which would also when attached to a tax return, be deemed proof of qualification for tax purposes as well, thus relieving the Treasury of the burden of policing the operations of private pension plans.

Mr. President, the matter is, of course, not without controversy; and the report reflects a brief dissenting opinion. But the report as a whole is in my judgment an excellent analysis of the subject, and its conclusions are well reasoned and worth our serious consideration.

I ask unanimous consent, therefore, that the report, which was printed in the November 1969 issue of the record of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, volume 24, No. 8, pages 523 to 533, be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMITTEE REPORT—PROPOSED FEDERAL REGULATION OF PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEMS

(By the Committee on Labor and Social Security Legislation)

The rapid growth of private pension systems in the past few decades (to the point where participants number approximately 25 million and reserve assets are estimated to total over \$100 billion¹) has generated substantial public interest in their structure and operations—and in the proper role of government in their regulation. Up to now the governmental role with respect to private pension plans has been limited chiefly to tax qualifications years to establish a more comprehensive scheme of federal pension regulations, widely disseminated among numerous different governmental regulatory departments. Several legislative proposals have been advanced in the last few years to establish a more comprehensive scheme of federal pension regulation.

During the 90th Congress, a bill endorsed by President Johnson was introduced which would have established federal fiduciary standards for trustees of private pension plans;² and a bill to establish minimum federal standards of vesting and funding and to establish a federal pension reinsurance program was introduced at the behest of then Secretary of Labor Wirtz.³ A more comprehensive measure which would have established federal fiduciary standards, vesting and funding standards, a reinsurance program and central pension regulation under a new Federal Pension Commission was advanced by Senator Javits.⁴ These bills or versions of them have been reintroduced into the 91st Congress and have been referred to appropriate committees for consideration.⁵

The legislative proposals have been put forward despite the facts that (1) the private pension plan system is built on top of a governmentally-operated Social Security System which is a foundation for voluntary experiments; (2) private plans and their amendments must be reported under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act;⁶ and (3) private plans which are jointly administered by employers and unions are limited to proper purposes by the criminal anti-bribery provisions of Section 302 of the Taft-Hartley Act.⁷

These facts are formidable. The intrusion of national government into the processes of voluntary, private supplementation to a governmental program is not a welcome development, especially when the supplementation is

rich with a vast number of different plans, each created and developed in accordance with individual institutional needs, pressures and balances. The gigantic sums of money involved add to the instinctive caution. Nevertheless, we conclude that experience has shown federal regulation to be necessary, and that such regulation should extend beyond jointly-administered plans to include employer-administered plans as well. We believe there is a need for minimum federal standards for all pension plans—vesting-funding standards, fiduciary standards, and a basic reinsurance requirement (as well as certain other requirements discussed below)—in order to provide protection to the average pensioner, who too often finds himself without the security he had for many years expected and labored to achieve.

We are aware that such standards and requirements will raise the cost of private plans, almost certainly so much as to hinder, if not totally prevent, the continuance of the steady rise in benefits promised to employees (and currently being actually received by many retirees). We are also aware that federal minimum standards may well become fixed ceilings for negotiators in collective bargaining. But here, again, we conclude that the assurance of promised and expected retirement benefits makes the price worth paying.

In general, our conclusion means only that the desirability of the goal seems to us to outweigh the disadvantages inherent in securing it. Those disadvantages do not disappear once the conclusion is reached; they endure in their importance and serve as warning signals against undue tinkering.

I. THE NEED FOR REGULATION

The basis for our recommendations lies not only in certain dramatic and nationally-noticed events in recent years, but also in less-dramatic disappointed expectations which have been occurring in the private pension plan system.

The most notable of these pension disasters was the closing of the Studebaker South Bend plant in 1964 and the termination of its pension plan mid-way in its 30-year funding period. Upon termination, arrangements were made for the payment of full pensions to 3600 persons who were retired or who had reached age 60, but 4000 employees between the age of 40 and 59 and with "vested" rights received only 15% of their pension equities, and 2900 employees, under age 40, received nothing.⁸ The Studebaker termination is by no means an isolated case. A recent Bureau of Labor Statistics study⁹ shows a marked increase in plan terminations during the period 1955-65. Over that 11 year period, 8100 retirement plans terminated. These covered some 225,000 people at the time of termination. Thus, approximately 20,000 persons per year were affected. The study could not estimate, because of lack of data, the number of affected employees who sustained a loss or diminution of pension "rights" under each terminated plan, but we consider it a fair judgment that the proportion was substantial.

Termination of pension plans prior to expiration of the funding period has not been the only source of disappointment. Job turnover prior to vesting is sufficiently frequent to constitute a substantial factor in actuarial assumptions; after many years, a long-service employee may lose his job, or move to another city and another employer, with the result that his pension "rights" have been forfeited because he did not work continuously for the same employer, as required by the plan, until the vesting date.¹⁰ And no one can reasonably predict the future impact upon the soundness of a plan (and an employee's pension rights) from actions of administrators and trustees who have succumbed to the temptations of personal power and aggrandizement offered by dominion over huge sums of money.

Footnotes at end of article.

Many pension plans, of course, are soundly financed and fairly structured. Yet many are not. Thus, while many workers actually receive a private pension, others expect to receive one, may have worked the better part of a lifetime "under" a private pension plan, and yet receive little or nothing at retirement age. We therefore support legislation which would establish a more certain correlation between what employees reasonably expect from a pension plan, and what they actually get.

II. PROPOSALS

A. Vesting and funding

Vesting is the granting of an irrevocable right to an employee to receive in the future, starting usually at a specified retirement age, pension benefits earned through his past employment.

Funding is the accumulation of assets (in the hands of a trustee, insurance company or the like) earmarked for the payment of pensions promised by a pension plan.

A majority of pension plans now in existence already provide some sort of pre-retirement vesting. Current funding requirements, under Internal Revenue Service rules for continued qualification, require only that employer contributions to the pension fund be sufficient (subject to exceptions not here relevant) (1) to permit current payment of plan benefits, and (2) to prevent any increase in unfunded past service cost. There is no obligation to fund the principal of initial past service liabilities.

The 1965 Cabinet Committee Report, which has come to be the starting point for most discussions of pension plan regulation, recommended "some reasonable measure of vesting,"¹¹ and suggested, as a possible minimum standard, fifty percent vesting after 15 years of service and full vesting after 20 years.¹² As to funding, the Cabinet Committee Report recommended that past service liabilities be funded over the average work life of employees, but not more than 30 years.¹³

The bill recommended by former Secretary of Labor Wirtz would have put the standard at 10-year vesting (10 years of employment after the age of 25) and would have established a 25-year funding standard.¹⁴ The Javits bill would have required full 15-year vesting at age 45 and 25-year funding.¹⁵

1. *Vesting.* Senator Yarborough, introducing the bill proposed by former Secretary Wirtz, stated that there are 12 million employees working under plans without 10-year vesting, and that 3 million of these will, in the absence of legislation, never get benefits from their plans.¹⁶ We think the problem is more severe, for these 3 million (and others) may very well go from plan to plan, forfeiting pension after pension, because they are too mobile ever to vest.

Legislative "vesting" requirements represent a decision in favor of fundamental fairness over contract rights—not unlike the "overreaching" grounds on which courts have voided provisions of certain commercial contracts. The basic consideration is essentially the same—is a man entitled to more than he is actually promised, particularly when he is made fully aware of the limitations of that promise at the time of its making? The question is made more difficult to answer affirmatively when it is also shown that the employer's promise has been precisely so limited in exchange for higher benefits in the plan or higher wage rates in general.

Still, the contractual argument does not sufficiently reflect the actual. The individual worker does not normally take or refuse a job depending on all the niceties of its fringe benefit provisions, however clearly spelled out to him. And unions (which represent a minority of our work force in any event) cannot be depended upon invariably to pro-

tect this particular employee interest—they are constantly tempted, as institutions, to produce and display to their constituents higher dollar figures rather than sober analyses of the attainment of a greater degree of security. Nor can employers be looked to as protectors of the individual's expectations: predictably, they often either accede to union demands for higher dollar benefits (in lieu of reducing a vesting period) or, if unorganized, set up plans on their own with "late" vesting provisions—their goals being both to retain a stable work force and to minimize costs. The consequence is that the early vesting interest of an employee tends to be over-ridden by other pressures in the process of private decision-making, and needs independent legislative support.

In addition, there is a serious question whether our society gains from a non-mobile, blue-collar work force. "Late" vesting, were it to perform as substantial a part of a wage-earner's motivation and life-style as the proponents of the contractual argument in effect urge it should, fosters the adherence to a job with a particular employer beyond the degree which may be desirable for American society. Ample security for retirement age is a highly desirable goal, but we would seek it without encouraging the proliferation of already strong bonds between employer and employee which might tend to obstruct the operation of a free enterprise economy and culture. We reach this conclusion notwithstanding the realization that an employer's interest in retaining the services of employees—particularly higher-level supervisory employees—can be both legitimate and substantial. But we do not believe that interest should outweigh the wage-earner's—especially since an employer has available to him other methods by which to tie executives to his business.

We therefore recommend the establishment by federal legislation of minimum vesting standards through "graduated vesting" not just for a transition period (as the Wirtz proposal provided) but as a permanent part of the vesting standard. Rather than have a worker's pension vest 100% after 10 or 15 years (but be forfeited entirely if he loses his job one day too soon), we believe his pension should vest to the extent, for example, of 10% after 6 years of work and 10% per year thereafter—as is provided in the current bill (S. 2167) introduced by Senator Javits. Under this method, full vesting would occur after 15 years and lesser vested rights would obtain prior thereto once the employee had worked for his employer for several years.

At the same time, we note that these proposals may more easily be made applicable to plans created after the effective date of new legislation, while retroactive application could too radically alter the nature of an original bargain; we therefore recommend that only years of service worked after the effective date of new legislation be credited toward the new vesting requirement.

2. *Funding.* The arguments for and against minimum federal funding standards echo those made with regard to vesting. There are, however, two additional considerations: (1) it is difficult to assume that an individual employee is sufficiently able to comprehend (and base his employment decisions upon) the various nuances of funding procedures; and (2) benefit failures from inadequacies of funding can occur despite an employee's total loyalty to his job and his employer, a situation not quite so frequent in late vesting situations. These facts render it easier to conclude that governmental funding standards should be created.

We therefore support the proposal that minimum funding standards should be imposed and, in this regard, believe a 30-year funding period to be appropriate.

We recommend as a further requirement that the cost of future increases in benefits or liberalization of eligibility standards be

funded separately so as not to weaken the funding of benefits previously granted.¹⁷ For example, assume a plan (1) originally providing for a \$100 per month pension, fully vested after 15 years; (2) granting full credit for years of past service rendered before adoption of the plan on commencement of funding; and (3) planned to take 25 years for funding of the deficiency created by past credited service. After the plan has been in operation for 20 years, that liability may be almost fully funded, and the employer (or union, or both) may decide to raise benefits to \$150 per month and/or vest benefits after 10 years. The change will necessitate an increase in contributions to the plan, not only to pay increased current service costs, but also to fund the new liability created by new past credited service at a higher benefit level. If the funding of the original past service liability is combined with the funding of the increased benefits and liberalized vesting, neither will be fully funded for another 25 years. If, in the interim, the plan terminates, the latest benefit and vesting liberalization may result in partial forfeiture of the original vested benefit which would have been fully funded if the plan had not been amended. The example sufficiency proves, we believe, the validity of a separate funding requirement.

B. Adjustments of existing plans

We consider that the most worrisome problem presented by federal standards—particularly in vesting and funding—is that of adjustment of existing plans.

We are not overly troubled by changes which would be required of unilateral employer plans covering unorganized workers. We do not make light of the inevitable increase in the employer's costs, but we are aware that in such circumstances the employer has great flexibility in revising his labor cost "package" so as to minimize the impact of the proposed legislation.

The collective management-union bargain is another matter. Realistically, vesting and funding revisions to meet federal standards cannot in the usual situation be politically "sold" to a union's constituency as a substantial improvement no matter how large the added costs may prove to be. It is not easy to recommend changes for which no political "credit" from employees is received; for no matter how appreciative of the employer's problem, union negotiators are unlikely to risk rejection by their members, and many employers in consequence will be faced with added pension costs separate and apart from economic demands which a union's leadership will consider the minimum necessary to secure ratification.

This problem has no ready solution known to us. It has been, in our judgment, the chief reason for opposition by both management and union groups to proposed federal standards.

The remedy most frequently proposed is that of added time. For example, the current Javits bill would allow an extra 10 years for funding past service liabilities in existing plans, and the Wirtz bill proposed transitional periods for both vesting and funding. We have no quarrel with provisions for added time—indeed, we consider them necessary; we observe, however, that the lack of political credit with employees might often mean that collective bargains would be struck without changes in pension standards right up to the deadline date; only then are negotiators normally willing to face up to the issue and consider it a factor in the bargain which must be handled with something other than a determination to decide it "next time around."

For that reason, we suggest, with hesitance, a device to work in conjunction with added time. We discuss below the creation for other purposes of a federal pension agency; we would charge that agency with a special

Footnotes at end of article.

function in this area: the issuance of orders to cease making benefit payments and promising benefits if federal standards are not absorbed into a plan by a certain date. Such orders would have the immediate effect of bolstering negotiators on both sides, for employees would be aware that a governmental authority had stepped into their specific collective relationship and had ordered changes made. The employer and the union leaders would be better enabled to explain the reasons for, and the effects of, the changes and would have a ready scapegoat for their actions.

This would by no means cure the problem completely. And we are, as noted, hesitant to recommend the arming of a new national agency with cease and desist power over thousands of plans and millions of covered employees—especially when the grant of that power is recommended for indirect reasons. Yet, the problem is of sufficient importance to warrant suggested solutions shaped to its cause; we are not aware of any other suggestion addressed to the core question of rank-and-file acceptance of the bargaining; which a new statute would mandate.

C. Exemptions for particular plans

The current Javits bill allows a longer funding period for certain multi-employer plans. Previous discussion of multi-employer plans has involved broader suggestions, namely that they be exempted entirely from federal standards or be enabled to seek qualified exemption because the continuity of the industry (as distinct from individual companies) is sufficient to give them a stability rendering unnecessary the proposed vesting and funding requirements.

We foresee more harm than good in creating an exemption for multiemployer plans. Whether they are financially more stable and are in the course of developing their own forms of intra-locality or intra-industry "portability" * seems basically irrelevant. If they are thereby entitled to fall outside regulation (and thus able to promise higher benefits to covered employees than the same costs would provide to employees covered by regulated plans) an unjustified discrimination will have been created. National companies like General Motors or area firms like Consolidated Edison could reasonably argue that their financial history and position was ample proof that their plans were safe, and that they and their employees were being forced into needlessly costly formulae.

A small minority of this Committee would avoid such "discrimination" and allow the administering agency to relax or eliminate the minimum funding standard when it considers a single employer or a group of employers strong and stable enough to warrant it. It is argued that the standard otherwise becomes too rigid and formalistic when applied to existing plans.

We believe most of the arguments for that position are considered and rejected elsewhere in this Report. At this point, we raise an additional factor, namely, the goal of efficient administration. Putting to one side our disbelief that a group of economists could be gathered having either the ability or the inclination to foretell with exactitude the economic future of a company or an industry, we question the wisdom of charging an agency with such responsibilities. It would be flooded with individual applications and would spend far too much of its time studying those applications in order to determine eligibility for exemption.

We conclude, therefore, that there should be no exemption for any type of plan.

D. Reinsurance and fiduciary standards

We are in favor of a federal reinsurance program with respect to the payment of pensions earned under private plans. We would

confine the insurance (so as to lower premium charges) to protection against the contingency of a plan termination upon the employer going out of business before achieving full funding—as occurred at Studebaker's South Bend plant. The cost of this program would be funded by a compulsory insurance premium payable by each plan based upon the amount of its own individual unfunded past credited service. So that premium costs can be kept within reasonable limits (and to avoid subsidization of the profligate by the prudent) we believe an insurance program should not be established unless all plans are made subject simultaneously to the substantive and other standards recommended in this Report. As respects existing plans, this would involve delay in their insurance coverage until they are brought into line.

Federal fiduciary standards also seem necessary. A number of recent disclosures, documented in Congressional and other inquiries,¹⁸ have revealed serious inadequacies not only in existing federal regulation but in state trust law as well.¹⁹ Legislation should impose standards broad enough to include misuse of a pension fund by employers and unions as well as by trustees.

In addition, we believe that any legislation establishing minimum standards for pension plans should include certain simple, fundamental mechanisms to help assure that a legal right to a pension can, as a practical matter, be converted into a pension in fact. In particular, we recommend, first, that the federal courts be given jurisdiction to enforce rights** under pension plans (as they now have jurisdiction under Section 301 of the Taft-Hartley Act to enforce collective bargaining agreements); second, that to facilitate such enforcement each plan, trustee, and administrator be required to designate some agent (perhaps the Secretary of Labor) to receive service of process; and third, that every employer and plan administrator be required to furnish to each employee who leaves a job after having earned a vested pension right some standard form of notice akin to an income tax "W-2" setting forth the amount and terms of the employee's pension, the age when he becomes entitled to receive it, who holds the money, and how, when and to whom to apply for benefits.

We also favor the proposals that there be licensing of actuaries.

E. Consolidated enforcement

The major share of regulatory jurisdiction over pension plans is now held by the Treasury Department, which decides whether a plan "qualifies" under Section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code, and the extent to which contributions to the Plan are therefore tax deductible. Other regulations administered elsewhere concern bonding and the filing of information forms under the Welfare and Pension Plans Disclosure Act (Labor Department), qualification under securities laws (SEC), qualification to exclude contributions from the "regular rate" so as not to have to pay a "pension and a half" for overtime (Labor Department, Wage and Hour Division), and compliance with the anti-bribery provisions of Section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act (Justice Department).

If, as we recommend, a substantial increase in federal regulation is added to the foregoing (e.g., vesting and funding standards, fiduciary standards, reinsurance), there will be a clear need for all regulation to be consolidated. We endorse, therefore, the concept embodied in both Javits' bills that a single agency should handle enforcement of all these requirements, perhaps issuing one qualifying certificate sufficient to establish compliance with all vesting, funding and reinsurance requirements, and which would also, when attached to a tax return, be deemed proof of qualification for tax pur-

poses as well, thus relieving the Treasury of the burden of policing the operation of private pension plans.

CONCLUSION

Comprehensive federal regulation of pension plans has been shown by actual experience to be necessary. Despite that evidence, regulation has hitherto expired in the Congress, primarily, we believe, because important segments of management and labor fear disruptive effects on existing plans and have expressed their fears in Washington. The deep disappointments suffered by individual employees tend to be underemphasized in such a situation, particularly when a legislator is led by a continuously expanding economy to conclude that those disappointments are not likely to reoccur. We believe that prudence calls for a different conclusion. If a lengthy recession occurs or a single industry founders for reasons particular to it, the effects can be catastrophic. Likewise, the adverse impact of legislation on existing plans is continuously augmented as more and more millions of employees become covered under plans, and more and more benefits are promised to them. We agree that the impact will be disruptive to some degree; but we perceive no rationality to delaying regulation until private plans cover the entire work force of the country, and by that fact alone predetermine a negative legislative judgment. Once it is clear that Congress should act, it seems to us just as clear that it should act promptly.

DISSENTING OPINION ***

The Committee Report is directed to an extremely complex subject, and the effect which the legislation proposed in the Report would have on employers and employees under private pension plans is unknown. It is questionable whether the Committee had before it sufficient factual material or studies, or data relating to costs or expenses of its proposals to warrant making many of the recommendations the Committee has made. Accordingly, dissent is taken from the issuance of a Report on proposed federal regulation without further study.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION (1968-69)

Arthur Mermin, *Chairman*; David I. Ashe, Joseph Barbash, Mark K. Benenson, Saul Z. Cohen, Frank Cummings, Emanuel Dannett, Bernard Gold, Morris P. Glushien, Stanley D. Halperin, Samuel M. Kaynard, Ida Klaus, Jack L. Kroner, Jerome Lefkowitz, Everett E. Lewis, Ivan C. McLeod, James M. Nabrit III, Peter M. Panken, Asher W. Schwartz, Herbert D. Schwartzman, Peter Seltz, Michael I. Sovern, Evan J. Spiefogel, William P. Witman, Sidney A. Wolf.

FOOTNOTES

*There has been much discussion during the debate on pension regulation with respect to "portability." The suggestions are generally for a central federal clearing house for pension credits, which could be transferred from one pension plan to another. The Committee believes that early graduated vesting sufficiently handles the situation so that a necessarily cumbersome federal "clearing house" for portability may not be necessary, and should not be created, at least for the present.

**We refer to individual rights of the employee or his beneficiaries such as to a stated pension amount, or to obtain information with respect to vesting or how, when and to whom to apply for benefits—but not to enforce fiduciary obligations as such. This latter would be better left to an administrative agency.

***The Committee has instituted as an experiment a method of signing its Reports whereby the adoption of a Report by a majority of a quorum present at a meeting will result in all Committee members being listed

in support of the Report; a dissent may be written by any member but will be anonymous.

¹ 1968 Senate Pension Hearings, *infra*, note 10, at 216-17. While private pension plans have existed longer than Social Security, the real growth of private plans—their reserve assets, coverage and benefits—has been a comparatively recent phenomenon. In 1940, only 4.1 million Americans were working in pension-plan-covered employment, and only 160,000 beneficiaries were drawing pensions. Reserve assets of these plans in 1940 were \$2.4 billion; contributions were flowing in at an annual rate of \$310 million; and benefits were being paid out at a rate of \$140 million per year.

But by 1962, the number of participants had grown from 4.1 million to 23.1 million; the number of those drawing pensions had risen from 160,000 to over 2 million; reserve assets had grown from \$2.4 billion to \$63.5 billion; annual contributions had risen from \$310 million to \$5.9 billion; and benefits flowing out of pension plans had risen from \$140 million to \$2.24 billion. See *Public Policy & Private Pension Program, A Report to the President on Private Employee Retirement Plans by the President's Committee on Corporate Pension Funds & Other Private Retirement & Welfare Programs*, App. A, Table I (Jan. 1965) (hereinafter cited as "1965 Cabinet Committee Report").

By 1967, reserve assets had reached at least \$90 billion. "To Protect the American Consumer," Message to the Congress from President Johnson, February 16, 1967. More recent data puts the total at \$103.4 billion, estimated by the SEC as of the end of 1967. Daily Labor Report, No. 85, April 30, 1968, at page B-3.

² S. 1024, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) (Sen. Yarborough); H.R. 5741, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967); H.R. 6498, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967), reintroduced in 1969 by Congressman Dent as H.R. 1046, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969), and as H.R. 6204 with additional sponsors (see footnote 5 below).

³ S. 3421, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1968) (Sen. Yarborough), reintroduced by Congressman Dent as H.R. 1045, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969).

⁴ S. 1103, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967) (Sen. Javits). Senator Javits has very recently introduced in the 91st Cong. a still more comprehensive measure, S. 2167.

⁵ H.R. 192, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969) (Rep. Ellberg); H.R. 2080, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969) (Rep. Helstoski); H.R. 6204, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. (1969) (Rep. Dent, *et al.*); and see footnote 4, *supra*.

⁶ 72 Stat. 997, as amended (1958), 29 U.S.C. §§ 301-309.

⁷ 61 Stat. 157, as amended (1947), 29 U.S.C. § 186.

⁸ *Private Pension Plans, Hearings Before the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee, Joint Economic Committee, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess., pt. I, at 126-27 (1966).*

⁹ *Beier, Termination of Pension Plans, Monthly Labor Review, June 1967, p. 26.*

¹⁰ *Pension and Welfare Plans, Hearings on S. 3421, S. 1024, S. 1103 and S. 1255, Before the Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, United States Senate, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess., 237-49 (1968)* (letters from disappointed pension claimants, submitted as exhibits to the testimony of Assistant Secretary of Labor Donahue). (These hearings are elsewhere cited as "1968 Senate Pension Hearings".)

¹¹ *1965 Cabinet Committee Report, supra* note 1, at 42.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Id.* at 52.

¹⁴ S. 3421, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1968).

¹⁵ S. 1103, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. (1967). Senator Javits also proposed as an alternative 50% vesting after 10 years, increasing by 5% each additional year so as to achieve total vesting after 20 years' service. His current bill

(see fn. 4 *supra*) provides for full vesting after 15 years, achieved by a 10% vesting after 6 years and an additional 10% for each year of service thereafter.

¹⁶ CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 9, p. 11544. See also 1968 Senate Pension Hearings, *supra* note 10, at 271.

¹⁷ S. 3421, 90th Cong., 2nd Sess. § 201(d), (Sen. Yarborough) would make this an optional standard.

¹⁸ E.g., S. Rept. No. 1348, 89th Cong., 2nd Sess. (1966); 1968 Senate Pension Hearings, *supra* note 10, at 226-230.

¹⁹ See Elliott, *Federal Fiduciary Standards for Welfare and Pension Plans* (Ass'n of Life Insurance Counsel, 1968).

SECRETARY WALTER J. HICKEL— 1 YEAR LATER

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, a year ago today at the Shoreham Hotel President Nixon announced his Cabinet nominations—among them Alaska's Governor, Walter J. Hickel, as Secretary of the Interior.

There were few of them who believed that a man from a State far from the geographical mainstream of the rest of the country and the turmoil of urban centers could do an effective job as guardian of the human and natural resources of the entire United States.

The hearings on his confirmation were grueling—the Secretary was before our committee for 5 days of intensive questioning—and he handled himself with more finesse and awareness of the problems facing his new department than many had expected.

Now, a year has passed since those controversial hearings. The skeptical have been proved wrong.

Through the efforts of Secretary Hickel the public has become aware that conservation means the wise and proper use of our natural resources. Our resources are valuable only as long as they are used without abuse.

In accordance with this theme Secretary Hickel has directed his efforts toward cleaning up the environment with a particular emphasis on water pollution. He has stated that "We must stop simply reacting to problems. We must start anticipating them." Secretary Hickel has anticipated the serious water pollution crisis that will be upon us if action is not taken and has applied stringent new water standards throughout the United States. Next Wednesday the Secretary will conduct a "Save Lake Michigan Seminar" in Chicago to discuss with the Governor of Illinois and leading scientists the most effective and expedient means to eliminate water pollution in that Great Lake.

Secretary Hickel has applied new and tough restrictions on offshore oil leasing after the Santa Barbara incident.

The Secretary believes that the Federal Government must acquire more land to provide recreational opportunities in and near our large centers of population—a program he calls "Parks to the People." The pilot project proposal is located in New York City and New Jersey. Called Gateway National Recreation Area because of its location near New York Harbor, this recreational area would cover 20,000 acres and provide five water oriented sites for recreation. The

area would be accessible to 10 million people and be particularly beneficial for children from ghettos who have never had access to facilities of this kind.

The State of Alaska has become the center of attention for conservationists because of the new oil discoveries which many feel threaten the State's existence as the last unexploited wilderness State. The Secretary has required stipulations for the pipeline which will carry the oil from the north slope to southern ports that set forth stringent standards for the protection of the environment. The stipulations call for hiring of Alaska natives to build the pipeline, for the pre-submission of certain construction plans and methods to the department, for department control and veto, but with means of appeal. In these stipulations the department retains control of its conservation interests while TAPS retains responsibility for the project.

At his hearings last January, the Secretary agreed to retain the land freeze in Alaska until settlement of the Alaska native land claims issue. Secretary Hickel formulated at the national level a generous and equitable formula for the settlement of the Alaska native land claims; a settlement which would bring justice to a group of Alaskans who have been waiting for justice for 102 years.

I think that Secretary Hickel has shown during his 1 year in office that he is concerned about our human and natural resources. He understands that the care which he and his department inures for the natural wealth and beauty of our country will be reflected in the quality of our lives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Natural Resource Goals," prepared by Secretary of the Interior Hickel, and published in the Aerospace Journal for the fall of 1969.

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

NATURAL RESOURCE GOAL

(By Walter J. Hickel, Secretary of the Interior)

In 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt said that the conservation and proper use of our natural resources constitutes the fundamental problem which underlies almost every other problem of our national life.

Because of the growth of resource problems which President Roosevelt foresaw far ahead of his time, this statement is even more true today.

In dealing with what President Nixon has called the greatest threat to our environment in our history, we must be sure we set our goals wisely and move to reach them vigorously and promptly.

The Department of the Interior has, as one of its most important responsibilities, the management of natural resources throughout our nation. These responsibilities also extend to our oceans.

I believe we must look ahead to the year 2000 and ask what problems we will face by then. We must stop simply "reacting" to problems. We must start anticipating them.

Our natural resources should be catalogued and inventoried, both in general and specifically, for various uses, whether for preservation for beauty, or as resources for development to accommodate people.

The resources in and under the ocean are also going to have to be catalogued. And we are going to have to have a stronger program in oceanography before we really understand what's out there and how best to utilize it.

There will be areas for the mining of hard minerals and areas for oil, and areas to be set aside for other uses. We should take a hard, visionary look at the resources of our vast continental shelf. We must come up with a long range program that's not only in the interests of the people of America, but literally for all the people of the world.

One of our most important priorities must be coping with pollution of water.

Next year we plan to present a far-reaching analysis to Congress to provide for a really major anti-pollution program. We cannot afford "piecemeal" planning.

What we should strive for is to get started now with a payment schedule for pollution control spread over the next 30 years.

What government should do is encourage understanding that pollution costs money and that measures to prevent air and water pollution and help clean up the environment make money.

When we consider our cities, we're looking at man-made, natural, and human resources, and all can be damaged or even destroyed by pollution. Even sweet, pure rainfall on a city which has a quarter of its surface covered with asphalt or concrete can create environmental problems.

Government must enlighten management, and set down regulations where the government is involved. It has to do this—even to itself. Some of the real polluters of air and water are government installations.

On federal lands, projects and leases—both onshore and offshore—we have to set regulations that are attainable. And then, as technology makes it possible, we can tighten up the regulations. We cannot have a program that says we're going to have mountain pure water tomorrow in the Hudson River. It's just not attainable. We must first undo the wrong that has been done, then set guidelines and then encourage the cities and industry to comply.

We also need a planned program for the future to conserve our wilderness areas and parks.

We've got to look ahead far enough, to the press of population in the year 2000 and even beyond, to what's going to be—or should be—developed; what's going to be used for the "pleasure of living," and the "pleasures of viewing." Until we do that, I fear we're going to have development on a "catch-as-catch-can" basis.

The federal government needs to acquire more land to provide recreational opportunities in and near our large centers of population.

An example is what we are doing at Breezy Point, Sandy Hook and Jamaica Bay in New York City to develop a Gateway National Recreation Area to provide unique recreational areas, and areas of wildlife and natural beauty.

This particular project will be immediately accessible to roughly ten million people. A person won't have to take two weeks to get out and rejuvenate his mind and body. Here he can do it over a weekend, or in an evening, or a day.

The federal government has an obligation to its "investors"—our millions of citizens.

Consider the grazing lands in the Great West.

We cannot expect continually to receive revenues from those lands without harming the environment.

We're going to have to determine what are the best uses for these lands.

I think we can find areas where land is not utilized to its highest degree and we can improve on nature by reclamation, irrigation and flood control projects. Then we can

have both virgin wilderness, plus greenbelt areas and forests where we can harvest our timber on a true sustained yield basis.

One of the real steps in this direction has been the Public Land Law Review Commission, which is to report in June 1970. It is to come up with recommendations as to how we can best use the public lands we have left.

In general, I believe the problems connected with resources should be kept in one department. In Interior, we have both natural resources and human resources. We have all the Indian problems—Indian, Eskimo and Aleut.

The government has become a crutch to the Indian, and we must allow our Indian citizens to make more of their own decisions concerning education, for example. We should allow them not only to make decisions as to what they think is best, but allow them the privilege of making mistakes, so they'll learn by those mistakes. We have got to have more communication between those in the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and those on the reservations.

In some way we're going to have to "cut the cord," so to speak, and encourage the Indian to become more involved, more independent.

It is not only in connection with our responsibilities for our Indian citizens, of course, that we are dealing with human problems. In handling all of our missions we must focus not on just the resource—but on what the resource can mean to us in building a better life for the people of our country and of the world.

As President Nixon has said, together we have damaged the environment and together we can improve it.

We are working to meet the urgent resource challenges of the seventies with the conviction that what is required is a strategy of quality for the future to match the strategy of quantity of the past.

Our natural resources are the base on which life itself depends. Our stewardship—the care we take of this natural wealth and beauty—will be reflected in the overall quality of our lives.

THE 1,000 CONSECUTIVE ROLLCALL VOTES BY SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate the remarkable attendance record of the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE).

Earlier today, on the passage of the District of Columbia appropriation bill, which he so ably managed as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, Senator PROXMIRE's vote was his 1,000th consecutive rollcall.

The Senator from Wisconsin has not missed voting on a rollcall since April of 1966, a period of over 3½ years.

All Senators are aware of the great service rendered by the Senator through his work on several important committees and subcommittees, and I know that all Senators join me in saluting Mr. PROXMIRE on his splendid achievement in having cast 1,000 consecutive rollcall votes.

I compliment the Senator on this truly outstanding performance, of which he and the people of Wisconsin may justly be proud.

PENDING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is H.R. 14580.

ADJOURNMENT TO 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 previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, December 12, 1969, at 10 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 11, 1969:

U.S. ATTORNEY

Gerald J. Gallinghouse, of Louisiana, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana for the term of 4 years vice Louis C. LaCour.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate, December 11, 1969:

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.

IN THE ARMY

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Joseph G. May, [redacted] Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. LaClair A. Melhouse, [redacted] Adjutant General's Corps.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Evan P. Aurand, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA GOVERNMENT

Graham W. Watt, of Ohio, to be Assistant to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

U.S. MARSHALS

Emmett E. Shelby, of Florida, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Florida for the term of 4 years.

Charles D. Loos, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning Jackie L. Slaughter, to be captain, and ending Homer M. Vernon, Jr., to be 2d, lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 5, 1969.

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning Walter A. Divers, Jr., to be 1st lieutenant, and ending Charles W. Zimmerman, to be 2d lieutenant,

which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 20, 1969.

IN THE NAVY

The nominations beginning George E. Balyeat, to be captain, and ending Daniel F. Kenney III, to be ensign which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 7, 1969;

Cmdr. Charles Conrad, Jr., Cmdr. Richard F. Gordon, Jr., and Cmdr. Alan L. Bean for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the Navy;

Lt. Cmdr. Donald W. Stauffer for appointment to the grade of commander while serving as leader of the U.S. Navy Band; and

The nominations beginning James Robert Abbey, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Sarah A. Zalesky, to be lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 1, 1969.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Barbara J. Lee, to be lieutenant colonel, and ending Harriet T. Wendel, to be captain, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in

the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 7, 1969;

The nominations beginning James A. Albright, to be 2d lieutenant, and ending Larry A. Sunn, to be 2d lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on November 17, 1969; and

The nominations beginning John E. Ailes, to be chief warrant officer (W-4), and ending Frank C. Zubiate, to be chief warrant officer (W-2), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 1, 1969.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, December 11, 1969

The House met at 10 o'clock a.m.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God is the strength of my heart.—
Psalms 73: 26.

Eternal Father, from whom we come and unto whom our spirits return, we bow our heads in adoration and gratitude before Thee. We thank Thee for every gift of Thy grace which lifts us and guides us, making us better men and better women.

We need Thy strengthening presence to support us through these troubled days, to keep our hearts free from the bitter spirit of hate and resentment, and to keep them filled with the happy spirit of love and good will.

We pray for our Nation and for the nations of the world. May the angels' song of good will among men be heard again and may the earth send back the song which now the angels sing. Led by Thy spirit, help us to live together in peace and with good will in all our hearts; through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

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

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate to continue marking up H.R. 15091.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas is proceeding under his 1-minute request. Will the gentleman from Texas read his request, please.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will finish the statement and then I will repeat the request.

Mr. Speaker, this is a vital piece of legislation which, if enacted, would help to lower interest rates and fight inflation, and would provide significant assistance to the homebuilding industry

and the home mortgage market so that our people can secure adequate housing.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I will appreciate it if the gentleman will wait until I have finished a sentence.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will be of significant importance to the small businessmen of our country since it would provide funding for small businesses through the Small Business Administration, and would provide the President with the necessary discretionary authority to curtail unnecessary business investment and consumer expenditures. Portions of this legislation expire December 22 and, unless the committee can finish its work in marking up this legislation, we can look for serious and severe disruptions within the financial community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today during general debate.

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

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am sure everything the distinguished Committee on Banking and Currency does is important, but the question I wanted to ask is: Has this request been cleared with the minority?

Mr. PATMAN. We have not had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman withdraw his request at this time, or I will object.

Mr. PATMAN. Then the gentleman will just have to object. If the request is withdrawn it would not be possible to get another one granted in time to permit the Committee on Banking and Currency to meet today, as requested during general debate. There is only 1½ hours of general debate remaining. The Committee of the Whole House will go into general debate almost immediately and another request cannot be made until it is over.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on

Commerce and Finance of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I apologize for being a little late—let me look at a note. Is the request to permit the two subcommittees of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to sit during general debate?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, this is a request for one of the two subcommittees, yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, according to my note, I will say to the gentleman from California, the ranking Republican on the full committee has no objection to this request.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. I have just been informed of that.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER, COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADVANCED RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS, TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Advanced Research and Technology of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

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

There was no objection.