

trade in fresh fruits and vegetables, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9657. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9658. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to take certain actions, and make an investigation and study, with respect to drilling and oil production under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE:

H.R. 9659. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9660. A bill to amend the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act to eliminate the 4-day waiting period applicable to sickness benefits during an individual's second or subsequent registration period within any benefit year, and to waive the 7-day waiting period applicable to sickness benefits during an individual's first such period where sickness (and any required waiting period) began in the preceding benefit year; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FRASER, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. REES, Mr. REUSS, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TIERNAN, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 9661. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 607. Joint resolution to declare the policy of the United States with respect to its territorial sea; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 608. Joint resolution to authorize and direct the Federal Trade Commission to conduct a comprehensive investigation of unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in the home improvement industry, to expand its enforcement activities in this area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.J. Res. 609. Joint resolution consenting to the Susquehanna River Basin compact, enacting the same into law thereby making the United States a signatory party, mak-

ing certain reservations on behalf of the United States, and for related purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.J. Res. 610. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a national preferential primary election to select candidates for the office of the President and Vice President and to provide for the election of the President and Vice President by the popular vote of the people of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H. Con. Res. 189. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 190. Concurrent resolution recognizing the courage of Apollo 8 astronauts and the appropriateness of their expressions of faith in Almighty God on their moon-circling mission, and encouraging the President of the United States and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to allow similar freedoms on future space flights; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 349. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. ALBERT, Mr. MILLS, Mr. RIVERS, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. MADDEN, Mr. MORGAN, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. HAYS, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. EDMONDSON, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. SISK, Mr. DENT, Mr. McFALL, Mr. ULLMAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. MATSUNAGA, and Mr. PEPPER):

H. Res. 350. Resolution to create a Select Committee on the Bureau of the Budget; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

94. By Mr. ALBERT: Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the Congress to repeal all recently passed legislation which restricts the constitutional right of a citizen to keep and bear arms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

95. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, relative to the interest rate of Federal moneys utilized for water-related projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

96. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Massachusetts, relative to oil imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9662. A bill for the relief of Josephat Ahing; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9663. A bill for the relief of the city of Port Allen, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 9664. A bill to provide for the advancement in grade of a certain officer in the U.S. Air Force Reserve; to the Committee on the Armed Services.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9665. A bill for the relief of Angero and Theophilos Kamperides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9666. A bill for the relief of Dr. Toshiyuki Ando; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9667. A bill for the relief of Enrique G. Balart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9668. A bill for the relief of Fernando Domenicale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9669. A bill for the relief of Enzo Enrico Bertoldi, his wife, Teresa Bertoldi, and their daughter, Maria Bertoldi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9670. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe La Placa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9671. A bill for the relief of Daniel Brower; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9672. A bill for the relief of Georgina Infantino and son, Giovanni Infantino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9673. A bill for the relief of Dr. Tai Chung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

83. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the narcotics and drugs traffic at the Mexican border, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE—Thursday, March 27, 1969

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

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

Eternal Father, we thank Thee for the world about us, and for that deeper world within us which Thou hast made for Thy habitation. Remove from our lives all that corrupts or tarnishes the divine image or that is alien to Thee, may Thy spirit indwell and reign over us.

We thank Thee that once in the man of Nazareth Thou didst enter our fleet-

ing life and make the pilgrimage in human flesh from the manger to the cross and beyond. And by Him and through Him we know the way we ought to journey. Grant us then a measure of His spirit that we may think as He thought, work as He worked, live as He lived, serve as He served, for the welfare of this Nation and the betterment of all mankind.

In His name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 26, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on today, March 27, 1969, the President had approved and signed the act

(S. 1058) to extend the period within which the President may transmit to the Congress plans for reorganization of agencies of the executive branch of the Government.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Monday next, March 31, 1969.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following the close of business today until noon on Monday, March 31, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives, and that it be ordered that such messages be referred to the appropriate committees.

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

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following the close of business today until noon on Monday, March 31, 1969, all committees be authorized to file their reports, including minority, supplemental, additional, and individual views.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

The bill clerk read the nomination of Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The bill clerk read the nomination of John A. Nevius to be a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency.

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

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

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

U.S. ARMY

The bill clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut to be lieutenant general.

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

U.S. NAVY

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

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Department of the Treasury.

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

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

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

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

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

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The bill clerk read the nomination of John A. Hanna, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

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

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United Nations representatives.

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

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

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—IN THE MARINE CORPS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 8508) to increase the public debt limit set forth in section 21

of the Second Liberty Bond Act, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 337) to increase the maximum rate of per diem allowance for employees of the Government traveling on official business, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to authorize the payment of the expenses of preparing and transporting to his home or place of interment the remains of a Federal employee who dies while performing official duties in Alaska or Hawaii, and for other purposes, which (with an accompanying paper) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a telegram from the Governor of the State of Alaska, informing the Senate that he had signed Senate Joint Resolution 29 of that legislature, recommending the confirmation of Charles Meacham as Commissioner of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PERCY:

S. 1701. A bill to remove the limitations on the rates of interest or investment yield on Government savings bonds; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. PERCY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1702. A bill for the relief of Nicola Galotto;

S. 1703. A bill for the relief of Rosa Pintabona; and

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of Lillian Blazzo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. McCLELLAN):

S. 1705. A bill to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of eighteen years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. GOLDWATER, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COOK, Mr. DOLE, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. McCLELLAN, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota):

S. 1706. A bill to strengthen the antiob-

scenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce, to establish the Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1707. A bill to establish a Commission on Government Procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON):

S. 1708. A bill to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. JACKSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Dr. Shean-Ming Liu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1710. A bill to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. MONDALE when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1711. A bill to establish the position of court executive in the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

S. 1712. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Western District of Missouri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. SYMINGTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 1713. A bill for the relief of Florentino Adona, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1714. A bill to amend titles 10 and 32, United States Code, to authorize additional medical and dental care and other related benefits for reservists and members of the National Guard, under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. MONTROYA):

S. 1715. A bill for the relief of Kong Wing Sik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RANDOLPH (for himself and Mr. BYRD of West Virginia):

S. 1716. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1717. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. YARBOROUGH when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HANSEN:

S. 1718. A bill to provide for the conveyance to the city of Cheyenne, Wyo., of certain real property of the United States heretofore donated to the United States by such city; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS):

S. 1719. A bill to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HATFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1720. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize certain reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 1721. A bill to promote the orderly adjustment of tobacco production and marketing; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1722. A bill for the relief of Nam Minh Doan Bouchard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. BROOKE when he introduced the first above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1723. A bill for the relief of Yan Sin Po, Tsang Kwai Yau, Ling Shing, Yung Wah Hap, and Li Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1724. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hussain I Saba, and his wife, Dr. Sabiha R. Saba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1701—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO RAISE INTEREST RATES ON U.S. SAVINGS BONDS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I am introducing proposed legislation today to raise the interest rates on savings bonds to reflect actual market rates of interest.

Millions of Americans have invested in savings bonds over the years in the faith that the Government would deal fairly with them. This faith has been betrayed in recent years as inflation has driven the cost of living up above the 4¼-percent yield of series E savings bonds. Inflation was at a 4.5-percent rate in 1968; thus, a savings bond holder failed to even match the cost-of-living increase by one-quarter of 1 percent. The larger investor who can afford to invest in units of \$1,000 can avoid this problem as the Treasury will pay competitive market rates of interest for his money. The investor in savings bonds is actually losing money at current rates of interest.

Present rates of interest on U.S. savings bonds are clearly unfair. They are not good investments. Their interest yield should be raised. By depositing funds in savings and loan associations, an investor can obtain 4¾ percent to 5¼ percent or even more in some cases.

An investor with over \$1,000 can buy 3-month Treasury bills which currently have more than a 6-percent return. Or he can invest in Federal Agencies bills

which last week returned a yield of 6.38 percent.

The increase in "E" bond interest rate last year from 4.15 percent to 4.25 percent does not in any way compensate for the rapid increase in inflation which erodes those yields.

The legislation I am introducing today will permit the Secretary of the Treasury to set interest rates on savings bonds at a level consistent with market rates of interest. The small investor should no longer be asked to lose money on his Government investments but should be able to obtain interest yields more commensurate with those who have larger sums to place in other investments.

Many business leaders have informed me they have pangs of conscience in trying to persuade their employees to buy savings bonds as they know they are asking their employees to put money in an uncompetitive investment.

Many Americans have invested in savings bonds as a convenient way to save with the faith that their investment would remain sound. Let us help keep these investments sound by raising interest rates on series E savings bonds to a fair market level.

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

The bill (S. 1701) to remove the limitations on the rates of interest or investment yield on Government savings bonds, introduced by Mr. PERCY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S.1705 AND S. 1706—INTRODUCTION OF ANTI-OBSCENITY BILLS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills designed to further protect minors against the harmful effects stemming from distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails and by means of interstate commerce.

Before introducing these bills it may be helpful to clarify the nature of the problem to which the bills are addressed. In this connection we need to recognize the magnitude of the problem and clearly understand the harmful consequences which flow from it.

Mr. President, we are confronted with a serious nationwide problem represented by an uninhibited traffic in smut conducted by unscrupulous individuals. This traffic utilizes mail and the instruments of interstate commerce to invade the privacy of homes with unwanted, obnoxious, obscene materials. This traffic has intruded into small towns and hamlets and even public schools throughout the Nation. Much of this traffic involves high school students and has become so widespread that J. Edgar Hoover has said that it amounts to "a wholesale invasion of America's schoolyards and playgrounds." In support of that conclusion, U.S. postal officials estimate that over \$500 million worth of obscene material is sold to youth through the mail each year.

Mr. President, these facts indicate the magnitude of the problem. Now let us consider some of the harmful effects which can reasonably be attributed to this unrestrained traffic in smut and obscenity.

In the March 1968 FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, Mr. Hoover said:

The publication and sale of obscene material is big business in America today . . . It is impossible to estimate the amount of harm to impressionable teenagers and to assess the volume of sex crimes attributable to pornography, but its influence is extensive.

Sexual violence is increasing at an alarming pace. Many parents are deeply concerned about conditions which involve young boys and girls in sex parties and illicit relations . . . Pornography in all its forms, is one major cause of sex crimes, sexual aberrations and perversions.

Substantial evidence is available to indicate a direct relationship between the shocking increase in youthful crime and violence and the corresponding increase in the volume of traffic in pornography. The effects are measurable in the increased involvement of youth in serious crimes such as criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny, and automobile theft.

There is yet another aspect of the problem. Federal, State, and local anti-obscenity laws are in a large measure ineffective due to current disarray and uncertainty in the law occasioned by U.S. Supreme Court decisions in the area of anti-obscenity legislation. State legislatures do not know, and the U.S. Supreme Court has not stated with an essential degree of certainty, what legislative regulations of the trade will be permitted. Obviously, something less than unanimity of opinion exists among members of the Supreme Court.

However, since obscenity is not protected by the first amendment of the Constitution and since Congress has an unquestioned power to protect the public interest in this area, and particularly as it relates to interstate commerce and use of U.S. mail, there would seem to be compelling reasons for Congress to take the initiative and tackle the problem. We can enact legislation consistent with Supreme Court standards to the extent that such standards can be ascertained and we can also go on record with an expression of unequivocal intent to suppress illegal traffic in obscenity.

Mr. President, we recognize that the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography created by Congress last year can contribute much information and opinion of value to Congress. Its investigations, presentations of fact, conclusions, and recommendations will doubtless prove helpful when completed and presented to Congress some time in 1970. We believe, however, that creation of the Commission was not intended to be an equivalent to a moratorium or a ceasefire in the war waged against this evil. To the contrary, we believe that at this time a clear-cut indication by Congress of a determination to eradicate this pox on the body politic would provide the Commission with needed guidance and encouragement. Certainly a refinement of existing Federal anti-obscenity laws is needed and will prove helpful to law enforcement personnel on the State and Federal levels. More importantly, congressional concern for evil influences of obscene materials upon the youth of our Nation cannot, in my judgment, safely be shelved or postponed until 1970 or 1971.

Mr. President, with the above considerations in mind, I now introduce the first of two anti-obscenity bills.

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

The bill (S. 1705) to prohibit the dissemination through interstate commerce or the mails of materials harmful to persons under the age of 18 years, and to restrict the exhibition of movies or other presentations harmful to such persons, introduced by Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. McCLELLAN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the first bill is a companion bill to H.R. 5171 introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman CHARLES E. BENNETT, of the Third District of Florida, with 40 cosponsors. This bill is patterned after a New York State statute, the provisions of which were upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case of *Ginsberg v. United States* (383 U.S. 629).

In substance this bill makes it unlawful for any person knowingly to sell, offer for sale, or deliver in interstate commerce or through mails certain materials to minors. The bill states with clarity and preciseness the nature of proscribed materials and sets forth legal criteria for judging the harmfulness of such material. The criteria provided has been approved by the U.S. Supreme Court in the *Ginsberg* case.

In addition, the bill provides that the Supreme Court and the courts of appeals of the United States shall not have jurisdiction to review any factual determination made in Federal district courts on the question of materials considered harmful to minors.

At this point, Mr. President, it is necessary that we briefly comment on the last provision. I personally believe that Congress has the power, in proper cases, to limit or exclude U.S. Supreme Court jurisdiction as it relates to the procedural right to review on appeal determinations of factual issues made in State and in Federal district courts. Moreover, I believe that there is a genuine need for Congress to impose such limitations in cases involving issues arising from enforcement of State and local laws against obscenity and in other areas involving the exercise of police powers of State governments.

In summary, I wholeheartedly agree that the jurisdictional provision of section 2 of this bill is valid and an appropriate exercise of power by Congress.

On the other hand, we are dealing with Federal laws and not State laws and while a strong case can be made for limiting appellate jurisdiction in this case, we are persuaded that the purpose of this bill can be accomplished without the added precaution represented by the jurisdictional provision. Moreover, we are concerned that a confrontation on the jurisdictional issue might needlessly jeopardize adequate consideration of the main features of the bill.

These considerations are offered in explanation of the second anti-obscenity bill which I now introduce on behalf of myself, and Senators GOLDWATER, BENNETT, COOK, DOLE, FANNIN, GURNEY, HANSEN, MANSFIELD, McCLELLAN, MUNDT, RANDOLPH, SPARKMAN, STEVENS, TAL-

MADGE, THURMOND, TOWER, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

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

The bill (S. 1706) to strengthen the antiobscenity laws in order to protect minors against the distribution or sale of obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce, to establish the Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes introduced by Mr. ALLEN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ALLEN. This second bill, Mr. President, retains the substantive provisions of the first bill. However, it deletes the procedural provision relating to appellate jurisdiction. This important deletion is not the only difference between the bills. The bill now under consideration supplements the first in several other important particulars. For one thing we believe that the nature and magnitude of the problem suggests the desirability of extraordinary law enforcement efforts by the Department of Justice. We suggest the need for "war on obscenity" to be conducted with the same fervor and same degree of Executive concern as demonstrated in the "war on poverty."

With this last object in mind, the instant bill establishes a Division of Obscenity Control in the Department of Justice. The Division is charged with the responsibility of administration of Federal antiobscenity statutes throughout the United States and in the District of Columbia, and it is charged with responsibility for providing technical assistance to the States and local governments in the administration of their laws relating to the illegal trade in obscene matter. In addition the Division shall conduct nationwide education and information programs on obscenity and its serious consequences.

Mr. President, we can do better in the area of law enforcement of existing antiobscenity laws. We have the know-how, the intelligence, and the resources to stamp out this monstrous evil in our midst. What is needed is a determination, a commitment, a marshaling of resources and talents under competent leadership and supervision to meet this challenge. Such is the purpose of the Division of Obscenity contemplated by the last-mentioned provision.

There are other differences in the revised bill which are designed to strengthen and expand the scope of the criminal provisions. The revised version includes a provision designed to reach individuals who might print, publish, create, or manufacture proscribed materials harmful to minors and it establishes procedures for mailing certain materials which might be harmful to minors. Among other things, the prescribed procedure requires a signed receipt indicating the age of the addressee as a condition of delivery by the Post Office.

Provisions are also included in this bill to recognize an exception for materials disseminated to persons or institutions having scientific, educational, or other special justifications for possession of such material and a provision which de-

finer the term "interstate commerce" as used for purposes of this law. These are major differences. There are also minor differences of a nature designed to meet what we consider to be valid technical objections to the first bill.

Mr. President, we believe that the bills under discussion form the basis for effecting a compromise which hopefully can gather support sufficient for enactment of a new law in this area. We are encouraged in this belief by reason of the long standing and continuing concern of the Senate with the problem of obscenity and by reason of the careful study already given the subject by many Senators. Furthermore, we believe that support of the instant bill may be significant not only as a reflection of geographic representation indicating the pervasiveness of the problem but also as an indication of a general desire to reconcile differences in approaches and to hammer out a new antiobscenity law.

Mr. President, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) has been most generous with helpful suggestions and encouragement in preparation of the revised bill. A debt of gratitude is owed to him for his determination and dedication to the worthy cause of providing a solution to this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be printed in the RECORD.

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

The statement of Mr. GOLDWATER is as follows:

Today Senator Allen and I, together with 17 other Senators, offer a bill which I believe this country needs and demands in order to protect our youth from the degrading, outrageous filth which is being sent through the mails and other channels of interstate commerce.

In short, our bill will make it unlawful to pander obscene materials through the mails or interstate commerce to children or to produce such materials knowing or intending they will be so disseminated to children. Further, it will place all Federal enforcement powers regarding obscenity into one division of the Department of Justice.

Mr. President, I believe this bill is in response to a national menace. To me the present situation represents a clear and present danger to the American people. The exposure of minors to the kind of trash that is being sent through the mails and other means of commerce can only result in the impairment of the ethical and moral development of our youth.

As far as the citizens of my State are concerned, there must be prompt and effective action taken at the highest levels of Government to stop the purveying of obscenity to minors. There is something terribly wrong in this land, when in a single morning's mail I have received as many as six letters from parents and concerned citizens of my State who plead that steps be taken to eliminate the unsolicited smut being sent to their homes through the mail.

Mr. President, I believe there is one decisive action we can take to answer the American public—and that is to pass a strong new law aimed squarely at the protection of minors. Strangely enough, there is no such law now on the books.

There is no question that the Government has an interest and an obligation to protect the welfare of our children. To this end our bill has been prepared with deliberation. We realize the measure must be strong to suc-

ceed in its purpose. But at the same time it must be safeguarded against the attacks of those knee-jerk civil libertarians who will see more social value in the output of smut-makers than in the protection of minors from exposure to materials which are undermining to their normal development.

Mr. President, every effort has been made to make this measure Constitutional. The United States Supreme Court has offered a guide in a recent decision upholding a statute of New York State designed to protect minors from obscene matter. This case, *Ginsberg v. New York*, 390 U.S. 629 (1968) has served as an aid in framing our bill. Also, the bill is patterned after the provisions of a revised law adopted by Congress only sixteen months ago for the District of Columbia (D.C. Code 22-2001). Thus, most of the provisions of our bill have already been tested and approved in the courts and by the Congress.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention to one feature of the bill which we believe is original and is likely to offer a very practical means to prevent obscene materials from reaching children. Due to the problem that some persons will be able to evade the purposes of the law because of the difficulty of proving that they knowingly sent obscenity to a child, we determined that some of the burden should be shifted to the purveyors of filth to keep their trash out of the hands of minors. Therefore, our bill includes the requirement that any publisher or seller who knows or has reasonable cause to know that any matter which he intends to mail is obscene and harmful to minors must indicate on the cover of such mail that the contents are harmful if exposed to minors. This provision further requires that any matter sent through the mails which shows such an indication shall not be delivered unless the postman obtains a receipt signed by an adult. Of course, there will be no penalty inflicted on the mailman in case he should make a mistake.

But the purveyor of filth will be guilty if he sends prohibited material through the mails in unmarked containers. On the other hand, if the sender does use the required indication, the matter will not be delivered indiscriminately to whomever opens the mail first, but will only be handed over in person by the mailman to an adult.

Hopefully, any adult receiving such material—which likely was unsolicited in the first place—will destroy it. At the very least, he will be able to keep it away from any minors in his family. As a further step, he will be in a position to notify his post office that all mail with such a marking is objectionable and should not be delivered at all to his residence. I should point out that nothing in this provision will make lawful any conduct which is otherwise prohibited. If the seller "knowingly" mails obscene matter directly to a minor he will be guilty of violating the major purpose of the law whether or not he indicates that the matter is harmful. Or if a seller forwards matter in the mails which is obscene both to minors and adults, he will run afoul of the criminal code regardless of whether the cover included a warning to children.

Mr. President, I believe there are precedents for this type of provision in many areas of the law. For one, the Gun Control Act of 1968 requires that firearms cannot be sold to anyone who does not appear in person at the dealer's place of business unless the dealer first forwards a prescribed statement by registered or certified mail with a return receipt requested to the chief local law enforcement officer. The parallel is clear. In both cases an additional burden is imposed on the seller because of the over-riding interest of the Congress in protecting the public safety. Consequently, lest any weeping towels be brought out because of the slight fee the makers and purveyors of smut will have to pay as handling charges to the

postal service, I point out that the procedure is clearly reasonable in light of the objectives of our bill and is a practice that Congress has used before. As to the requirement that a designation be made to identify the nature of the contents, we are all familiar with precedents such as the laws which require warning messages on the labels of cigarettes and notices on the face of advertisements that look like bills but in fact are only offers to sell.

Mr. President, in summary I urge that action be taken on legislation along these lines as soon as possible. If anyone wishes this problem to be studied further, I make an appeal to pass this law or one with a similar purpose first and then to focus any study on ways to strengthen the law or add to it. The American people deserve the most effective laws we can conceive to eliminate this danger to our youth. We must act now.

S. 1708—INTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL LANDS FOR PARKS AND RECREATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Federal Lands for Parks and Recreation Act of 1969.

The purpose of this measure is to make surplus Federal property available to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at prices which reflect the important role recreation and open spaces play in our contemporary life. This bill is in accord with and in furtherance of our longstanding national policy as expressed in the land and water conservation fund and other measures designed to encourage State and local governments to acquire and develop lands for parks and outdoor recreation.

This bill is of special importance to many of our major metropolitan areas where the need for parks and open spaces is greatly increasing while at the same time the limited land available is being dedicated to other, often incompatible, purposes. If we are to improve the quality of life and surroundings for the residents of our major cities, we will have to take advantage of every future opportunity to acquire land adjacent to where people live for recreational and park purposes.

In spite of our longstanding national policy to encourage and assist State and local governments in the acquisition of open spaces we are not coming close to meeting the need. A recent report of the National League of Cities on "Recreation in the Nation's Cities: Problems and Approaches" concludes:

Land acquisition (for parks and recreation facilities) has become difficult, if not impossible, in most of the Nation's cities. Except in outlying areas land is very scarce and even in outlying areas it is extremely valuable. Even when there is land available the need for new acreage far outstrips available funds.

As a result of the high price of potential park and recreation areas which are located where they are needed most—where the people are—many cities are unable to meet the demand. The League of Cities report notes, for example, that San Antonio, Tex., a city of 722,000 people has been able to acquire an average of only 6 acres of park land per year between 1945 and 1961. It is estimated that

170 acres should have been added each year if the needs of city residents were to be met. This same picture of inadequate revenues to meet the public need for open space is repeated in city after city.

One way to meet this need for city parks and recreation areas is to take advantage of every available opportunity to see that appropriate parcels of surplus Federal property are dedicated to the highest and best use of the American public. The crowding, the congestion and the growing pressures of modern life make it clear that one of the highest and best uses of land in the last one-third of the 20th century is for parks and open spaces.

Today, there are over 30 million acres of land presently held in fee ownership and used by the Department of Defense alone. Periodically, portions of this property are declared surplus. Many of these surplus military installations are located in or near major metropolitan areas and afford a great opportunity for urban park and recreational complexes. Surplus property held by other departments of the Federal Government afford similar opportunities.

Mr. President, passage of the measure I propose today will make it possible for the Congress to insure that the States and units of local government in this Nation have a chance—a financially realistic chance—to acquire these lands for park and recreational purposes.

The Federal Lands for Parks and Recreation Act of 1969 would amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act by providing that for a period of 5 years after the date of enactment, surplus Federal property could be conveyed to State and local governments for park and recreational use at less than the 50 percent of fair-market value required under present law.

The bill provides three methods by which a State or its political subdivision may acquire surplus Federal property for park and recreational purposes. First, if the State or its political subdivision originally donated the property to the Federal Government, it may be reacquired at no cost. Second, the property may be acquired at the purchase price which the Federal Government paid for the property. Third, where the State or its political subdivision so elects, surplus property may be acquired at 0 to 50 percent of fair-market value. The price is to be determined on the basis of standards relating to suitability, accessibility, need and the highest and best use of the property.

One of the most significant features of this measure is that it does not require the use of condemnation powers. As a result, it provides a means whereby needed open space may be made available without having to move people out of established neighborhoods.

Mr. President, I became aware of the urgent need for legislation on this subject when it became apparent that Fort Lawton—a military installation of over 1,100 acres in the city of Seattle—would soon be declared surplus to Federal needs. Acquisition of this area by the city for park and recreation purposes is in the

national interest. The problem Seattle and many other units of local government face, however, is that paying 50 percent of fair-market value may be financially impossible. This is especially true when the property is located in or near a major metropolitan area and the land appraisals are based on commercial, industrial or high density residential development.

The problem posed is national in scope. The Citizens Advisory Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty recommended that legislative action be taken in its June 1968 annual report to the President and to the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty. The Citizens Committee stated at page 5 of the report:

OUTDOOR RECREATION AND FEDERAL SURPLUS LANDS

Each year vast amounts of land become surplus to the operating needs of the Federal government. Some of the land is disposed of through sale to public or private entities while other acreages are held for future disposition. We are interested in assuring that the public outdoor recreational needs will be served in the sale or disposition of these lands, and that the eventual use of such lands is compatible with the land use plans and objectives of the public jurisdiction in that area. We recommend that the Administration seek legislation to permit the disposal of surplus lands at no cost to public bodies for park and recreation purposes. We recommend that, where possible, military lands be made available for public outdoor recreational use.

Enactment of this legislation would benefit every State and every area of the country which has Federal property and installations which may someday be surplus to Federal needs. It is imperative that we act and act now to insure that these lands are available for public use.

As Members of the Senate are aware, under the provisions of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act the proceeds from the sale of surplus Federal real property are paid into the fund for use by Federal, State, and local government for recreational land acquisition and development. My bill would result in some reduction in revenues paid into the fund. This small reduction would, however, be offset many times by the value of new park and recreational lands made directly available to the Nation. Very often, the sale price realized from many of these properties is relatively small when compared with the overall receipts to the land and water fund. To local government, however, the 50-percent-of-fair-market-value requirement under present law can be too much for overextended and limited budgets. When this is the case, the land may be forever lost to public use.

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

Mr. President, it is my understanding that a report entitled "Utilization and Disposition of Federal Lands for Recreation" was prepared last summer which also recommends legislation on this subject. This report was prepared by the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty at the request of the

Vice President of the United States, who serves as Chairman of the Council.

This report has not been released and I do not know what specific legislative recommendations it proposes. I would, however, urge Vice President AGNEW to release the report and to see that the administration's proposed legislation be transmitted so that it may be considered together with my bill.

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

The bill (S. 1708) to amend title I of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JACKSON (for himself and Mr. MAGNUSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1708

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

SEC. 2. Section 2(b) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 (78 Stat. 897), as amended (effective March 31, 1970, Section 2(b) becomes Section 2(a) pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 90-401, July 15, 1968), is further amended by deleting the last sentence and adding the following new paragraphs:

"Provided, however, that notwithstanding the provisions of the Surplus Property Act of 1944, as amended, and the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, States and their political subdivisions shall have the right, for a period of five years from the date of enactment of this Act, to acquire from the United States surplus Federal real and personal property for park and recreation purposes by the following methods:

(1) Where the State or its political subdivision originally donated the property to the United States, the surplus Federal property may be reacquired at no cost;

(2) Where the United States paid valuable consideration for the property to the State, its political subdivisions, an association, or to an individual, the State or its political subdivision may acquire the surplus Federal property at the original cost of purchase; or

(3) Where a State or its political subdivision so elects, it may acquire surplus Federal property at 0 to 50 percent of the fair-market value as determined by the General Services Administration in accordance with the recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior based on the following standards:

(i) the suitability of the property for park and recreational uses;

(ii) the accessibility of the property to major population centers;

(iii) the need for park and recreational facilities in the immediate geographical area;

(iv) the highest and best use of the property taking into consideration the need of future generations for parks, open spaces and recreational opportunities.

The Secretary of the Interior is directed to prepare and publish guidelines and regulations for implementing these standards in making the price discount determinations set out in this section.

Except as provided in this section, nothing in this Act shall affect existing laws or regulations concerning disposal of real or personal surplus Federal property to schools, hospitals, States and their political subdivisions.

S. 1710—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO DONATE CERTAIN LANDS TO THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE, WHITE EARTH INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am today reintroducing legislation which I first introduced on May 23, 1967. This bill, identical to S. 1830 of the 90th Congress, restores to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Reservation, certain submarginal lands of the United States and makes such lands part of the reservation. These properties consist of approximately 28,700 acres purchased by the Federal Government during the mid-1930's under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act. The lands were so acquired in order to retire them from private ownership, to correct maladjustments in land use, and with the expectation that they would be made available for tribal use.

Mr. President, these lands were originally owned by the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. Unfortunately, they were allotted under the allotment act and subsequently passed from Indian ownership. The Government acquired the lands at a cost of \$175,664. In 1963, when similar legislation was introduced in the Congress, their market value was placed at \$474,000 by appropriate governmental agencies.

Similar legislation has already been enacted, Mr. President, restoring property to the Seminoles of Florida and to the Pueblos and other tribes in New Mexico. I am, therefore, most hopeful that this legislation will receive favorable consideration during the present session. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1710) to donate to the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Indian Reservation, some submarginal lands of the United States, and to make such lands parts of the reservation involved; introduced by Mr. MONDALE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1710

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States of America in the lands, and the improvements thereon, that were acquired under title II of the National Industrial Recovery Act of June 16, 1933 (48 Stat. 200), the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 115), and section 55 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 750, 781), and that are now under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior for the administration of the benefit of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe, White Earth Reservation, are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for this Indian tribe, and the lands shall be parts of the reservation heretofore established for the tribe.

SEC. 2. Nothing in this Act shall deprive any person of any right of possession contract right, interest, or title he may have in the land involved.

SEC. 3. The Indian Claims Commission is directed to determine in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 13, 1946 (60 Stat. 1050), the extent to which the value of the title conveyed by this Act should or should not be set off against any claim against the United States determined by the Commission.

S. 1712—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE APPOINTMENT OF AN ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in my own behalf and that of my colleague, Senator EAGLETON, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for an additional Federal judge for the western district of Missouri.

The U.S. Judicial Conference has recognized the need for an additional Federal judge in the eastern district of Missouri. However, because of an unfortunate series of circumstances, consideration was not given to the approved recommendation for an additional judge for the western district of Missouri by the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit.

It is my understanding that an additional judge in the western district is justified by the workload experience of that district, and this is, of course, reflected by the request of the Judicial Council of the Eighth Circuit.

I support the provision in S. 952 for an additional Federal judge for the eastern district of Missouri as well as an additional judge for the western district of Missouri, as provided under the terms of the separate bill we introduce today.

I would hope for early and favorable action in this Congress.

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

The bill (S. 1712) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the Western District of Missouri, introduced by Mr. SYMINGTON (for himself and Mr. EAGLETON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1719—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING JUST COMPENSATION IN FEDERAL CONDEMNATION CASES

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the measure is to give full effect to the provision of the fifth amendment of the U.S. Constitution, ensuring that private property shall not be taken for public use without just compensation. The bill seeks to correct a longstanding inequity by making available to defendants certain legal resources commensurate in degree to those of the Government.

Currently, in Federal land condemnation proceedings, the owner of condemned property who believes the proffered price to be less than his estimate of the value of the property must, after other measures fail, go to court to have the fair value determined. The costs of bringing this legal action are borne by the property holder alone. Thus, even if a court determines that the land in question is more valuable than the Government offer indicated, the property owner must assume the costs of the litigation. His judgment then is discounted by the costs which he has incurred in pursuit of his constitutional right to just compensation.

For a small property owner, assuming costs of attorneys' and appraisers' fees may effectively preclude pursuit of legal remedy. Even if the remedy is pursued, the costs may prove especially burdensome. An individual who owns a small tract of land—which he values at \$5,700 or \$5,800—may be offered only \$5,000 by the Government. If the property holder decides to take the case to court and wins, he is then saddled with considerable fees for an attorney and professional appraisers. These costs may well exceed the difference between his estimate and the Government's estimate of the property's value. The result is that the landowner, who has valiantly protected the value of his property, ultimately receives less than fair compensation for his property. The net receipt to the landowner, then, is the fair value of the property minus legal and other fees—expenses incurred solely in order to prove that the Government was wrong and parsimonious in its offer.

Not only is the end result unfair. Throughout the proceedings the Government has an unjust advantage in attempting to convince property holders to accept the initial offer. Government officials can argue that the legal and other costs incurred by the landowner in court action would bring no appreciable financial benefit. Yet to better insure justice, the Government's offer should stand on its own financial merits; the condemnor should not have the added coercive advantage which now exists.

Further, the landowner must not only use his own resources to defend against an apparently inadequate offer, but he is faced with the prospect that the Government may simply drop its condemnation proceedings after court action has begun. This results generally from the fact that the Government can, after reassessing the situation, decide that the need for the land is not as great as initially presumed. The landowner, again, is the ultimate loser; he must still pay legal and other fees incurred up until that point. He keeps his land, but has suffered substantially from the Government's action. For this governmental wrong, no remedy now exists.

Mr. President, the bill which I have introduced provides that the costs and expenses incurred by the defendant in legal action shall be paid by the U.S. Government, if it is determined that just compensation for the landowner's interest exceeds by 10 percent the maximum amount offered by the United

States before the institution of the action. The measure also provides that where the United States dismisses the action before the judgment, the court is to enter judgment requiring the United States to pay the defendant landowner a sum equal to the costs and expenses incurred.

This legislation benefits from and draws upon the successful experience of Oregon legislation dealing with condemnation proceedings. Oregon statutes provide that in land condemnation cases property owners can recover reasonable attorneys' fees as determined by the court. These fees are recovered if the jury makes an award higher than the initial Government offer. Because of this legal remedy the guarantee of just compensation is thus better insured. The Federal Government, Mr. President, must similarly insure this protection.

Considerable support for this measure has come from the Oregon bar. The bill's predecessor, introduced in the 89th Congress, enjoyed the support of the board of governors of the Oregon State bar, the judicial committee of the Oregon State bar, the Bar Association of Union and Lane Counties, and others.

It is my feeling that this bill, if enacted, would guarantee that the protection of just compensation would be truly secured. I urge its prompt enactment.

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

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

The bill (S. 1719) to provide for the payment of reasonable costs, expenses and attorneys' fees to defendants in actions by the United States for the condemnation of real property after determination of the amount of just compensation, or after abandonment of such actions by the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. TYDINGS), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1719

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 161 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 2415. Actions for the condemnation or taking of real property

"(a) If, in any action brought by the United States for the acquisition of any interest in real property through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, it is determined that just compensation for such interest exceeds the maximum amount offered by the United States for such interest before the institution of that action, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the United States with respect to that interest shall provide for the payment to the defendant having the title to that interest of (1) the amount determined to constitute just compensation for that interest, and (2) a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by such defendant incident to that action: *Provided*, That no payment for costs and expenses shall be made unless the judgment awarded exceeds the

maximum amount offered by the United States before the institution of the action by ten percent. If, after the institution of any such action, the United States dismisses such action before compensation has been determined and paid, or such action is dismissed upon motion of the defendant having title to that interest for failure of prosecution of such action, the court shall enter in that action, upon application made by such defendant, judgment requiring the payment by the United States to such defendant of a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by such defendant incident to that action.

"(b) If, in any such action brought by the United States with respect to any interest in real property, it is determined that the United States is without lawful authority to acquire that interest through the exercise of any power of eminent domain, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the defendant shall provide for the payment to the defendant by the United States of a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by the defendant incident to that action.

"(c) If, in any action brought against the United States for the recovery of just compensation for the taking of any interest in real property, it is determined that such taking occurred without a tender of compensation to the plaintiff for such interest or that just compensation for the interest taken exceeds the maximum amount tendered to the plaintiff for such interest by or on behalf of the United States before the institution of that action, any judgment entered in that action in favor of the plaintiff with respect to that interest shall provide for the payment to the plaintiff of (1) the amount determined to constitute just compensation for that interest, and (2) a sum equal to the aggregate amount of the costs and expenses incurred by the plaintiff incident to that action: *Provided*, That where a tender has been made to the plaintiff for such interest by or on behalf of the United States before the institution of action, no payment for costs and expenses shall be made unless the judgment awarded exceeds the maximum amount offered by the United States before the institution of the action by ten percent.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'United States' means the United States Government, any department, agency, instrumentality, or officer thereof, and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States Government; and

"(2) the term 'expenses' includes, but is not limited to, expenses reasonably incurred for appraisal and other expert services incident to the preparation and trial of a civil action, and a reasonable attorney's fee incurred incident to the preparation and trial of such action and the review of any judgment or decree entered therein, as determined by the court in that action."

(b) The chapter analysis of such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"2415. Actions for the condemnation or taking of real property."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective with respect to all actions brought on and after the first day of the third month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act (1) by or on behalf of any department, agency, instrumentality, or officer of the United States or any corporation owned or controlled by the United States Government for the acquisition of any interest in real property through the exercise of the power of eminent domain, or (2) by any party for the recovery of just compensation for the taking of any interest in real property by or on behalf of any such department, agency, instrumentality, officer, or corporation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor with the distin-

guished senior Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) a bill to provide the payment of costs and fees of litigants in certain property condemnation proceedings.

This bill is similar, in large measure, to S. 1351, introduced during the 90th Congress by Senators MORSE and HATFIELD. That bill would have allowed payment of reasonable costs, expenses, and attorneys' fees by the Government to defendants in condemnation actions brought by the United States, if the defendant was awarded any judgment in excess of the Government's initial offer.

The Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery held hearings on this bill on April 5 and May 7, 1968, and heard representatives of the American Bar Association, various Oregon attorneys, and other interested parties. During the course of these hearings concern was expressed that S. 1351, as introduced, had the potential of stimulating litigation and causing expense to the Government in cases where the ultimate jury award was not substantially greater than the last Government offer. Under these circumstances, even though the Government's offer might be reasonable, an intransigent property owner could resist condemnation, win a jury verdict only a few dollars more than the best Government offer, and, under S. 1351, receive all expenses of litigation.

The main thrust of this legislation is to protect the just compensation provisions of the fifth amendment to the Constitution and to protect a property owner from being forced to accept an unreasonable offer by the Government because of the weight of expenses attached to defending a land condemnation suit. It is not meant to stimulate needless litigation. Consequently, I, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, suggested that the Government be liable for reasonable costs and attorneys' fees only when the jury award exceeded by 10 percent the amount offered by the United States prior to suit. Such a provision will assure that this legislation will not stimulate needless litigation but will protect the just compensation of a litigant whose property has been grossly undervalued by the Government. I am pleased that Senator HATFIELD has adopted this 10-percent provision in the bill he introduces today.

This legislation is needed and will correct a serious deficiency in existing law. It will not only better assure the protection of just compensation, but it will encourage the Government to make a fair offer initially in order to avoid the costs of litigation. It will give the property owner an opportunity to secure a more equitable price for his property through negotiation than he would have obtained previously. I commend the distinguished Senator from Oregon on his introduction of this legislation and look forward to working with him to secure its passage.

S. 1720—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I am deeply concerned by the initial decision of the

Civil Aeronautics Board hearing examiner with respect to standby youth fares. If accepted by the Board, his recommendation to eliminate these fares would have a very detrimental effect on the Nation and on my own State of Hawaii. I believe that such fares provide vast benefits to our youth in terms of education experience and safety; they also strengthen our domestic airline industry.

The hearing examiner has recommended that these reduced rates should be discontinued because they are "unjustly discriminatory." His recommendation to the CAB is understandable in light of a recent circuit court ruling that these fares were unjustly discriminatory under existing law and remanded the case to the CAB for a decision not inconsistent with that court's ruling.

I believe the court interpreted the law under too narrow a construction. I concur with the CAB position in its argument before the circuit court that all factors related to the tariff, such as competition, public welfare, public safety, and airline profit have a bearing on whether this rate is unjustly discriminatory.

Let me review some of the reasons that I feel are important in considering the value of these fares.

One of the major factors the examiner did not emphasize in his initial decision is the "blackout" characteristics of these student fares. The majority of the airlines which offer these reduced rates restrict their use to offpeak hours or days. In other words, the youth fare can be utilized on major airlines only during periods that are unpopular with the general public. They are used to fill up seats that might otherwise remain empty.

The students or young adults who use this plan are subject to restrictions not imposed on the general air traveler. In addition to restrictions on days and time period in which they may travel, they have no assurance that they can get on a plane of their choice or that they will not be "bumped off" by a passenger who has a reserved seat somewhere along the line. I, for one, do not believe that these young people are receiving "substantially equal service," for they are not allowed the primary luxury of travel—the ability to leave or arrive as fits your schedule. It is conceivable that they might wait hours, or even days, before they are allowed to board a plane.

The CAB examiner stated that youth alone is not enough to allow this reduced rate to continue. Under present law, narrowly construed, he may be correct. However, I should like to point out that our country has a history of using arbitrary ages as a qualification for various discounts. All we need to do is look around us to see student rates at hotels, movie theaters, plays, and public transportation systems. We are a society which places a high priority on our youth and I feel that the youth fare is another valuable method of doing so.

Many of the airline representatives who testified before the examiner indicated that the "youth market" is very elastic. They felt that the cost of travel had much more impact on the 12-to-21 age group than it did on the population above that level. The airlines, therefore, conceived this plan which would increase

the traffic by our youth and increase the profit of the airline industry.

Mr. Brenner of American Airlines made this statement when queried if there were sound transportation reasons behind the youth fares:

Well, yes. This goes to the fundamental concept of the youth fare. The youth fare, of course, had one purpose, one main purpose, to provide this—by providing this discount to an elastic market, to generate in our opinion, and we believe it has succeeded, more revenue than it would cost to handle this. The businessman's market is not an elastic market.

Again, in response to a question by the CAB examiner as to why American does not offer a standby fare to all passengers, Mr. Brenner replied:

The test of a sound promotional policy should rest with the elasticity of the market you are dealing with . . .

Statistics provided by American Airlines indicate that only 9.4 percent of the youth passengers were on some type of business trip, while over 60 percent of their regular passengers were on a business trip. United and TWA statistics indicated that less than 5 percent of their youth-fare passengers were on business trips. Continental statistics indicate that between 35 and 45 percent of their current youth-fare passengers would not have made the trip by air had the discount not been in effect. These statistics indicate beyond any doubt that the elimination of these fares would severely limit the amount of air travel by our youth. If they did not travel by air, Continental's statistics indicate that over 50 percent of those students would travel by automobile.

When the CAB approved the military standby fares, the Board noted the contention by the Department of Defense that there is a safety factor involved in encouraging many servicemen "who would otherwise travel by automobile over great distances or hitch-hike to their destinations to avoid the risks of the highway by utilizing the military fares." I feel that this contention applies to the youth fares. Any automobile insurance company will affirm the high degree of risk involved in the under-25 age group of drivers. I am sure that anyone who has children of driving age is aware of this fact. It is translated into the cost of our automobile insurance. Therefore, I think that this contention of safety should apply with more vigor in this situation.

I should also like to point out to the Senate that these same hearings indicated the fact that these fares were very profitable to the airline industry. Every airline that kept statistics in this area affirmed that these reduced fares promoted traffic by our youth and brought profit to the industry.

I should now like to address myself to a specific situation—Hawaii. As you know, Hawaii is a State surrounded by water. We are an island community and we are forced, therefore, to travel from island to island by air. It is the only efficient and practical method of travel. Airplanes are our lifeline to the continental United States.

We also have a disadvantage that is prevalent in many small States; we have

only one university in our State and only several small colleges. Consequently, many of our residents must send their children long distances to mainland colleges. We are separated from the continental United States by 2,500 miles and from the east coast by about 5,000 miles.

This distance places great hardship on the parents of college students in our State. Transportation costs alone are a heavy burden. In this situation, I feel that the elimination of these student fares may make the difference in whether or not a student from Hawaii can afford to attend a mainland college. At the very least, it will prevent many of our students who are away at school on low budgets from returning to their families during vacations.

The student fare is also important to Hawaii for the education of our youth. Since the only method of travel between our islands is by air, our students cannot visit different cities, monuments, or historic places on the various islands without flying. The student fare provides them with an opportunity to visit and learn about areas of our State which they otherwise might not have.

For these reasons, and because I feel so strongly about the necessity of retaining these fares, I introduce today legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize the reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger.

My bill would amend section 403(b) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1968 to include youth 21 years of age or younger. These exemptions already include airline directors, officers, employees, and members of their immediate families; witnesses and attorneys attending legal investigations in which the air carrier is interested; persons injured in aircraft accidents; doctors and nurses attending such persons; and ministers of religion under such conditions as the Board may prescribe. I propose to include our youth in this group of persons who are exempted from the statutory rule against unjust discrimination.

I should like to emphasize to my colleagues that my amendment is enabling legislation. The airlines will not be forced to retain these fares if they are not profitable or feasible. It will provide, however, the statutory authority for the CAB to approve youth fares proposed by any of the airlines.

I hope the Senate Commerce Committee will schedule early hearings on youth air fares and report legislation for prompt Senate action.

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

The bill (S. 1720) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize certain reduced-rate transportation to individuals who are 21 years of age or younger, introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1721—INTRODUCTION OF THE TOBACCO MARKET ADJUSTMENT ACT

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to be known as the

Tobacco Market Adjustment Act of 1969. This bill would have the effect of phasing out price supports for tobacco production over a 4-year period, beginning in 1970, and prohibiting use of government funds to advertise or promote this product.

As a legislator, a parent, and a concerned citizen, I find it appalling and totally unacceptable that the Federal Government presently has more than \$750 million in loans outstanding from the Commodity Credit Corporation to support the price of tobacco. Tobacco has been shown, in numerous Government and private studies, to be highly injurious to health. It is known to be a major factor in causing cancer of the throat and lungs. Heavy smokers can expect, on an average to lose 6 minutes of their lives for every cigarette they smoke. The overall effect can be cut as much as 8 years off the life of an average smoker, and to reduce his productive capacity over a much longer timespan.

Congress has already indicated its deep concern with this problem by requiring a warning to be posted on all packages of cigarettes indicating that the contents may be injurious to health. And various proposals have been made which would prohibit the advertising of cigarettes through the mass media.

Despite these concerns, however, price supports for many different kinds of tobacco continue. And what is more, our Government spends large sums of money to advertise this product in foreign countries.

I am well aware of the contribution which tobacco makes to our economy and to our balance of payments. Some 650,000 families are engaged in the production of this crop. The annual value of this cash crop is roughly \$1.3 billion. In addition, tobacco exports, valued at \$686 million in 1968, make a significant contribution to our balance of payments.

I am well aware that this legislation will not end the production of tobacco, or to prohibit its sales. Tobacco will still be grown and sold at competitive market prices as long as people insist on its dubious pleasures. But I believe very strongly that Federal tax dollars should not be used to support the price of a product which has been proven by agencies of our own government to be injurious to health.

I believe this is an area in which economies can wisely and well be made, while at the same time helping to improve the health of our people. Surely there are more constructive uses for these hundreds of millions of dollars than continued subsidies for a "nonessential" product which has been proven harmful.

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

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

The bill (S. 1721) to promote the orderly adjustment of tobacco production and marketing, introduced by Mr. BROOKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1721

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 "Tobacco Market Adjustment Act".

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares—

(1) that medical evidence of the harmful effects of smoking on personal health has been amply developed and analyzed by the Surgeon General of the United States and other qualified authorities;

(2) that the United States Government and the governments of many other nations have published detailed scientific evaluations demonstrating the adverse effects of smoking on health and have undertaken information campaigns to acquaint the public with the hazards associated with the use of tobacco;

(3) that the widespread use of such harmful substances constitutes a danger not only to personal but to public health, in view of the epidemic proportions of illnesses associated with the use of tobacco in our society and of the particularly grave implications of continued habituation of the youth of our country; and

(4) that continued governmental support of tobacco production and marketing is incompatible with the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect the health of American citizens.

SEC. 3. Title I of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 108. Notwithstanding any other provision of law—

"(1) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1970 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco during the 1970 crop year not less than 25 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(2) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1971 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1971 crop year not less than 33 1/3 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(3) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1972 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1972 crop year not less than 50 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(4) No producer of tobacco shall be eligible for price support on his 1973 crop of tobacco unless he withholds from the production of tobacco for the 1973 crop year not less than 75 per centum of the tobacco acreage allotment for his farm for such crop year.

"(5) Beginning with the 1974 crop, no price support shall be made available under this or any other Act for any crop of tobacco.

"(6) Any acreage withheld from the production of tobacco in any crop year pursuant to the provisions of this section may be devoted, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, to the production of crops other than tobacco; and any such acreage so withheld from the production of tobacco in any crop year shall, for the purposes of determining tobacco acreage allotments for any future years, be deemed to have been planted to tobacco in such crop year.

"(7) No Federal funds may be expended on or after July 1, 1970, for the purpose of advertising or promoting the sale or use of any kind of tobacco or tobacco product; and no Federal funds may be expended for the purpose of subsidizing in any way the export of tobacco to any foreign country. The foregoing provision shall in no way affect the export of tobacco for use by members of the Armed Forces of the United States serving in foreign countries.

"(8) The Secretary is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems appropriate in order to carry out the provisions of this section."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 845) the ammunition redefinition bill. This makes a total of 35 cosponsors.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 765) to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Lung Institute.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 811) to require the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to make a separate accounting of funds requested for the Department of Agriculture for programs and activities that primarily stabilize farm income and those that primarily benefit consumers, businessmen, and the general public, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as cosponsors of S. 1189, a bill I introduced February 28, 1969, which would improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), I ask unanimous consent that, at their next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 472) to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn under title II of the Social Security Act without suffering deductions, and of the bill (S. 1209) to eliminate in certain cases the requirement that an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for extended medical care services.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1223) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 50th anniversary of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

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

Mr. COOK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1689), the Toy Safety Act.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN) be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 7) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 20) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the nomination and election of the President and Vice President of the United States.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 173—RESOLUTION REQUESTING THE PRESIDENT TO RELEASE FROM ACTIVE DUTY CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution calling upon the President to order the immediate deactivation of the men of the 29th Infantry Brigade who were called to active duty in May 1968.

Of the 24,500 men called to active duty at that time, 4,070 men were from the State of Hawaii. The men from Hawaii constituted 17 percent of the total number recalled nationally.

For the size of the State of Hawaii which has a population of less than one-half of 1 percent of the national population, this callup of 17 percent from Hawaii was most unjust and inequitable. It forced upon Hawaii a burden 45 times larger than her just share.

Immediately upon hearing the an-

nouncement of the activation of the 29th Brigade I sent a telegram to President Johnson and the Secretary of Defense, urging that the order for the 29th Brigade be canceled. I pointed out that Hawaii was being directed to furnish a much higher number of men, based on population, than any other State in the Union, and also that this large levy on a small State imposed a serious burden on the Honolulu Police Department which lost 40 men in the callup, on Hawaii's building industry, and on many other groups in Hawaii who lost many of their highly trained employees because of this recall.

The initial reason given for calling up so many men from one unit was that they had been trained together to accomplish a specific military mission and should be kept together. They were also needed to fill an emergency need.

Since these men were called to active duty they have been sent to Vietnam individually and in small groups. Immediately upon hearing that the 29th Brigade was being broken up in this manner I again telegraphed the Department of the Army urging the deactivation of the 29th Brigade. I pointed out that the men of the 29th were being sent to Vietnam on a piecemeal basis and were being assigned to different units there. Since they were not being utilized together, the reason given for their recall was no longer valid and they should be returned to civilian life.

I regret that the Department of the Army and the Defense Department have not seen fit to correct this grave injustice done to Hawaii.

We in Hawaii are patriotic citizens. We have responded to the utmost in time of war and have compiled one of the most outstanding records of war service. Hawaii suffered disproportionately high fatalities in Korea and in Vietnam. Today, as always, Hawaii's men continue to serve in combat with exemplary courage.

As no affirmative response has been given to our appeals for justice and equity I am compelled to bring this matter to the attention of the Senate. Already more than Hawaii's fair share of men called to active duty last May have been assigned to duty in Vietnam.

I urge that the Senate do justice and equity to Hawaii by seeking correction of the disproportionate number of Hawaii Army reservists and national guardsmen called to active duty last year.

The reasons given for their recall that they were trained together and should be kept together in service and that they were needed in an emergency are no longer valid as they have been sent to Vietnam on a piecemeal basis and the emergency in manpower shortage does not now exist.

I urge the Senate Armed Services Committee to take quick favorable action on this resolution conveying to the President that it is the sense of the Senate that justice and equity be done.

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

The resolution (S. Res. 173), which

reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

S. RES. 173

Resolved, That the President is hereby urged and requested to release immediately from active duty members of the 29th Infantry Brigade, United States Army, who were ordered to active duty as an emergency measure in May of 1968.

**SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS
BILL, 1969—AMENDMENT**

AMENDMENT NO. 91-8

Mr. FULBRIGHT submitted an amendment to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(See reference to the above amendment when submitted by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under a separate heading.)

**NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 11, THE
INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL
ACT OF 1969**

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I should like to announce that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations will hold 1 additional day of hearings on S. 11, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1969, on April 1.

It is the purpose of S. 11 to strengthen intergovernmental cooperation and the administration of grant-in-aid programs; to extend State and local merit systems to additional programs financed by Federal funds; to provide grants for improvement of State and local personnel administration; to authorize Federal assistance in training State and local employees; to provide grants to State and local governments for training their employees; to authorize interstate compacts for personnel and training activities; and to facilitate the interchange of Federal, State and local personnel.

S. 11 embodies, with some modifications, the provisions of S. 699, the Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1967, which was passed by the Senate on November 7, 1967, and is based on investigations made by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations over the past 3 years, and on many suggestions offered by witnesses in hearings held on S. 699 and other legislation.

The hearings will be held in room 3302, New Senate Office Building, beginning at 10 a.m. Previous hearings on this legislation were held March 24, 25, and 26.

**THE UNITED STATES SHOULD
RECOGNIZE RED CHINA**

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the establishment of a workable relationship with the government of mainland China is one of the most important problems facing our Nation today. The facts are that from late 1965 to this good hour I have advocated that the United States follow the example of Mexico, the United Kingdom, France, and other nations, and recognize the Government of Communist China, instead of relying

on Hong Kong as a listening post and observatory into the vast area of mainland China with its population of one-quarter of the inhabitants of the entire world. Following recognition, we should invite that nation to open an embassy in Washington and we then open and maintain an Embassy in Peking. The time for such diplomatic exchange is long past due.

On April 20, 1966, I spoke in the Senate, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 7, page 8644, urging that our Government recognize the Government of Communist China.

Nations, like individuals, should not ignore the facts of life. Recognition of one nation by another never means approval of the ruling regime of that country. For example, early in the first term of the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt the United States recognized the Government of the Soviet Union. It was stated at that time and well understood that our recognition of the Soviet Government would not imply any approval of the political structure of that nation. Our acknowledgement by official action that the Peking government exists and has been for many years the government of China is only a matter of stating the obvious. It does not imply our approval of that regime any more than our recognition of the Soviet Union, Spain, Greece, or any one of a number of nations ruled by Communist or Fascist dictatorships or military juntas indicates our approval of these regimes or their ideological bases.

Our embassy in the Soviet Union provided a valuable listening post and furnished us with much information during the Stalin regime when Russia was a closed society. Yet there were, and are, rightwing extremists who all along denounced our recognition of the Soviet Union. We are, and have been over recent years, greatly handicapped in acquiring information about, and in dealing with, Communist China, being dependent upon our consul general in Hong Kong for intelligence reports.

With Red China exploding crude nuclear weapons and engaging in serious border fighting with the Soviet Union along their 6,500-mile common border, a U.S. Embassy in Red China would undoubtedly be of great value to us. If the administration is seriously interested in normalizing relations with China, it should take steps toward entering into meaningful diplomatic and economic relations with the Peking government. Should the arrogant Communist dictators of China rebuff that effort, their refusal would result in a propaganda victory for the United States.

The Peking government has been the duly constituted and permanent government of mainland China for 20 years. It has governing authority over some 750 million men, women, and children—nearly one-fourth of the world's population. Red China unquestionably exists and just as unquestionably it will exist, immensely more powerful, 5 years from now. In spite of this fact, we continue to pretend that Red China is not there and that perchance some miracle will happen to solve this perplexing problem.

Furthermore, it is folly to believe that

mainland China is ever going to be conquered by Chiang Kai-shek's little army of many generals and no combat experience, in virtual exile on Formosa, protected by our airpower and 7th Fleet. We have for 19 years been supporting that corrupt and boastful old warlord, Chiang Kai-shek. When he was driven from the Chinese mainland in the civil war, he sought a haven in Formosa for himself and his beaten army. Almost immediately his army massacred some 17,000 unarmed people. With our help he then established himself in power. His government is a puppet government of the United States.

Despite the boasts in the mid-1950's of Secretary of State John Foster Dulles and those in the China lobby about unleashing Chiang-Kai-shek to reconquer the mainland, it has been and is our 7th Fleet and airpower and more than \$10 billion of American taxpayers' money that has maintained this Nationalist Chinese Government, so-called, on the island of Taiwan. Ardent supporters of Chiang Kai-shek remind one of Mississippi extremists who are still waving the Confederate flag a century after the Civil War ended. Chiang is a tiger without any teeth. He has an over-age army of 600,000 at Taiwan. Over the years he has boasted of invading the Chinese mainland. This, of course, with the proviso, and he does not mention this, that the United States furnish all-out support from our Air Force and 7th Fleet, and that our warships and warplanes protect the convoy of American transports necessary to transport this invasion force. The time is long past due that we should withdraw all support from Chiang Kai-shek and cease pretending that the small island he dominates is a nation deserving of our support and of any prominence whatsoever in the United Nations. It is true that he has an army of 600,000 which is capable of parading in competition with the Shriners and would probably be about as good in combat.

Chiang Kai-shek has been making the empty boasts for years of his intent to invade the Chinese mainland. He is a braggart and a faker and it is high time our State Department officials stop catering to him.

I advocate that the United States should withdraw immediately all our soldiers in Taiwan serving as military advisers. I urge that without delay we open negotiations with Communist China and that Chang Kai-shek be denied any further support from us, not only as far as Asia is concerned but in the United Nations. It is fakery that this corrupt warlord with his little island, where Madam Chiang has taken over the ownership of the Grand Hotel and most of the worthwhile real estate, should be regarded as a nation worthy of a seat in the General Assembly.

Leaders of Communist China have in the past expressed disinterest in joining the United Nations. However, the United States should urge the chiefs of state of those nations which have heretofore recognized Red China and are presently enjoying lucrative trade with that huge nation to join with us in offering a place in the United Nations to this huge na-

tion which we have been so myopic as to disregard altogether or treat as an outlaw.

Ambassador Edwin Reischauer, former Ambassador to Japan and one of our great Asiatic experts, has been proposing for some years that our Government accord recognition to Communist China and sponsor its admission to the United Nations.

Of course this corrupt warlord, Chiang Kai-shek, who has been subsidized over the years by our taxpayers, will cry out in rage against our recognition of Red China; against reopening trade channels with Red China; against any attempt whatever by the United States to improve relations with the Peking government. In 1959 I was in Taiwan, and after listening to the bombastic statements of Chiang Kai-shek and questioning him, Madam Chiang interjected herself, ranting about the imminent invasion of mainland China by Chiang's forces. She disregarded the fact that except for our airpower and 7th Fleet and our taxpayers' money, the Red Chinese would have crushed the forces of Chiang Kai-shek long before then, and very likely she and Chiang would have been residing in the United States at that time.

Mr. President, of course, any change in our China policy should recognize the right of self-determination for the people of Taiwan, including safeguards for all minorities. A solution for the future status of Taiwan, the Pescadores, and the offshore islands should be sought within the framework of the United Nations.

Unfortunately, since 1950 the United States and the Government of mainland China have adopted policies which stand like a great wall between the two nations preventing all normal contacts. We do not speak to one another, except occasionally at the ambassadorial level at Warsaw. In the meantime, the world moves on and there are tremendous changes everywhere.

Mr. President, a mature society, like a mature man, faces its problems squarely. It does not bury its head in the sand and dream that its problems will disappear when it lifts its head. Such fantasy fools no one, and all the while precious time is lost that could be devoted to solving these problems.

There is probably no greater threat to world peace today than the threat posed by the Red Chinese dictators. They are arrogant, hostile, and apparently devoid of mercy or desire for cooperation. They are violent Communists in the Stalin pattern. Time and time alone will lessen the bitterness they feel toward the nations of the Western World, including czarist Russia, that oppressed China during the 18th, 19th, and around the turn of the 20th century. The European powers in particular humiliated the Chinese and helped themselves by merciless military action to vast parcels of Chinese territory, often under the guise of 99-year leases. Recent border clashes between Soviet and Chinese troops stem directly from border disputes arising from that period of colonialism.

China, with her 750 million disciplined, hard-working and dedicated people will be incapable for many years of develop-

ing the weapons necessary to challenge our security. Mao Tse-tung has stated his nation needs 30 years of peace and development. Nonetheless, it is the most powerful nation in Asia. Notwithstanding occasional economic setbacks, China is a formidable fighting opponent for any nation. We should face reality. As her industrial economy advances, more and more nations will expand trading relations with her.

In spite of occasional serious reverses, due in large part by drought, her agricultural economy is progressing and all reports indicate that she has managed to overcome widespread starvation, heretofore so common in China and India and other hugely populated countries in the Far East in times of crop failure and other national disasters. Illiteracy in China will soon be a thing of the past. Education, however biased, is progressing at an unprecedented rate.

The reality of China of 1969 is that, having survived the fires of adversity, it is an awakened giant that for better or worse will have a profound influence upon the kind of world in which we and our children's children will be living.

National interests can be accommodated when the will to reconcile them exists on both sides. By and large, the United States and the Soviet Union have learned after more than 20 years of the cold war that their conflicts must be reconciled peacefully in this nuclear age. We should apply the lessons of the past to our future with China. It will be a National tragedy if we continue this period of conflict with that nation—a period in which vast amounts of our Nation's energies are devoted to military power at the expense of our social and cultural development. We have many times over the military force necessary to defend ourselves. We would do better to use our energies to help free people everywhere create a way of life that would lead them to utterly reject the lure of communism.

The facts are that from a military standpoint Red China today is a paper dragon if and when the ability to wage a prolonged offensive war on land, at sea, and in the air is considered. It is overrated as a great military power. It has crude nuclear capability, that is true. However, it will take at least 5 or 10 years before it will have the know-how to deliver any nuclear warheads on targets. Its air force is inferior. It has no surface navy except a few torpedo boats and gunboats—no modern transports—nothing except thousands of junks. It is an agrarian nation, with 85 percent of its population engaged in agriculture. On the Pacific, under the Pacific, and in the air over the Pacific, we have a more powerful Navy, submarine fleet, and Air Force than all the nations of the world combined.

Furthermore, there is certainly no inevitability of a war between us and China. We live in such different political and economic environments that like land and sea animals, we hardly meet. We have no real reason to tangle with each other.

Just as we have learned at great cost and hazard to live at peace with the Soviet Union, we should make up our

minds to accept Red China's existence, to respect her legitimate interests, and to meet her challenge other than by military containment. Let us hope that we will do so before another 20 years of the cold war and the arms race elapse.

Mr. President, there is no assurance nor certainty that were we to recognize Red China the attitude of its leaders toward us would become any less intransigent or more cooperative than at present. However, it seems highly advisable that we face up to the problem of recognition if we hope to restrain the expansion of Red China without war and if we are to have a direct assessment and judgment of Chinese interests and intentions, so vital in this grim period of international anarchy.

In addition to recognition, there are other steps that we can take to help reduce tensions between our Nation and the people of mainland China. We should unilaterally take steps in the direction of free travel between the United States and mainland China. We should explore the possibilities for cultural and student exchanges. We should show our concern for the well-being of the people of China by examining areas of technical cooperation such as exchange of information on food production, family planning, irrigation and water development.

We should permit the sale to Communist China of food and other non-strategic items through commercial channels as do many other nations of the free world. Our allies, including neighbors such as Canada, are prospering by their trade with that country for which the Chinese are paying in gold at the world price. The Canadian Government has sold almost \$1 billion worth of Canadian wheat for gold, cash on the barrelhead, to Red China. Australia has sold Communist China more than \$500 million worth of wheat.

Very definitely, American producers and manufacturers should be permitted to sell to Red China at world prices whatever the nationals of that nation may wear, eat, drink, or smoke, and in turn, buy the products and handicrafts of the Chinese. We have farmers and industrialists who would like to sell their surplus products in the markets of the world. Obviously, this also would be a step toward world peace. Nations, like individuals, are unlikely to fight with their customers.

Every effort must be made to involve the Red Chinese Government in international negotiations regarding such issues such as disarmament, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, and the limited nuclear test ban. The cooperation of a nation numbering one-fourth of the inhabitants of the globe is absolutely vital to the establishment of workable disarmament agreements. Toward that end, it is imperative that Red China join the community of nations and be admitted to the United Nations.

The United Nations is not an honor society, membership in which is a reward for "being good." It appears sometimes to be a debating society. If so, a forum where representatives of nations keep talking rather than start bombing has a definite advantage. As matters now

stand China, with her many millions who solidly support their government, is excluded. Being outside the U.N., Red China is not constrained to keep its actions in harmony with any web of collective agreements. It can keep on ignoring, insulting, and defying world opinion.

The absence of Peking has been a critical element blocking effective U.N. consideration of the Vietnam problem and other Asian security issues. Absence from the U.N. leaves China out of arms-control agreements on nuclear weapons that have been arrived at and are now being negotiated.

Our decision years ago not to accord diplomatic recognition to the Red Chinese was based in part on the belief that failure to do so would somehow inhibit the success of that regime. Actually, the reverse has proven to be the case. Our refusal to recognize China and our attempt to exclude it from the world community has relieved it from the responsibilities of United Nations participation, has deepened our ignorance of Chinese internal development, and has allowed Red China's nuclear weapons capacity to emerge unchallenged and unfettered by international obligations. It has allowed us to become a convenient hate symbol in a period of dynamic Chinese growth and development. It has impaired the United Nations' ability to deal effectively with problems affecting world peace.

Mr. President, there is nothing to indicate that recognition at this time would either change Red China's attitude toward the United States or her dedication to the promotion of world revolution and the ultimate destruction of the capitalistic system. However, time is a great healer. There should be a basic rethinking by our citizens, the Congress, and among officials of the executive branch of our Government regarding Asia in general, and China in particular.

Any attempt to reach an understanding for peaceful coexistence with the Peking regime will demand great patience, understanding, good will and a readiness to enter into honorable compromises. Both sides must be willing to take a hard look at the charges hurled at each other over the years in an effort to understand and clarify the issues dividing them. I urge that a proper policy for our country would be to offer the olive branch of coexistence and peace in the future to China. The time has past when this Nation could afford to adhere to that rigid idea that it is unthinkable to permit the very thought of recognition of Communist China or of its admission into the United Nations. China has a great history, tradition, and culture going back thousands of years. Nevertheless, by reason of technological superiority and weapons of war, the European nations throughout the 19th century seized vast areas of China, oppressed the Chinese, contemptuously regarded them as inferior and humiliated them. For example, England fought a war and killed many Chinese in the 1840's because the Chinese governing authorities tried to suppress opium traffic which was extremely lucrative to English merchants. This is known to the shame of the British as the opium war. It resulted in the seizure

of the island of Hong Kong and other areas that had been Chinese for thousands of years.

In speaking out for diplomatic recognition of China, I recognize the facts of international life. In fact, I speak today for the generation of Americans who did not participate in framing our present Chinese policy. We all condemn the outrageous actions and aggressions of Chinese Communist leaders, but here is a de facto government stronger than ever before. We would do well to consider actions that would encourage more responsible behavior rather than to seek to crush a people as the British Empire did in the opium war.

Mr. President, I make these remarks today because I am thinking of tomorrow and of many tomorrows. I am thinking of generations of Americans yet to come. In fact, I am thinking of my four granddaughters and of other children and grandchildren of today who in a comparatively few years will become the guardians, keepers, and trustees of this Nation. We want them to have a nation that is the last best hope for permanent peace in this world, a nation not only supreme in power but one that is solvent whose citizens, fully protected in all their civil rights and civil liberties, enjoy contentment and comfort in a peaceful world free from hardship, aggression, and the sorrows of war. I am thinking of our great Nation in a peaceful world. Let us strive to do our utmost that future generations in our United States of America may live in peace and happiness in a peaceful world instead of in fear and terror and then eye hath not witnessed nor finite mind conceived the future grandeur, glory, contentment, and happiness of our people.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION MEETING IN VIENNA, AUSTRIA—APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the provisions of Public Law 170 of the 74th Congress, appoints the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) to attend the Interparliamentary Union Meeting, to be held at Vienna, Austria, on April 7 to 13, 1969.

THE NINTH MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, in accordance with Public Law 86-420, appoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) to attend the Ninth Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Conference, to be held in Mexico on

April 2-8, 1969 to replace Senators BAYH and MURPHY, who are unable to attend.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES — APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 77-250, appoints the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonesential Federal Expenditures vice Senator ALLOTT, resigned.

XXX—GENOCIDE CONVENTION: MORE IMPORTANT THAN FISH

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States is a unique body. Only the Senate can approve certain executive appointments, and only the Senate can ratify treaties made with other countries. This is a very important power—it gives this body the opportunity to work with the President to map out general foreign policy for the Nation. Over the years, the Senate has unreservedly exercised this power, forming hundreds of official agreements with other countries.

Since the Genocide Convention was introduced to the Senate by President Truman in 1949, the Foreign Relations Committee has held hearings on over 100 treaties. Also during this time, the Senate has given its advice and consent to more than 100 treaties.

A random sampling of some of these treaties can only raise serious doubt as to their historical and practical importance. We have a Tuna Convention with Costa Rica, a Halibut Convention with Canada, a Shrimp Convention with Cuba, and, of course, we cannot forget the "Pink Salmon Protocol." It took a treaty to build a bridge across the Rainy River, and another to allow licensed American drivers to drive on European highways. To expedite the importation of advertising samples, we have the Commercial Samples Convention. Our national security is guaranteed by our treaties of amity with Muscat and Oman.

It is not my intention to suggest that any of these treaties should not have been ratified by the Senate. I am certain that they are all in the national interest and necessary to us.

But each of these treaties is very limited in scope. In every case, they promote either profit or pleasure. Mr. President, I fail to see why a treaty to save wild geese should be given precedence over a treaty to save human beings.

The Genocide Convention was drawn up neither for pleasure nor for profit. It was adopted by the United Nations in order to guarantee the life, the rights, and the dignity of man. Therefore, Mr. President, I plead with the Senate to look beyond the screens of obstruction to perceive its obligation to mankind.

Let us now ratify the Genocide Convention.

After 20 years, after three Presidents of the United States during that period have warmly recommended the Genocide Convention, it is time for the Senate to act to ratify it.

THE APOLLO 8 MISSION—THREE BRAVE MEN

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, on December 27, the world watched as our three astronauts splashed down in the Pacific after their historic flight around the moon. Since the Apollo 8 mission, much has been written about this magnificent feat in space exploration.

A letter to the "three brave men" which appeared in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin expresses very simply but with great feeling the significance of this mission for all Americans.

I wish to share with Senators this tribute to our three astronauts who have realized our dreams. I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

A LETTER TO THREE BRAVE MEN (By Jim Becker)

GENTLEMEN: You have done a brave thing. An amazing thing. A thing that boggles the mind.

You have flown to the moon. And you have flown back again.

A journey to the moon! It stuns us to read those words, displayed on the front page of a newspaper as routinely as the holiday traffic toll or the latest peace talk snarl.

You are going to hear today and on many days to come many things about your brave journey. All of what you hear will be sincere, and some of it may even be eloquent.

You are going to hear about how you have lifted the horizons and taken a giant scientific step and raised the dawn of a new era. All of that will be true.

But would you like to hear about how you have made some of your fellow earthlings feel?

Those of us who frankly don't understand very much about giant scientific steps and who aren't sure how it is possible to put a big space ship with three men inside into an orbit or send it whirling around at 25,000 miles an hour without even a motor running.

And never will understand it, for that matter, despite all the well-meaning efforts to explain it to us?

Would you like to know what you have done for us?

Well, gentlemen, we live in times that try men's souls and their nerves and even their will to get up and go out and face the daily traffic jam and the weekly wipeout and the monthly mugging at the hands of fate's fickle fist.

It is a tough world, gentlemen, as you know, and the only light a man sees at the end of most tunnels is liable to come from an explosion of some kind or other.

It is a world in which the neighbor you are supposed to love—and would really like to, sometimes, when you think of it—is liable to blow his car horn at you or cut you off at the intersection, or play his radio in your ear or grab your parking place before you even get a chance to love him.

It is a world in which some people would rather burn our cities down than live in them, and in which the easiest thing is to sit around and blame "them" for everything.

And when you battle that often, your spirits sag and your sights get lower and even to think of flying to a world you know not of, as Hamlet said, is enough to paralyze the will, and lose the name of action.

And soon you wonder if all is paralyzed, and no one will gain the name of action.

And then you three came along, men who dare to dream and to fly to those worlds one knows not of, with the name of action written clear.

And we think back to a fellow named Shepard, sitting alone, completely alone—in the tip of that fantastic rocket on the Florida launching pad, seven years ago, waiting to be shot off into a world he knew not of.

And a fellow named Glenn, who was cast into an orbit around the earth, and, circled it, unparalyzed, in action.

(Yes, and of the Russians, too, Gagarin, wasn't it?, and Titov, they were men who dared to dream. Brave men. Human beings.)

There have been these brave men before you, some now dead for their bravery, and bravery is not a commodity you can measure on a chart.

Some men are brave who only serve at Sears, and put clothes on their kids and umpire at the Little League.

But there are none so brave as those who fly to worlds they know not of, as those who do not lose the name of action.

And because you have done it, because you three had that kind of bravery, those of us who have more mundane struggles to face in a world we know well of, are helped to find the name of action, too.

And because you three are our countrymen, sons of our soil, we are helped to find that action in the land we know of.

And the first Good Earth you touched after your journey to the moon was our earth, Hawaii's earth.

You are welcome to it, men from the moon. You have made it a little easier to struggle along upon it.

FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA WEEK: FOCUS ON POSITIVE ACTION

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the period of time between March 23 and March 29 has been set aside to observe National Future Homemakers of America Week and its theme, "Focus on Positive Action." Some 600,000 members of 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the United States and Puerto Rico are at this moment engaged in service projects, and in activities to promote good will and the principles of positive citizenship.

My home State of Wisconsin is fortunate to have the national vice president of the central region, Marilyn Drew of Rice Lake. This central region has 175,000 FHA members in 13 States. Miss Drew attends Rice Lake High School, where she is the editor of the school paper and a member of the student council, the National Honor Society, and the forensics squad. The State's own 15,000 members are led by Beth Monson of Hammond, Wis., president of the Wisconsin State FHA Association, and Mrs. Esther Brown of Madison, Wis., State FHA adviser.

As Estelle Hunter, national president of the FHA, so aptly put it:

The overall objective of Future Homemakers of America is to help individuals improve personal, family, and community living. . . . During this week FHA members across the country will stress constructive activities.

These members assist in local Headstart programs, help the mentally retarded and the handicapped, organize tutorial programs for underprivileged children, visit the elderly, assist in the March of Dimes, serve as hospital candy strippers, and carry out many other projects which give practical application to their classroom learning.

Founded as a nonprofit organization

in 1945, the FHA has served more than 12 million high school youth. The members themselves have always set their own goals and planned their own activities and projects, developing the opportunity for leadership and creativity. It is an organization, according to one member "in which common interests in home economics values are realized, friends are made, and family bonds are strengthened."

Mr. President, in an age when we hear in the news only about the young people participating in riots, illegal protests, and other forms of rebellion, it is comforting to find that these dissenters are but a small minority of the total youth population. The 600,000 teenagers of the FHA do not get into trouble with the law—they are too busy organizing worthwhile projects with constructive results. And while the hippies, the yuppies, and the malcontents may continue to burn American flags, they will never eclipse the good citizenship and positive action of the responsible majority in such organizations as the Future Homemakers of America.

THE SCOURGE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) was scheduled to deliver a speech before the Women's National Democratic Club this noon, but was unable to appear because he was called away from Washington by the death of his mother.

I know that all of Senator CRANSTON's colleagues join me in expressing our sorrow at his loss.

Mr. President, the remarks which Senator CRANSTON was to deliver today are so timely that I have requested his permission to place them in the RECORD. I particularly call the attention of this body to a sentiment which I share completely:

I find unacceptable the notion that there is any such thing as an acceptable increase in unemployment. Acceptable to whom? I want to know! And callous, total indifference to how many millions of men and women may be unemployed is, of course, an even worse attitude.

The Senator goes on to say of the relationship between unemployment and inflation:

That is the bitter paradox: those who already suffer the most from inflation will be the same people who will suffer most from efforts to curb inflation. . . . Unemployment is not a private inconvenience to be kept at acceptable levels. It is a national scourge to be wiped out altogether.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CRANSTON's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON BEFORE THE WOMAN'S NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 27, 1969

A not-so-funny thing happened to the Nixon administration on its way to developing a program to fight inflation.

It seems to have been stopped by some long-standing hang-ups. Because it is understandably up-tight over using the power and the money of the federal government in

ways that might drastically increase unemployment, it doesn't appear even to be thinking about steps it might take to reduce unemployment. And that is less understandable.

No one is sure that the anti-inflation steps the administration is contemplating—"tight" money and a so-called "tight" budget with continued high taxes and increasingly higher interest rates—will, in fact, curb inflation.

I've heard some top administration officials privately express serious doubts about their effectiveness. And publicly, some economists, like Leon Keyserling, think restricting the flow of money actually causes inflation instead of stopping it.

But there is one thing of which nearly everyone, in or out of the administration, does seem certain: that conventional anti-inflationary measures will increase unemployment.

Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the Economic Council, tells Congress he wishes prices could be stabilized without any affect at all on unemployment, but he doesn't believe it can be done without a substantial increase in joblessness.

Treasury Secretary David M. Kennedy says that to cool off the economy, a one percent increase in unemployment "would not be too much".

Counselor to the President Arthur F. Burns says unemployment, now at an all-time low of 3.3 percent, may have to rise to 3.5 percent or more. Even with 4.5 percent of our work force out of jobs, Mr. Burns says, he would still consider us to be in an economy of "full employment."

And the Business Council, made up mostly of leaders of large corporations sympathetic to President Nixon, declares that steps taken to curb inflation might have to push the unemployment rate up to 5.5 or perhaps a full 6 percent—double the present number.

For very good reasons, political and humanitarian, the administration has been frightened off by the prospect. And rather than bring about an abrupt, high rise in unemployment by an all-out assault against high prices, the administration talks about taking a cautious approach which, it hopes, will keep unemployment down to something the President calls an "acceptable" level.

Meanwhile, however, prices and wages continue surging upward on all fronts. The latest sorry bulletin just came from Secretary of Housing and Urban Development George Romney, who disclosed skyrocketing prices for the lumber we so desperately need to meet our critical housing shortages.

Softwood lumber prices have gone up 30 percent since last year, Secretary Romney noted, with plywood prices soaring a startling 77 percent!

Protests are mounting not only from labor and consumer groups, but from businessmen as well. Particularly those who by temperament would have no truck with gradualism.

Some members of the National Association of Manufacturers, for example, scorn the pussy-footing pusillanimity of the President's advisers. The NAM's chief economist, George G. Hagedorn, wants Mr. Nixon to plow right in and slash federal spending, with "no time to lose."

As for the increased unemployment such a rash and thoughtless move would bring: Forget it! Full employment, says Mr. Hagedorn, is a "myth" anyway, so why get strung-out on such nonsense?

Besides, a substantial labor pool of unemployed workers is still deemed desirable by a few economists who continue to cling to a vestigial brand of conscienceless capitalism that is long gone but, unfortunately, not forgotten.

Actually, there will always be a labor pool—unless the pill cuts the birth rate to zero and unless the march of science and tech-

nology suddenly stops putting so many jobs out of style.

There would even be new sources of labor if we could extricate ourselves from Vietnam. Or end the arms race.

I reject all approaches—Mr. Hagedorn's and everybody else's—that are based upon the notion that any level of unemployment is proper.

I find unacceptable the notion that there is any such thing as an acceptable increase in unemployment. Acceptable to whom? I want to know! And callous, total indifference to how many millions of men and women may be unemployed is, of course, an even worse attitude.

Mr. Hagedorn told the Joint Economic Committee that trying to stop inflation gradually, as the Nixon administration is trying to do, is "like saying if you pull a tooth gradually it will hurt you less".

As an economist, Mr. Hagedorn would make a good dentist. Maybe. What he said about dental extractions may or may not be correct. I don't know.

But nobody's talking about pulling teeth; we're talking about throwing men out of work, of cutting off families from their life-sustaining source of income.

Any man who has ever been out of work or has compassion enough to imagine how it might feel to be thrown out of work, would be able to explain to Mr. Hagedorn the obvious: that the longer your job lasts, and the less the cut in income you ultimately have to take, the better.

Still on his irrelevant dentistry kick, Mr. Hagedorn also warned the Congress that there is no painless way to fight inflation. But he never made clear, nor did he show much concern over, whom he expects to bear the pain.

Those unemployment percentages Mr. Hagedorn and others throw about so easily represent people, thousands, even millions, of people. Take those percentages and transpose them into human beings, and what do you get?

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz concedes that the administration's anti-inflation program could cause an increase of 300,000 to 500,000 jobless by the end of this year. The AFL-CIO thinks the number of lay-offs will be closer to 780,000. A Wall Street Journal article suggests it could be 1,000,000.

They would come in addition to the 2,600,000 Americans already listed among the ranks of the unemployed and the countless numbers of the under-employed who, as Senator Walter F. Mondale has pointed out, "live in pockets of poverty in the midst of unprecedented plenty".

Who are these unhappy Americans, these fellow citizens of ours who are either already unemployed or are likely to lose their precarious hold on their jobs if work becomes more scarce?

We all know who they are. They are those among us who traditionally are the last to be hired when times are good and the first to be fired when things get tough. They are the unskilled and semi-skilled workers, especially, but by no means entirely, those from minority groups; women, working part-time to help support their families; elderly persons, doing odd jobs to make ends meet on pensions suffering from steadily diminishing purchasing power.

Those who are working now have proved they do not fit the stereotypes held by some affluent Americans. They have disproved the theory that they are shiftless, idle loafers who prefer welfare to work.

But though today they have jobs, tomorrow they may be out in the streets—not because of their own failure, but because of their government's anti-inflation moves.

And many who are not working now don't fit the free-loader stereotype either: youngsters who have just graduated from high

school, adults who have just completed job-training courses, servicemen who have just returned from fighting in Vietnam.

A large number of them are finding we have no room for them in our economy.

Tragically and predominantly, our unhappy Americans are teenagers and blacks, whose unemployment rate already is two and three times higher than the national average. In some critical urban areas, between 30 and 40 percent of the teenagers and blacks are right now skulking the streets out of work.

The people who will be hit hardest by deflationary attempts to cool down the economy are, in a word, the very people for whom the so-called overheated economy isn't so hot to begin with; people without capital reserves who can least afford to be without an income; people who, because of a fixed and limited income—or no steady income at all—are already being mauled by the soaring cost of living.

That is the bitter paradox: those who already suffer the most from inflation will be the same people who will suffer most from efforts to curb inflation.

That is, unless we show enough imagination and creativity to keep it from happening.

Unemployment is not a private inconvenience to be kept at acceptable levels. It is a national scourge to be wiped out altogether.

I believe that every man and woman willing to work and physically and mentally able to work is entitled to work. I believe that every American who wants productive, gainful employment has a right to productive, gainful employment.

And if, at any moment and for any reason, private industry is not able to provide full employment for our people, then I believe the government has the responsibility to step into the gap as the employer or investor of last resort.

That is especially true, it seems to me, if people lose their jobs in private industry because of deliberate governmental action. Like slowing down our economic growth in order to protect the stability of the dollar.

Let us pause and think this through carefully.

Isn't it unwise, improper and utterly unjust for our government to act to protect the value of some people's dollars—and then do nothing when, as a consequence, other people are deprived of their dollars altogether?

I simply cannot accept the view that the government can stand idly by while our lowest and most vulnerable wage earners pay for the cost of our economic stability with their livelihoods.

It is particularly outrageous for us even to contemplate letting that happen in view of the fact that our so-called anti-inflationary measures are still in their experimental stage: though we know they will cause unemployment, we do not know that they will really cure inflation.

If the national interest demands a policy that puts people out of work, however unintentionally and however temporarily, then the nation owes a special responsibility to those people. If private industry cannot give them employment, the government must.

No measure that will cause a rise in unemployment is acceptable, in my view, unless it is offset by a positive, constructive program to eliminate that unemployment. I believe the President has a responsibility, and I believe we in Congress have a responsibility, to formulate such a program.

I suggest we look into new ways by which the government can create meaningful jobs to absorb the unemployed. More than that, we must explore, more imaginatively than we have in the past, ways by which the government can stimulate new jobs in private industry and the proper training of workers to fill those jobs.

The new administration's plans for tax incentives to business for those purposes may well prove to be part of the answer to the problem. They cannot, however, be the whole answer.

Crying out to us at this time, for example, is the urgency to begin now to plan and program industrial conversion to a peacetime economy. That means manpower conversion as well.

We must find better ways to teach our young men and women how to live and earn a living in our speedily changing, computer-directed society. We need to develop more effective methods of retraining our older workers whose skills, if any, have been rendered obsolete by our never-exhausted technological ingenuity.

Already, in two of our oldest industries—construction and farming—labor-saving machines and time-saving techniques have radically changed the nature of our manpower needs, thus creating all sorts of new problems. But changes of comparable magnitude have not taken place in our thinking about how to go about solving those problems.

I am convinced that the social harm that unadjusted unemployment will surely bring will more than offset whatever benefits we may derive from an artificially imposed economic slowdown.

More crime and more riots are only the more obvious, notorious and violent manifestations of the social ills that will inevitably occur if we don't take preventive measures.

We need a program that will create jobs and tool-up workers for those jobs.

Without such a work-creating, job-filling program, we will always be timid in tackling inflation for we will always be held back by the spectre of unrestrained unemployment. We will take half-measures that will only half-halt inflation if indeed they halt it at all.

And there, finally, is unearthed the essence of a very sensible message that had been hiding all along behind Mr. Hagedorn's extravagant stance. It is a message the administration might well heed.

The President irks the NAM because he hesitates to take more aggressive measures to counter inflation for fear of bringing about a severe upturn in unemployment. For his compassion, I commend him.

But would not the President feel free to deal more forcefully with inflation if he knew that he had at his command a program by which he could eliminate unemployment almost as rapidly as it occurs?

I believe he would, I believe the country would be better for it. And I believe we can do no less.

What I have suggested will inevitably raise the question: If we guarantee every able-bodied American a job, won't that keep too much money in circulation and hence nullify the effects of whatever anti-inflation measures the government takes?

The answer is: No.

Unemployment is not the real aim of anti-inflationary moves, it is only an unintentional by-product. The additional money full employment would put into circulation might partially diminish the effects of anti-inflationary steps. But the alternative—increased unemployment compensation and welfare payments—would have the same general effect, and would be more costly.

On the other hand, aggressive anti-inflation measures, which a full-employment policy would at long last permit, would—hopefully—make a substantial contribution toward stabilizing our dollars.

I was discussing this the other day with a friend who is involved in compensatory education programs for under-privileged children out in California. Here's what he said:

"The greatest thing about keeping an able-bodied man out of the ranks of the unemployed and off welfare isn't what it does for that man's self-esteem. It's what it does for his kids."

He told me he's watched child after child "goof off, get into trouble and drop out while their fathers were idle. But when their fathers landed jobs—and held those jobs—they start to stand up straighter and look at their parents, and themselves, with new respect."

My friend concluded by saying he's noticed that these same youngsters start studying seriously "and begin feeling new hope and confidence in their futures".

That about sums up what for me is probably the best reason for pursuing—and achieving—full employment.

Certainly we have learned enough through job-training programs to know that a great many Americans, who were once written off as unemployable, are perfectly capable of standing on their own feet and earning their own living. If only we help them get started.

Let us set to the task of guaranteeing a job for every able-bodied American.

The result will be good not only for the men and women of today, it will be good for the men and women of tomorrow; it will be good not only for our dollars, it will be good for our souls.

SENATOR RICHARD BREVARD RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, additional editorials in praise of Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL have been published in a number of Georgia newspapers. They express their hope, and indeed the hopes of all Georgians, for his full, speedy recovery from the tumor on his lung that he announced last week.

I bring these editorials to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Athens (Ga.) Daily News, Mar. 22, 1969]

BEST WISHES, SENATOR

Georgians and most of their counterparts throughout the country felt a sense of grief Thursday in hearing of the illness of U.S. Senator Richard B. Russell.

With the same dogged determination he has demonstrated in numerous battles in the Senate, Mr. Russell announced the illness himself and went to great length to explain the treatment he will begin undergoing for the lung tumor. Many people were as stunned by his straightforward announcement as by the illness itself.

All Georgians should be proud that a man of Richard Russell's stature serves this state in the federal government. Many times over, the state has been all the better and richer because of his representation in Washington.

The senior senator has indicated he will continue to serve at least through his present term. This statement in itself is gratifying.

We sincerely express to Senator Russell our heartfelt wishes for successful treatment and for the strength to recover.

All of Georgia will be thinking of him and wishing him well in the coming weeks and months.

[From the Columbus (Ga.) Enquirer, Mar. 22, 1969]

OUR PRAYERS WITH RUSSELL

It goes without saying, of course, that we read with deep regret the news that Sen. Richard Russell has cancer.

During the past few years his health has indeed been a serious problem. But despite the great discomfort emphysema has caused him, he has performed his substantial duties amazingly well.

The senator will immediately start cobalt treatments which we pray will be effective. Great strides have been made in the area of nuclear medicine in recent years. And Columbus itself is blessed with one of the most modern nuclear medicine facilities at the Medical Center.

We wish the senior senator, who has served his state and nation so well for so long, God-speed and every hope for a full recovery.

[From the Macon (Ga.) Telegraph, Mar. 22, 1969]

GEORGIANS JOIN IN HOPE FOR RUSSELL'S RECOVERY

Georgians of all political viewpoints are saddened by the announcement of the serious illness of Sen. Richard B. Russell, widely regarded as the most influential member of the United States Congress.

The Russell announcement has triggered considerable speculation as to what moves Georgia politicians may make if the state's senior U.S. senator is forced to retire before his term expires in January 1973.

Any conjectures must include the name of Gov. Lester Maddox, who might in a "gentleman's agreement" with Lt. Gov. George T. Smith resign and be appointed to the Senate for the unexpired term. There is nothing novel about such procedure when vacancies occur in the Senate.

If such events did, in fact, occur, Maddox would almost certainly face opposition from at least former Gov. Carl Sanders in the 1972 elections. It is probable the Republicans would also field a candidate.

Meanwhile, Sen. Russell says he will undergo treatment for his lung condition and hopes he will be able to continue to serve out at least his present term. Citizens from every part of Georgia hope Sen. Russell's disease will be arrested and that he will add many more years of public service to his already illustrious career.

[From the Thomasville (Ga.) Times-Enterprise, Mar. 22, 1969]

SENATOR RUSSELL'S ILLNESS A MATTER OF CONCERN

The illness of Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia, is a matter of serious concern to the people of this country and especially of his home state.

His long and outstanding service in the Senate has made him a national figure, and he is held in high esteem by his colleagues, who recognize him as the best parliamentarian in the Senate, and one of the most powerful figures in the Congress.

As chairman of the appropriations committee he is today fourth in line for the Presidency in event the President should die. He has also served as chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, a position he gave up to head the Senate Appropriations committee.

Suffering from emphysema, Sen. Russell is said to have a lung tumor, for which the cobalt treatment will be applied, an operation having been ruled out. The hope is that the treatment, will be effective and his general condition will improve to the end that he may be spared for many more years as one of the nations leading and most influential statesmen.

The senator has many warm friends in his home state. The Times-Enterprise throughout his long career has been one of his most loved supporters. In turn the Senator has proven himself a true friend of this community, as well as of the entire state.

[From the Waycross (Ga.) Journal Herald, Mar. 22, 1969]

PRAYERS FOR SENATOR RUSSELL

Georgians and the people of the nation are distressed and concerned over the news that Sen. Richard B. Russell will undergo treatment for lung cancer.

It is not necessary to say for those familiar with the Washington political scene that Russell is a powerful and influential man.

He has been a key figure in Congress since he left the office of governor of Georgia in 1933.

Not long ago the senior senator of our state gave up his post as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, itself a key office, to take over the chairmanship of the equally important Senate Appropriations Committee.

His counsel has been sought by several Presidents and he was especially close to former President Lyndon B. Johnson who referred to the Georgian in his valedictory address to Congress.

Although Russell has always been clearly identified with Georgia and the South, his ability, dignity and fairness have won him friends from all parts of the nation.

For several years the senator, who calls Winder home, has been suffering from emphysema but he has continued to assume his heavy responsibilities.

It can only be hoped that the treatments he will now undergo will be successful and that the services of this outstanding public servant may not be lost.

Meanwhile, people everywhere and particularly those of us who are his Georgia constituents and friends, pray for his recovery.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Morning News, Mar. 23, 1969]

THE SENATOR'S TOUGHEST FIGHT

Sen. Richard B. Russell's disclosure that he is suffering from a serious and inoperable illness weighs heavily on the thoughts of his fellow Georgians, who love and respect him as they have few men in public life.

The concern of Georgians is shared by many outside Sen. Russell's native state. Southerners have come to look upon Dick Russell as the voice of the South in Washington. And during his 36 years in the Senate officials of both parties have come to rely on his counsel as well as his ability to lead and persuade. One of his visitors at the hospital before he announced his illness was President Richard Nixon.

Sen. Russell has said he will undergo cobalt treatment for a malignant lung tumor. Lung damage caused by emphysema, from which he has suffered for some time, rules out surgery. He hopes to serve out the remainder of his term, which expires in 1972, and to continue his duties while undergoing treatment.

In Sen. Russell's words, he is "hoping this treatment will enable me to serve out my term. It is too early to make a decision on whether to seek a new term in 1972."

Sen. Russell's illness could have a profound influence on Georgia politics. He is 71 years old, has served in the Senate longer than any other member, and has been considered unbeatable at the polls. His stature and influence in Washington are such that his illness also could have powerful effects there.

Sen. Russell has said that he will be out of his office only for several days and that his treatment is now expected to last six weeks. Medical specialists have told him, he said, that "as of now I am as well qualified and able to carry on my work as I have been for the past seven months."

For the moment, the overriding consideration is that Dick Russell is undertaking what may be his toughest struggle. Georgians who have supported him through many struggles in the past will be supporting him in this one with their prayers and hopes for his recovery.

[Mar. 24, 1969]

SENATOR RUSSELL

One of the saddest things to hit Georgia—and the nation—was the announcement from Senator Russell's office that he was

being treated for a potentially cancerous condition.

For many, many years Senator Russell has been a dominant figure on the national scene, and for Georgians he was the epitome of a Senator that should be sent to the nation's Congress.

Amid the sadness of the physical condition of Georgia's Senior Senator there comes the hope that modern medicine can stop the condition and save the Senator for service for the remainder of his term at least.

Georgia has done itself proud in sending Senator Russell back to the Senate time and again, and we are convinced that were his health such, the people of Georgia would continue to return him to the place in the Senate because of the honor and the prestige that he has brought to the State and its people.

The Senator has realized, we are sure, one ambition that he had: he is now the oldest Senator in term of service in the U.S. Senate and is serving as President pro tempore of the Senate.

Other honors have come to the Georgian as he compiled a record of service to his state and nation that is the envy of many of his contemporaries in the Senate.

Just last week Senator Russell was honored as the first member of the Congress ever to receive the James B. Forrestal Award of the National Security Industrial Association. This latest recognition was merely the continuation of the many awards and recognitions that he has been given over the years.

The fondest hope of most Georgians, as well as many people over the nation, is that the treatments the Senator is now undergoing will be successful, and that for four more years at least, Senator Russell will grace the scene of the U.S. Senate.

[From the Gwinnett (Ga.) Daily News, Mar. 24, 1969]

SENATOR RUSSELL'S ILLNESS

All Georgians were saddened by the news Thursday that a malignant tumor has been found on the lung of Sen. Richard Russell. No man is as widely respected in Georgia than the state's senior senator and president pro tem of the Senate.

His constituents join Russell in the hope that he not only can serve out the rest of his present term, but that treatment can arrest the cancer sufficiently to prolong his life and his usefulness for years beyond that. Physicians plan to begin cobalt treatments immediately, and they will know more about this condition after they can see how he responds to the treatment.

Meanwhile, Russell plans to continue his regular Senate duties.

Speculation inevitably will begin on what might happen if the illness forces Russell to resign before the end of his present term. But that is premature at this point. The senator made it clear he has no present intention of stepping down.

Georgia and the nation need his service. He is the dean of the Senate, not only in terms of seniority, but in distinction, contribution and knowledge as well. He has served his state and the cause of sound government exceedingly well.

For our sake as well as for his, we pray that he will remain able to serve for many months to come.

[From the Albany (Ga.) Herald, Mar. 24, 1969]

GOOD LUCK, SENATOR RUSSELL

Young man and old, Richard Brevard Russell has served the people of Georgia as a State legislator, a Governor and United States Senator for well over 40 years, 36 of them in Washington. Consequently, a man of his ability, character and stature must be reflecting ruefully, as he undergoes ther-

apy for a lung tumor which he has good reason to believe is malignant, on how eager so many of his political colleagues back home seem to be to dispose of him. This reaction has not represented any expression of anguish; rather it has been profoundly political.

As Georgians, we can say what Senator Russell never would: We resent these comments. They are in the worst possible taste. Senator Russell is by no means dead. His health, at 71 years of age, is not of the best, admittedly. But like any other human being anywhere, he is entitled to seek and receive medical attention for his infirmities without being consigned, however prematurely, to the grave that awaits not only him, but most assuredly each and every one of us.

Fortunately, none of us, as individuals, knows that day and hour, as an all-wise Providence has planned it. And who really knows? Richard Brevard Russell just might out-live many of those who now deal in shabby speculation about his successor. Permit us to so hope. And good luck, Senator Russell.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 24, 1969]

SENATOR RUSSELL'S ILLNESS MAKES MANY PEOPLE SAY, "I REMEMBER"

(By Celestine Sibley)

The illness of Richard Russell has, I feel sure, set all his friends and neighbors in Georgia and probably people in all parts of the world thinking about him with special warmth and concern. The day the word that he had cancer reached the Georgia capitol you could hear people all over the place beginning sentences with, "I remember . . ." They remember all kinds of things about him, important and trivial, funny and solemn. So many of them were inspired to run for public office by his example back in the 1930s when he stumped the state as a bright young reform candidate for governor.

He was my first Georgia politician. I had worked for the paper only a little while when I was sent to Winder to cover a speech by Senator Russell at a barbecue. I don't remember the speech now but I remember the feeling I had about the tall, slender man who moved easily and comfortably among his old neighbors and friends. The smell of smoke from the barbecue pit was rich and pungent with the blend of oak and hickory and succulent roast pork. Hound dogs flapped their tails from beneath parked cars and shade trees. Little children cried out and were hushed by an absent pat of the hand from a listening mother or a father. At the time I was impressed by the fact that Senator Russell arrived without a retinue of aides and flunkies and that he was so approachable.

There were times later when I was to approach him for favors for friends and the marvel to me was that he received each small-seeming request as if it were of the greatest importance and dealt with it with speed and efficiency.

There was the time the teen-age daughter of a friend of mine was missing in Europe. She had been in school in Florence and had told her parents that she had just enough money to get to Paris for a holiday. They told her they would send money to her in care of American Express in Paris and to let them know that she had arrived there safely and collected it.

Days passed and they didn't hear from their daughter. They telephoned American Express in Paris to find that the money still waited for her there, uncollected. They didn't know a soul in Paris to whom they could appeal for help and finally the mother called me, assuming that newspaper friends would have connections in almost every corner of the world.

Oddly enough my newspaper friends who might have had Paris connections didn't take the problem seriously. They had the

"Oh, she's having a good time, she'll turn up," approach.

Incensed because she was a child dear to me too, I stalked to the telephone and called Senator Russell at his home in Winder. He might have sighed a little to himself but he didn't laugh. He said, "Celestine, there are probably three million Americans in Paris this summer but we wouldn't want one little Georgia girl to be lost. I'll see what I can do."

Within 12 hours Senator Russell's "connections" in Paris had had her telephone her frantic parents.

It was a small thing to take to so powerful and important a man, I realize now. But Senator Russell didn't belittle it. He dealt with it. The picture of a great man is built of such little bits and pieces. No wonder so many of us grieve that he is ill and pray for his recovery.

[From the Rome (Ga.) News Tribune,
Mar. 21, 1969]

RUSSELL ILLNESS

Not only Georgia, but the entire nation, has cause to regret the serious illness which afflicts Sen. Richard B. Russell.

Although he has faithfully represented his state for more than 30 years, Senator Russell is far from being a partisan servitor of either state or party. His service encompasses the entire range of United States interests.

Never, in its long history has the U.S. Senate had a more able and informed member. Senator Russell has been a valued advisor to five American presidents. We all hope that such a career will not be untimely interrupted by illness.

GENERAL SHOUP ASSAILS NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Gen. David M. Shoup, one of our Nation's greatest fighting men and former Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, has written an extremely important article, "The New American Militarism," which appears in the April 1969 edition of the Atlantic. General Shoup's article is without doubt the most damning indictment of the Military Establishment and of the military-industrial complex ever written by one who was so intimately involved in the Defense Establishment.

General Shoup was a heroic leader in the victorious invasion of Tarawa in 1943 and rose to become Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps for 4 years until his retirement in December 1963. He has been one of the most vociferous critics of our involvement in the ugly civil war in Vietnam, and in 1966 stated:

In my judgment, the whole of Southeast Asia as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the American people is not worth the life of a single American.

General Shoup has charged that an ambitious elite of high-ranking officers from all branches of our Armed Forces prefer war to peace and are turning the United States into "a militaristic and aggressive nation." He has asserted that the search for promotion, interservice rivalry, and an eagerness to test military doctrines were the prime factors behind our involvement in Vietnam and the top-heavy invasion of the Dominican Republic with more than 20,000 marines and infantry. He condemns the bombing of Vietnam, including North Vietnam, as "one of the most wasteful and expen-

sive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people."

General Shoup charges that military, naval, Marine, and Air Force leaders were so eager and so obsessed to test new equipment and tactics in Vietnam that they encouraged the Johnson administration to mire the United States in the quagmire of Vietnam.

This former Commandant of the Marine Corps assails the warlike propensities of high-ranking officers as a natural product of their training, selection, and code. He writes:

Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate. Since the end of World War II—

The general wrote—

these officers have gained a new respect and the voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent.

Their position—

General Shoup stated—

was enhanced by the millions of veterans from that and succeeding wars for whom the military indoctrination may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had.

Mr. President, General Shoup's relentless and sweeping comments should be read by every American concerned with the future security and well-being of our Nation. In my view it should be "must" reading in every home, in every high school and college classroom in the Nation.

General Shoup, who will undoubtedly now be assailed by some rightwing extremists and apologists for the military-industrial complex such as members of the Liberty Lobby, so called, has performed a very great public service in bringing the views as he sees them and as he lived them to the attention of his countrymen. He is indeed a hero in peace as well as in war and deserves the thanks of all Americans for his efforts to stem the rampant trend toward militarism in our Nation. I commend his article to Senators and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE NEW AMERICAN MILITARISM

(By Gen. David M. Shoup)

(NOTE.—Its roots are in the experience of World War II. The burgeoning military establishment and associated industries fuel it. Anti-Communism provides the climate which nurtures it. "It" is a "new American militarism." General Shoup, a hero of the Battle of Tarawa in 1943, who rose to become Commandant of the United States Marine Corps for four years until his retirement in December, 1963, doesn't like it. He has written this essay in collaboration with another retired Marine officer, Colonel James A. Donovan.)

America has become a militaristic and aggressive nation. Our massive and swift invasion of the Dominican Republic in 1965, concurrent with the rapid buildup of U.S. military power in Vietnam, constituted an impressive demonstration of America's readiness to execute military contingency plans

and to seek military solutions to problems of political disorder and potential Communist threats in the areas of our interest.

This "military task force" type of diplomacy is in the tradition of our more primitive, pre-World War II "gunboat diplomacy," in which we landed small forces of Marines to protect American lives and property from the perils of native bandits and revolutionaries. In those days the U.S. Navy and its Marine landing forces were our chief means, short of war, for showing the flag, exercising American power, and protecting U.S. interests abroad. The Navy, enjoying the freedom of the seas, was a visible and effective representative of the nation's sovereign power. The Marines could be employed ashore "on such other duties as the President might direct" without congressional approval or a declaration of war. The U.S. Army was not then used so freely because it was rarely ready for expeditionary service without some degree of mobilization, and its use overseas normally required a declaration of emergency or war. Now, however, we have numerous contingency plans involving large joint Air Force-Army-Navy-Marine task forces to defend U.S. interests and to safeguard our allies wherever and whenever we suspect Communist aggression. We maintain more than 1,517,000 Americans in uniform overseas in 119 countries. We have 8 treaties to help defend 48 nations if they ask us to—or if we choose to intervene in their affairs. We have an immense and expensive military establishment, fueled by a gigantic defense industry, and millions of proud, patriotic, and frequently bellicose and militaristic citizens. How did this militarist culture evolve? How did this militarism steer us into the tragic military and political morass of Vietnam?

Prior to World War II, American attitudes were typically isolationist, pacifist, and generally antimilitary. The regular peacetime military establishment enjoyed small prestige and limited influence upon national affairs. The public knew little about the armed forces, and only a few thousand men were attracted to military service and careers. In 1940 there were but 428,000 officers and enlisted men in the Army and Navy. The scale of the war, and the world's power relationships which resulted, created the American military giant. Today the active armed forces contain over 3.4 million men and women, with an additional 1.6 million ready reserves and National Guardsmen.

America's vastly expanded world role after World War II hinged upon military power. The voice and views of the professional military people became increasingly prominent. During the postwar period, distinguished military leaders from the war years filled many top positions in government. Generals Marshall, Eisenhower, MacArthur, Taylor, Ridgeway, LeMay, and others were not only popular heroes but respected opinion-makers. It was a time of international readjustment; military minds offered the benefits of firm views and problem-solving experience to the management of the nation's affairs. Military procedures—including the general staff system, briefings, estimates of the situation, and the organizational and operational techniques of the highly schooled, confident military professionals—spread throughout American culture.

World War II had been a long war. Millions of young American men had matured, been educated, and gained rank and stature during their years in uniform. In spite of themselves, many returned to civilian life as indoctrinated, combat-experienced military professionals. They were veterans, and for better or worse would never be the same again. America will never be the same either. We are now a nation of veterans. To the 14.9 million veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military

establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees, and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968 the total living veterans of U.S. military service numbered over 23 million, or about 20 percent of the adult population.

Today most middle-aged men, most business, government, civic, and professional leaders, have served some time in uniform. Whether they liked it or not, their military training and experience have affected them, for the creeds and attitudes of the armed forces are powerful medicine, and can become habit-forming. The military codes include all the virtues and beliefs used to motivate men of high principle: patriotism, duty and service to country, honor among fellowmen, courage in the face of danger, loyalty to organization and leaders, self-sacrifice for comrades, leadership, discipline, and physical fitness. For many veterans the military's efforts to train and indoctrinate them may well be the most impressive and influential experience they have ever had—especially so for the young and less educated.

In addition, each of the armed forces has its own special doctrinal beliefs and well-catalogued customs, traditions, rituals, and folklore upon which it strives to build a fiercely loyal military character and esprit de corps. All ranks are taught that their unit and their branch of the military service are the most elite, important, efficient, or effective in the military establishment. By believing in the superiority and importance of their own service they also provide themselves a degree of personal status, pride, and self-confidence.

As they get older, many veterans seem to romanticize and exaggerate their own military experience and loyalties. The policies, attitudes, and positions of the powerful veterans' organizations such as the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and AM-VETS, totaling over 4 million men, frequently reflect this pugnacious and chauvinistic tendency. Their memberships generally favor military solutions to world problems in the pattern of their own earlier experience, and often assert that their military service and sacrifice should be repeated by the younger generations.

Closely related to the attitudes and influence of America's millions of veterans is the vast and powerful complex of the defense industries, which have been described in detail many times in the eight years since General Eisenhower first warned of the military-industrial power complex in his farewell address as President. The relationship between the defense industry and the military establishment is closer than many citizens realize. Together they form a powerful public opinion lobby. The several military service associations provide both a forum and a meeting ground for the military and its industries. The associations also provide each of the armed services with a means of fostering their respective roles, objectives, and propaganda.

Each of the four services has its own association, and there are also additional military function associations, for ordnance, management, defense industry, and defense transportation, to name some of the more prominent. The Air Force Association and the Association of the U.S. Army are the largest, best organized, and most effective of the service associations. The Navy League, typical of the "silent service" traditions, is not as well coordinated in its public relations efforts, and the small Marine Corps Association is not even in the same arena with the other contenders, the Marine Association's main activity being the publication of a semi-official monthly magazine. Actually, the service associations' respective magazines, with an estimated combined circulation of over 270,000, are the primary medium serving the several associations' purposes.

Air Force and Space Digest, to cite one example, is the magazine of the Air Force

Association and the unofficial mouthpiece of the U.S. Air Force doctrine, "party line," and propaganda. It frequently promotes Air Force policy that has been officially frustrated or suppressed within the Department of Defense. It beats the tub for strength through aerospace power, interprets diplomatic, strategic, and tactical problems in terms of airpower, stresses the requirements for quantities of every type of aircraft, and frequently perpetuates the extravagant fictions about the effectiveness of bombing. This, of course, is well coordinated with and supported by the multibillion-dollar aerospace industry, which thrives upon the boundless desires of the Air Force. They reciprocate with lavish and expensive ads in every issue of *Air Force*. Over 96,000 members of the Air Force Association receive the magazine. Members include active, reserve, retired personnel, and veterans of the U.S. Air Force. Additional thousands of copies go to people engaged in the defense industry. The thick mixture of advertising, propaganda, and Air Force doctrine continuously repeated in this publication provides its readers and writers with a form of intellectual hypnosis, and they are prone to believe their own propaganda because they read it in *Air Force*.

The American people have also become more and more accustomed to militarism, to uniforms, to the cult of the gun, and to the violence of combat. Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda; the few years of peace since 1939 have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and warfare are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood. Even the weaponry and hardware they use at war are similar to the highly realistic toys of their youth. Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime.

It is this influential nucleus of aggressive, ambitious professional military leaders who are the root of America's evolving militarism. There are over 410,000 commissioned officers on active duty in the four armed services. Of these, well over half are junior ranking reserve officers on temporary active duty. Of the 150,000 or so regular career officers, only a portion are senior ranking colonels, generals, and admirals, but it is they who constitute the elite core of the military establishment. It is these few thousand top-ranking professionals who command and manage the armed forces and plan and formulate military policy and opinion. How is it, then, that in spite of civilian controls and the national desire for peace, this small group of men exert so much martial influence upon the government and life of the American people?

The military will disclaim any excess of power or influence on their part. They will point to their small numbers, low pay, and subordination to civilian masters as proof of their modest status and innocence. Nevertheless, the professional military, as a group, is probably one of the best organized and most influential of the various segments of the American scene. Three wars and six major contingencies since 1940 have forced the American people to become abnormally aware of the armed forces and their leaders. In turn the military services have produced an unending supply of distinguished, capable, articulate, and effective leaders. The sheer skill, energy, and dedication of America's military officers make them dominant in almost every government or civic organization they may inhabit, from the federal Cabinet to the local PTA.

The hard core of high-ranking professionals are, first of all, mostly service academy graduates: they had to be physically and intellectually above average among their peers just to gain entrance to an academy. Thereafter for the rest of their careers they are exposed to constant competition for selection and promotion. Attrition is high, and only the most capable survive to reach the elite senior ranks. Few other professions have such rigorous selection systems; as a result, the top military leaders are top-caliber men.

Not many industries, institutions, or civilian branches of government have the resources, techniques, or experience in training leaders such as are now employed by the armed forces in their excellent and elaborate school systems. Military leaders are taught to command large organizations and to plan big operations. They learn the techniques of influencing others. Their education is not, however, liberal or cultural. It stresses the tactics, doctrines, traditions, and codes of the military trade. It produces technicians and disciples, not philosophers.

The men who rise to the top of the military hierarchy have usually demonstrated their effectiveness as leaders, planners, and organization managers. They have perhaps performed heroically in combat, but most of all they have demonstrated, their loyalty as proponents of their own service's doctrine and their dedication to the defense establishment. The paramount sense of duty to follow orders is at the root of the military professional's performance. As a result the military often operate more efficiently and effectively in the arena of defense policy planning than do their civilian counterparts in the State Department. The military planners have their doctrinal beliefs, their loyalties, their discipline, and their typical desire to compete and win. The civilians in government can scarcely play the same policy-planning game. In general the military are better organized, they work harder, they think straighter, and they keep their eyes on the objective, which is to be instantly ready to solve the problem through military action while ensuring that their respective service gets its proper mission, role, and recognition in the operation. In an emergency the military usually have a ready plan; if not, their numerous doctrinal manuals provide firm guidelines for action. Politicians, civilian appointees, and diplomats do not normally have the same confidence about how to react to threats and violence as do the military.

The motivations behind these endeavors are difficult for civilians to understand. For example, military professionals cannot measure the success of their individual efforts in terms of personal financial gain. The armed forces are not profit-making organizations, and the rewards for excellence in the military profession are acquired in less tangible forms. Thus it is that promotion and the responsibilities of higher command, with the related fringe benefits of quarters, servants, privileges, and prestige, motivate most career officers. Promotions and choice job opportunities are attained by constantly performing well, conforming to the expected patterns, and pleasing the senior officers. Promotions and awards also frequently result from heroic and distinguished performance in combat, and it takes a war to become a military hero. Civilians can scarcely understand or even believe that many ambitious military professionals truly yearn for wars and the opportunities for glory and distinction afforded only in combat. A career of peacetime duty is a dull and frustrating prospect for the normal regular officer to contemplate.

The professional military leaders of the U.S. Armed Forces have some additional motivations which influence their readiness to involve their country in military ventures. Unlike some of the civilian policy-makers, the military has not been obsessed with the

threat of Communism per se. Most military people know very little about Communism either as a doctrine or as a form of government. But they have been given reason enough to presume that it is bad and represents the force of evil. When they can identify "Communist aggression," however, the matter then becomes of direct concern to the armed forces. Aggressors are the enemy in the war games, the "bad guys," the "Reds." Defeating aggression is a gigantic combat-area competition rather than a crusade to save the world from Communism. In the military view, all "Communist aggression" is certain to be interpreted as a threat to the United States.

The armed forces' role in performing its part of the national security policy—in addition to defense against actual direct attack on the United States and to maintaining the strategic atomic deterrent forces—is to be prepared to employ its *General Purpose Forces* in support of our collective security policy and the related treaties and alliances. To do this it deploys certain forces to forward zones in the Unified Commands, and maintains an up-to-date file of scores of detailed contingency plans which have been thrashed out and approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Important features of these are the movement or deployment schedules of task forces assigned to each plan. The various details of these plans continue to create intense rivalries between the Navy-Marine sea-lift forces and the Army-Air Force team of air-mobility proponents. At the senior command levels parochial pride in service, personal ambitions, and old Army-Navy game rivalry stemming back to academy loyalties can influence strategic planning far more than most civilians would care to believe. The game is to be ready for deployment sooner than the other elements of the joint task force and to be so disposed as to be the "first to fight." The danger presented by this practice is that readiness and deployment speed become ends in themselves. This was clearly revealed in the massive and rapid intervention in the Dominican Republic in 1965 when the contingency plans and interservice rivalry appeared to supersede diplomacy. Before the world realized what was happening, the momentum and velocity of the military plans propelled almost 20,000 U.S. soldiers and Marines into the small turbulent republic in an impressive race to test the respective mobility of the Army and the Marines, and to attain overall command of "U.S. Forces Dom. Rep." Only a fraction of the force deployed was needed or justified. A small 1935-model Marine landing force could probably have handled the situation. But the Army airlifted much of the 82nd Airborne Division to the scene, included a lieutenant general, and took charge of the operation.

Simultaneously, in Vietnam during 1965 the four services were racing to build up combat strength in that hapless country. This effort was ostensibly to save South Vietnam from Viet Cong and North Vietnamese aggression. It should also be noted that it was motivated in part by the same old interservice rivalry to demonstrate respective importance and combat effectiveness.

The punitive air strikes immediately following the Tonkin Gulf incident in late 1964 revealed the readiness of naval air forces to bomb North Vietnam. (It now appears that the Navy actually had attack plans ready even before the alleged incident took place!) So by early 1965 the Navy carrier people and the Air Force initiated a contest of comparative strikes, sorties, tonnages dropped, "Killed by Air" claims, and target grabbing which continued up to the 1968 bombing pause. Much of the reporting on air action has consisted of misleading data or propaganda to serve Air Force and Navy purposes. In fact, it became increasingly apparent that the U.S. bombing effort in both North and South Vietnam has been one of the most wasteful and

expensive hoaxes ever to be put over on the American people. Tactical and close air support of ground operations is essential, but air power use in general has to a large degree been a contest for the operations planners, "fine experience" for young pilots, and opportunity for career officers.

The highly trained professional and aggressive career officers of the Army and Marine Corps played a similar game. Prior to the decision to send combat units to South Vietnam in early 1965, both services were striving to increase their involvement. The Army already had over 16,000 military aid personnel serving in South Vietnam in the military adviser role, in training missions, logistic services, supporting helicopter companies, and in Special Forces teams. This investment of men and materiel justified a requirement for additional U.S. combat units to provide local security and to help protect our growing commitment of aid to the South Vietnam regime.

There were also top-ranking Army officers who wanted to project Army ground combat units into the Vietnam struggle for a variety of other reasons; to test plans and new equipment, to test the new air-mobile theories and tactics, to try the tactics and techniques of counterinsurgency, and to gain combat experience for young officers and noncommissioned officers. It also appeared to be a case of the military's duty to stop "Communist aggression" in Vietnam.

The Marines had somewhat similar motivations, the least of which was any real concern about the political or social problems of the Vietnamese people. In early 1965 there was a shooting war going on and the Marines were being left out of it, contrary to all their traditions. The Army's military advisory people were hogging American participation—except for a Marine Corps transport helicopter squadron at Danang which was helping the Army of the Republic of Vietnam. For several years young Marine officers had been going to South Vietnam from the 3rd Marine Division on Okinawa for short tours of "on-the-job training" with the small South Vietnam Marine Corps. There was a growing concern, however, among some senior Marines that the Corps should get involved on a larger scale and be the "first to fight" in keeping with the Corps' traditions. This would help justify the Corps' continued existence, which many Marines seem to consider to be in constant jeopardy.

The Corps had also spent several years exploring the theories of counterinsurgency and as early as 1961 had developed an elaborate lecture-demonstration called OPERATION CORMORANT, for school and Marine Corps promotion purposes, which depicted the Marines conducting a large-scale amphibious operation on the coast of Vietnam and thereby helping resolve a hypothetical aggressor-insurgency problem. As always it was important to Marine planners and doctrinaires to apply an amphibious operation to the Vietnam situation and provide justification for this special Marine functional responsibility. So Marine planners were seeking an acceptable excuse to thrust a landing force over the beaches of Vietnam when the Viet Cong attacked the U.S. Army Special Forces camp at Pleiku in February, 1965. It was considered unacceptable aggression, and the President was thereby prompted to put U.S. ground combat units into the war. Elements of the 3rd Marine Division at Okinawa were already aboard ship and eager to go, for the Marines also intended to get to Vietnam before their neighbor on Okinawa, the Army's 173rd Airborne Brigade, arrived. (Actually the initial Marine unit to deploy was an airlifted antiaircraft missile battalion which arrived to protect the Danang air base.) With these initial deployments the Army-Marine race to build forces in Vietnam began in earnest and did not slow down until both became overextended, overcommitted, and depleted at home.

For years up to 1964 the chiefs of the armed services, of whom the author was then one, deemed it unnecessary and unwise for U.S. forces to become involved in any ground war in Southeast Asia. In 1964 there were changes in the composition of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in a matter of a few months the Johnson Administration, encouraged by the aggressive military, hastened into what has become the quagmire of Vietnam. The intention at the time was that the war effort be kept small and "limited." But as the momentum and involvement built up, the military leaders rationalized a case that this was not a limited-objective exercise, but was a proper war in defense of the United States against "Communist aggression" and in honor of our area commitments.

The battle successes and heroic exploits of America's fine young fighting men have added to the military's traditions which extol service, bravery, and sacrifice, and so it has somehow become unpatriotic to question our military strategy and tactics or the motives of military leaders. Actually, however, the military commanders have directed the war in Vietnam, they have managed the details of its conduct; and more than most civilian officials, the top military planners were initially ready to become involved in Vietnam combat and have the opportunity to practice their trade. It has been popular to blame the civilian administration for the conduct and failures of the war rather than to question the motives of the military. But some of the generals and admirals are by no means without responsibility for the Vietnam miscalculations.

Some of the credibility difficulties experienced by the Johnson Administration over its war situation reports and Vietnam policy can also be blamed in part upon the military advisers. By its very nature most military activity falls under various degrees of security classification. Much that the military plans or does must be kept from the enemy. Thus the military is indoctrinated to be secretive, devious, and misleading in its plans and operations. It does not, however, always confine its security restrictions to purely military operations. Each of the services and all of the major commands practice techniques of controlling the news and the release of self-serving propaganda: in "the interests of national defense," to make the service look good, to cover up mistakes, to build up and publicize a distinguished military personality, or to win a round in the continuous gamesmanship of the interservice contest. If the Johnson Administration suffered from lack of credibility in its reporting of the war, the truth would reveal that much of the hocus-pocus stemmed from schemers in the military services, both at home and abroad.

Our militaristic culture was born of the necessities of World War II, nurtured by the Korean War, and became an accepted aspect of American life during the years of cold war emergencies and real or imagined threats from the Communist bloc. Both the philosophy and the institutions of militarism grew during these years because of the momentum of their own dynamism, the vigor of their ideas, their large size and scope, and because of the dedicated concentration of the emergent military leaders upon their doctrinal objectives. The dynamism of the defense establishment and its culture is also inspired and stimulated by vast amounts of money, by the new creations of military research and materiel development, and by the concepts of the Defense Department-supported "think factories." These latter are extravagantly funded civilian organizations of scientists, analysts, and retired military strategists who feed new militaristic philosophies into the Defense Department to help broaden the views of the single service doctrinaires, to create fresh policies and new requirements for ever larger, more expensive defense forces.

Somewhat like a religion, the basic appeals of anti-Communism, national defense, and patriotism provide the foundation for a powerful creed upon which the defense establishment can build, grow, and justify its cost. More so than many large bureaucratic organizations, the defense establishment now devotes a large share of its efforts to self-perpetuation, to justifying its organizations, to preaching its doctrines, and to self-maintenance and management. Warfare becomes an extension of war games and field tests. War justifies the existence of the establishment, provides experience for the military novice and challenges for the senior officer. Wars and emergencies put the military and their leaders on the front pages and give status and prestige to the professionals. Wars add to the military traditions, the self-nourishment of heroic deeds, and provide a new crop of military leaders who become the rededicated disciples of the code of service and military action. Being recognized public figures in a nation always seeking folk heroes, the military leaders have been largely exempt from the criticism experienced by the more plebeian politician. Flag officers are considered "experts," and their views are often accepted by press and Congress as the gospel. In turn, the distinguished military leader feels obligated not only to perpetuate loyally the doctrine of his service but to comply with the stereotyped military characteristics by being tough, aggressive, and firm in his resistance to Communist aggression and his belief in the military solutions to world problems. Standing closely behind these leaders, encouraging and prompting them are the rich and powerful defense industries. Standing in front, adorned with service caps, ribbons, and lapel emblems, is a nation of veterans—patriotic, belligerent, romantic, and well intentioned, finding a certain sublimation and excitement in their country's latest military venture. Militarism in America is in full bloom and promises a future of vigorous self-pollination—unless the blight of Vietnam reveals that militarism is more a poisonous weed than a glorious blossom.

THE PRESIDENT'S OIL IMPORT POLICY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when the President first announced that he was taking it upon himself to decide all future questions of oil import policy, I expressed the hope that the new study he was ordering would not be used as an excuse for delay. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the press release I issued on February 20 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY

Today's announcement by President Nixon that he is assuming personal responsibility for all decisions in the area of oil import controls is a welcome one to the extent that fact-finding and decisions regarding the oil import program will be taken out of the Interior Department where they tend to be most vulnerable to the importunings of the oil industry.

On the other hand, the oil industry's response to all proposals for the long overdue rethinking of the oil import program has always been "further study", i.e., delay. I hope President Nixon will give us assurance that "extensive review in detail" does not mean indefinite delay. Congressional committees, executive agencies, and other groups have developed sufficient information, statistics, and testimony over the past decade to enable the President and Congress to move immediately to the action stage. I, for one,

have expressed my intention to introduce legislation to change the oil import program, and I am proceeding on this course.

I do not think appointment of a Cabinet level or non-Government study group is necessary or justified. However, if the President appoints such a group, it should be fully representative of consumer and citizen interests, with a strictly limited representation from the petroleum-petrochemical industry. It should have a mandate to report quickly, certainly within 90 days.

I am also hopeful that today's announcement will not presage any delay in two pending actions affecting New England's access to reasonably priced oil products. Both the Machiasport free trade zone proposal and the pending regulation regarding independent oil terminal operators constitute relief which should and must be granted in any event as long as the present system of controls continues. Thus these should be implemented immediately, regardless of what major overhauls in the system may eventually take place.

I am communicating these suggestions directly to the President in a telegram tonight, and am asking for an early opportunity to meet with the person in his office who will have responsibility for this area.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I also indicated that I thought that it would be a waste of time and effort to appoint a Cabinet-level committee to study this problem. Yesterday, 1 month and 6 days after his original announcement, the President revealed that he is convening such a Cabinet-level committee. Thus not only will we have the additional delay which working through such a committee will engender, but we have also presumably had 5 weeks of inaction before the Cabinet committee has even begun its work. During those 5 weeks, I would have thought that the entire machinery of the Federal Government could have assembled all the conceivable information necessary to make an enlightened decision. In our recent hearings before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee, I asked the expert witnesses who are experienced in this field how long it should take to make the necessary decisions once the available information was assembled, and they indicated that 2 or 3 months would certainly be sufficient time. The entire Nation has suffered for 10 years now under the yoke of the oil import program, and it has cost consumers and businessmen some \$40 to \$70 billion. Every week that goes by means more millions of dollars of unnecessary expense to the American public.

The people of the Nation, especially the people of my section of the country, deserve relief, and deserve it immediately.

President Nixon owes them an explanation for the delays, and he owes them action.

SENATOR RICHARD RUSSELL HAS OUR HOPES FOR COMPLETE RECOVERY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I join with Senators in wishing the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia, RICHARD B. RUSSELL, a speedy and complete recovery.

I was shocked and disturbed to learn of his illness this past weekend. It is my fervent hope that the miracles of modern

medical science will provide a cure for his illness.

Since he came into the Senate in 1933, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL has epitomized integrity, dignity, fairness, and all of the great qualities that make him the Senators' Senator. His illness has stunned this body. We all look to him as the premier parliamentarian among us. Any Senator could approach him and could ask for counsel or advice on parliamentary procedure. He always gave it freely, accurately, and truly.

It has been my privilege this past 4 years to serve with Senator RUSSELL as a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Now, after 36 years in the Senate, Senator RUSSELL has become President pro tempore and also chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. He has compiled a record of dedication and service to his constituents and to this country which brings credit to his name, to his State, and to the Senate as a body.

Even though he is away for treatment for only a short period of time, we miss his wisdom and counsel from day to day. All Members of this body wish him well and look forward to his return from the hospital soon.

COAL MINER'S PNEUMOCONIOSIS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier today I sent to the desk a bill to provide Federal financial assistance to States to enable them to pay compensation to certain disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal-mining industry, suffer from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to compensation under any workmen's compensation law. The bill is being cosponsored by my senior colleague, Mr. RANDOLPH, and myself, and we hope that other Senators will join in cosponsoring the bill. We would welcome additional names in support of this measure.

The purpose of the bill is to provide compensation to disabled coal miners suffering from "black lung," and other forms of pneumoconiosis, who are not covered by State laws.

My colleague and I believe that here is a legislative gap which should be bridged, and it seems to us that the only way to do it is through the enactment of Federal legislation.

For example, the West Virginia Legislature recently enacted a new compensation law covering pneumoconiosis, but I am advised that some of the "black lung" sufferers may not benefit from it because such workmen's compensation legislation cannot be retroactive.

So, unless a Federal law is enacted to include those who may have retired before the new State law goes into effect, or for whom the statute of limitations may have expired, I am told that some of these people may have no recourse to compensation. Therefore, the bill which my colleague and I are sponsoring would authorize compensation in such cases on a Federal-State matching basis. The legislation would only affect those miners disabled from pulmonary diseases contracted through exposure to coal dust,

silica, et cetera, and who are not covered by State laws.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Labor would be authorized to enter into an agreement with any State for the purpose of assisting that State in providing compensation to disabled individuals who, as a result of their employment in the coal mining industry, are suffering from pneumoconiosis and who are not entitled to receive compensation under any workmen's compensation law.

The State agency administering the workmen's compensation law of the State would be responsible for administering the act which we are proposing. The amount of compensation payable to any individual would be \$25 per week. This amount would be lower than the benefits to which miners would be entitled under the compensation laws of any State, but the amount would at least provide an income from \$100 to perhaps \$115 per month, which would prevent many families from having to depend on public welfare. The \$25 benefit payment, being lower, I am told, than that provided by any compensation law of any State would encourage miners to explore eligibility before a State's statute of limitations expires rather than take the chance of receiving benefits under the Federal-State program at a level lower than the benefits provided in a State's workmen's compensation program.

Under this bill the State of West Virginia would not have to bear the burden of paying compensation under the Federal-State program to a former West Virginian who would now be living, let us say, in the State of California or Ohio or Kentucky. An individual would have to be a resident of West Virginia in order to qualify under this program in West Virginia.

This legislation would leave the definition of pneumoconiosis to the respective State laws, but a person entitled to benefits under this act would have to be unable, by reason of pneumoconiosis contracted as a result of employment in or in connection with the mining of coal, to engage in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The act would expire in 20 years—specifically with the close of December 31, 1989. The Federal Government would provide 100 percent of compensation and administrative costs in the first calendar year, commencing on January 1, 1970. The Federal share, for both compensation and administrative costs, would be reduced 5 percent for each calendar year thereafter. This would gradually shift the burden to the States. The justification for the Federal Government's bearing 100 percent of the burden during the first year is based partly on the fact that many claims would have to be processed during the first year of operation of the act. Consequently, it would be extremely burdensome upon a State to have to deal with the congestion of such claims which would be bound to occur at the beginning of the 20-year period. Moreover, many of the State legislatures would not meet until a year after the program had begun, and unless the Federal Govern-

ment pays 100 percent of the costs during that first year, those same States would be prevented from participation because their legislatures would not have authorized the expenditure of State matching funds.

The act requires that, in order for a State to qualify for benefits under this program, the pertinent statute of limitations could not be less than 3 years.

In fine, Mr. President, the bill which is being introduced by my colleague and myself has as its purpose the compensating of miners disabled because of pneumoconiosis who cannot qualify under State laws because the statute of limitations may have run or because of the prohibition on retroaction of State laws, and so forth. This program would serve as an adjunct to, not as a substitute for, the workmen's compensation program in a particular State. It is not meant to displace a State's workmen's compensation program, and, of course, it is to be funded in a different manner, as I have already described.

My colleague and I believe that this is a good bill. Indubitably, it can be altered and improved by the committee to which it will be referred. For example, the committee may wish to make it applicable also to other types of mining. Senator RANDOLPH and I are not wedded to any particular provision in the measure, and we would both like to see it improved in whatever way the Labor Committee deems advisable. But we do feel that the basic idea embraced by this bill is one which, through necessity, must be implemented and we hope that the committee will consider the bill, make whatever changes may appear to be advisable, and favorably report the resulting legislation for action by the Senate. As I said in the beginning, there is a gap in the workmen's compensation laws of the States, and it is hoped that this bill will be the instrument whereby this gap will be closed.

FARMERS' TAX INEQUITIES

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on January 22 I reintroduced, as S. 500, a bill designed to remove the inequities between legitimate farm operators and taxpayers who are in the business of farming mainly because of the tax advantages that serve to put their nonfarm income in a lower tax bracket. The problem is that liberal tax rules designed for the benefit of the ordinary farmer are being abused by tax-dodge farmers—people who engage in farming for the purpose of creating artificial losses which can be used to offset substantial amounts of their nonfarm income. Collectively, a bipartisan group of members from at least 30 different State congressional delegations have specifically endorsed this legislation.

One of the finest statements discussing the whole question of tax-dodge farming was the statement submitted to the House Ways and Means Committee on March 10 by John W. Scott, master of the National Grange. In his statement, Mr. Scott points out that as early as 1939 the Grange adopted a resolution in opposition to the practice of tax-dodge farming.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the exhaustive analysis made by the Grange in support of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. SCOTT, MASTER OF THE NATIONAL GRANGE, BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 10, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am John W. Scott, Master of the National Grange, with offices at 1616 H Street N.W., Washington, D.C. The National Grange is a farm and rural-urban community and family organization, representing 7,000 community Granges located in rural America. Our membership lives in rural-urban areas in 40 of the 50 States and has a vital interest in the matter being considered by this Committee over a long period of our 102 years.

We are in support of H.R. 4257, and identical bills, to eliminate existing tax loopholes which benefit wealthy nonfarmers who enter farm loss operations and distort the agricultural economy at the expense of legitimate farmers and the average taxpayer.

The Grange has a long history of interest in this particular area of income tax revision, as it has been of vital concern to our members since 1939. At the 73rd Annual Session of the National Grange, held in Peoria, Illinois, the delegate body adopted the following resolution:

"In order to discourage corporation farming and capitalists acquiring large acreage of farm land, we recommend that the Federal income tax be amended to provide that losses on agricultural operations can be deducted only from incomes derived from agricultural operations."

The policy of the National Grange, adopted 28 years ago, was a lone voice against the inequities contained in the Internal Revenue Code. The continuing validity of this objective has been subsequently recognized by action of the Delegate Body taken in 1963, 1964, 1965 and again in 1967 at the 100th Anniversary of the founding of the National Grange.

At our 102nd Annual Session held in Peoria, Illinois, in November 1968, as we started our second century of service to rural America, the Delegate Body once more reaffirmed Grange position on this important and vital matter of great concern to family farms and rural communities.

The Taxation and Fiscal Policy Committee that considered tax revision resolutions made the following statement:

"The mounting concern of the family farm operator over the accelerating acquisition of agricultural lands by individuals and organizations for the purpose of building up a loss position from farming operations conducted on the lands acquired and deducting such losses from income tax liability is indicated by the fact that resolutions to prevent this practice have been received at this Annual Session of the National Grange from eighteen of the 38 State Granges.

"Farmers and their families engaged in bona fide farming operations are being forced to leave the farm, as a result of net income being at a depressed level.

"Competition of non-farm investors inflating the price of agricultural land and using loss on farming operations as a deduction against non-farm income is a factor in this lower net farm income.

"Resolved, that the National Grange vigorously support amending the Internal Revenue Code to prohibit any substantial portion of farm operating losses being used as a tax deduction or write-off against non-farm income."

The Delegate Body adopted the above statement and resolution, once more raising their voices against the unfair competition such tax advantages provide for those non-

farm interests engaged in agricultural production, for the family and commercial farmers who are dependent upon the profit from agriculture for their livelihood.

We welcome and commend Senator Lee Metcalf of Montana for taking the leadership in introducing legislation to close the "loop-hole" in the Internal Revenue Code that makes "tax-loss" farming possible and profitable for non-farm interests. We also are appreciative of the efforts of Representative John Culver of Iowa for his sponsorship of identical legislation in the House of Representatives. We further appreciate the 26 other Senators and 29 additional Representatives that have co-sponsored this important legislation. For 25 years the Grange was the lone voice speaking out for tax reforms pertaining to "tax-loss" farming. We are grateful that our voices have been joined by the Departments of Agriculture, Treasury and some additional 11 farm organizations as well as the AFL-CIO. To paraphrase a statement made by President Nixon in his inaugural address on January 20, 1969, "We hope now that our words will be heard as well as our voices", as we speak out for tax reforms to help preserve the family farm structure in American agriculture.

THE PROBLEM OF TAX-LOSS FARMING

We do not presume to be tax specialists and we do not want to fill the record with information that is not based on pertinent data, therefore, we would like to quote from Part 2 "Tax Reform Studies and Proposals, U.S. Treasury Department", which outlines the tax rules that encourage "tax-loss farming" and defines the problem far better than we would be able to do with our limited knowledge of the Internal Revenue Code.

Methods of Accounting.—There are two principal methods of accounting used in reporting business income for tax purposes. In general, those businesses which do not involve the production or sale of merchandise may use the cash method. Under it, income is reported when received in cash or its equivalent, and expenses are deducted when paid in cash or its equivalent.

"On the other hand, in businesses where the production or sale of merchandise is a significant factor, income can be properly reflected only if the costs of the merchandise are deducted in the accounting period in which the income from its sale is realized. This is accomplished by recording costs when incurred and sales when made, and including in inventory those costs attributable to unsold goods on hand at year's end. Deduction of the costs included in inventory must be deferred until the goods to which they relate are sold, and deduction is not permitted when the costs are incurred. Thus, under this method of accounting, income from sales of inventory and the costs of producing or purchasing such inventory are matched in the same accounting period, thereby properly reflecting income.

"Farmers, however, have been excepted from these general rules. Even in those cases where inventories are a material factor, they have historically been permitted to use the cash accounting method and ignore their year-end inventories of crops, cattle, et cetera. This results in an inaccurate reflection of annual income in situations when expenditures are fully deducted in the year incurred, but the assets produced by those expenditures (inventories) are not sold, and the income not reported, until a later year.

Capitalization of Costs.—Farmers are also permitted another liberal tax accounting rule. In most businesses, the costs of constructing an asset (including maintenance of the asset prior to its being used in the business) is a capital expenditure which may not be deducted as incurred but may be recovered only by depreciation over the useful life of the asset. In this manner, the cost of the asset is matched with the income earned by the asset. Farmers, however, have been per-

mitted to deduct some admittedly capital costs as they are incurred. For example, a citrus grove may not bear a commercial crop until 6 or 7 years after it has been planted. Yet, the farmer may elect to deduct as incurred all costs of raising the grove to a producing state even though such expenditures are capital in nature. Similarly, the capital nature of expenditures associated with the raising of livestock held for breeding may be ignored, and the expenditures may be deducted currently.

The Problem.—These liberal deviations from good accounting practices were permitted for farm operations in order to spare the ordinary farmer the bookkeeping chores associated with inventories and accrual accounting.

"However, some high-bracket taxpayers whose primary economic activity is other than farming, carry on limited farming activities such as citrus farming or cattle raising. By electing the special farm accounting rules which allow premature deductions, many of these high-bracket taxpayers show farm losses which are not true economic losses. These 'tax losses' are then deducted from their high bracket non-farm income, resulting in large tax savings. Moreover, these 'tax losses' which arise from deductions taken because of capital costs or inventory costs usually thus represent an investment in farm assets rather than funds actually lost. This investment quite often will ultimately be sold and taxed only at low capital gains rates. Thus, deductions are set off against ordinary income while the sale price of the resulting assets represents capital gain. The gain is usually the entire sales price since the full cost of creating the asset has previously been deducted against ordinary income.

"The existing 'hobby loss' provision of the Internal Revenue Code is ineffectual in dealing with this problem. While that provision disallows deductions for continuing heavy losses in a trade or business over a period of at least 5 consecutive years, the fact of a loss and its extent are measured by comparing the expenses of the business with the total income from the business including the full amount of capital gain income although only one-half of that income is subject to tax. Thus, to escape the hobby loss provision, it is merely necessary that the taxpayer realize capital gain farm income at least once every 5 years. If the capital gain income just equals the farm expenses for a year, the hobby loss provision is inapplicable for 5 years even though the taxpayer will show a tax loss for that year equal to one-half his farm expenses.

Effect of tax benefits on farm economy.—When a taxpayer purchases and operates a farm for its tax benefits, the transaction leads to a distortion of the farm economy. The tax benefits allow an individual to operate a farm at an economic breakeven or even a loss and still realize an overall profit. For example, for a top-bracket taxpayer, where a deduction is associated with eventual capital gains income, each \$1 of deduction means an immediate tax savings of 70 cents to be offset in the future by only 25 cents of tax. This cannot help but result in a distortion of the farm economy, and is harmful to the ordinary farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support him and his family.

"This distortion may be evidenced in various ways: For one, the attractive farm tax benefits available to wealthy persons have caused them to bid up the price of farmland beyond that which would prevail in a normal farm economy. Furthermore, because of the present tax rules, the ordinary farmer must compete in the marketplace with these wealthy farmowners who may consider a farm profit—in the economic sense—unnecessary for their purposes."

We believe that this clearly demonstrates what has caused the problem and the scope

and serious effect our tax laws have spawned in distorting the farm economy. In addition it pinpoints the competition this outside interest that farms for tax dollars presents to the family farm.

CORRECTION OF THE PROBLEM

The correction of the problem lies in eliminating the tax advantage high-bracket, part-time farmers have in using the generous farm accounting rules to reduce their tax liability on their nonfarm incomes.

It is our belief that the provisions of H.R. 4257 and H.R. 7575, introduced by Rep. Culver and 28 other Representatives in the House of Representatives, and S. 500, introduced by Senator Metcalf and 26 other Senators, will correct the abuse of the liberal tax rules provided in the Internal Revenue Code for the use of bona fide farmers.

This corrective legislation will affect only non-farmers with large amounts of non-farm income who invest in farming in order to secure tax losses which may be set off against their non-farm income.

There are numerous safeguards in the bill to protect the family farmer who depends on his farm to produce the income needed to support his family.

There is an important exception to the dollar limitation in the bill. This legislation in no event prevents the deduction of farm losses to the extent they relate to taxes, interest, casualty losses, losses from drought, and losses from the sale of farm property. An exception is made for those deductions, since they are in general deductions which would be allowed to anyone holding property without regard to whether it was being used in farming or because they represent deductions which are clearly beyond the control of the farmer; such as losses from casualty and drought. Under provisions of the bill, if the total of these deductions is higher than fifteen thousand dollars then the higher figure may be used without any reduction because of nonfarm income above fifteen thousand dollars. In other words, the fifteen thousand dollar limitation is directed solely at the type of deductions that are artificially created through the abuse of the special accounting rules designed for ordinary farmers.

We are confident that the legislation will not have a detrimental effect on legitimate farmers or non-farmers who invest in farming to earn farm profits. The legislation is unique, in that it is pointed directly at the abuse of the liberal tax accounting rules of the Internal Revenue Code, provided by Congress for ordinary farmers or those interests outside of agriculture that make investments in farming for a profit.

The legislation also provides for the large commercial farming interests in cattle, citrus and other farm specialty crops to be exempt from the provisions of the Act if they follow standard accrual accounting methods. Surely, such large privately-owned agricultural interests or investors in agriculture that use either grove management firms or cattle management firms have available to them the accounting expertise to follow such accounting methods.

The National Grange would be the last organization to support legislation to prohibit persons outside of agriculture from entering agriculture as full-time farmers or as investors supplying capital for those already engaged in agricultural production. We have insisted, however, and will continue to insist, that the rules for playing the game be the same. The enactment of H.R. 4257 will equalize the rules and make farming a fair game for all interested in agriculture for profit.

INVASION BY CONGLOMERATES

We realize that the elimination of tax loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code as it applies to individuals and corporations investing or engaged in agriculture will not stop the conglomerate corporation invasion. It will, however, eliminate the financing of such mergers and take-overs by the American

taxpayer by the use of "tax shelter" windfalls.

The real control over conglomerate corporate invasion can be done by tightening of the anti-trust laws, which we realize does not come under the jurisdiction of this Committee. However, we feel that this intrusion into agriculture is part of the same kind of problem which the Committee is considering today and perhaps is a far greater danger to the family farm structure of American agriculture. Curtailing tax abuse is the first step, and a necessary step, in controlling conglomerate corporation invasion of agriculture. We welcome this and similar tax legislation to take the "tax profit" out of such acquisitions by non-farm interests.

BENEFITS FROM TAX SHELTERS

We, as responsible members of the agricultural society, would be amiss if we did not consider any possible economic benefit to agriculture and rural America of the so-called "tax incentives" provided in the Internal Revenue Code.

Those who are in opposition to plugging the Internal Revenue loopholes that permit "tax-loss" farming present the following arguments in favor of a continuation of the *laissez faire*:

1. They are not tax loopholes but are tax incentives to attract into agriculture outside "risk" money;
2. That outside capital investments in agriculture have assisted in improvement in livestock breeds;
3. That farmers have benefited by outside capital in that they can expand their operations, buy more cattle, more land, which in turn benefits rural America.

We cannot help but agree that outside capital has benefited *certain individuals in agriculture* as well as *certain specific rural communities*. However, we hasten to ask, is it worth the total cost to the *Federal Treasury of approximately \$145 million in lost revenue*? The total increase in Federal revenue would be much higher since farm operations carried on by corporations usually are not separately reported on the corporation tax return. Consequently, data concerning the number of corporations and revenue effect with respect thereto are not available.

Thousands upon thousands of family farms, the backbone of rural communities, are adversely affected by the activity of a small percentage of individuals who are lucky enough to have benefited directly from outside "risk" capital.

Improvement in livestock breeds has been and continues to be a major research function of our land grant colleges. These institutions are supported by public funds and devote time, money and labor into herd improvement by breeding as well as scientific feeding. We suggest that these laboratories of animal research have made major contributions to breed improvement, feeding improvement and similar advancements in the livestock industry far in excess of contributions made from outside "risk" capital.

We submit to this Committee that the interest of American agriculture and rural communities will be best served if the family farm structure does not have to compete with a select few individuals who are deriving direct benefit from the loopholes in the Internal Revenue Code.

Three categories of people receive direct benefit from the abuse of the liberal provisions in the Internal Revenue Code created for the use of the ordinary farmer: the investor, the financial manager and the farmer who manages the livestock or agricultural crops in which outside risk capital is invested, this at a tremendous loss to the Federal Treasury and the further economic loss to the family farm structure that is dependent upon profit for its very existence. Gentlemen, can we afford this kind of "Cowboy Economics"?

CONCLUSIONS

The National Grange recognizes the importance of preserving and protecting the integrity of the owner-operator-manager farm, as a guarantee to the Nation of the efficient and abundant production of high-quality food and fiber at reasonable prices for the domestic and world market.

We seek to obtain for American farmers a return for their labor, management, risk and investment which bears a reasonable relationship to that received for these same economic factors in any other segment of our economy, as well as adequate compensation for their contribution to the general welfare.

The activities of conglomerate corporations and other nonfarm interests in agriculture are not consistent with long-range Grange objectives and have resulted in commodity market price manipulation, unrealistically high prices for farm land and increased farm real estate taxes, (which have made it increasingly difficult to pass farms on to heirs). The net result has been a loss in rural America of farm families. These farm families are frequently forced to migrate to urban centers and into situations for which they are ill-prepared, which further aggravates the explosive problem of our central cities and urban areas, including flooding of the labor market with additional unskilled workers.

If large corporations and non-farm interests become predominant in agriculture, the need for many Main Street businesses, schools, churches and municipal facilities will be eliminated. It will destroy job opportunities in rural America and will not be in the best interest of long-term national objectives.

This impact on community life makes the non-agricultural corporate farm invasion a human as well as an economic problem. It is a problem that should concern all Americans and demand their immediate attention.

We again express our thanks to the Chairman and this Committee for allowing the National Grange to present our views on this problem that is so vital to rural America and the preservation of the family farm structure of American Agriculture.

DR. JAMES P. WESBERRY, PASTOR OF THE MORNINGSIDE BAPTIST CHURCH, ATLANTA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the State of Georgia's most beloved and respected pastors, Dr. James P. Wesberry, observed his 25th anniversary on March 1 as pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church in Atlanta.

Dr. Wesberry was honored at special services on that occasion by his congregation and his many friends and associates in Atlanta, throughout Georgia, and from across the Nation. Dr. Wesberry's ministry has carried him all over the world and for a time in 1949 he served as Acting Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives.

On March 4, the Georgia State Senate adopted a resolution commending and congratulating Dr. Wesberry on his long and distinguished service. Jim Wesberry is a great man, and a great pastor. I am proud to count him as one of my warmest friends.

I ask unanimous consent that the Georgia State Senate resolution, along with portions of Dr. Wesberry's biographical profile, be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. RES. 87

A resolution commending and congratulating Dr. James Pickett Wesberry; and for other purposes

Whereas, on Saturday, March 1, 1969, Dr. James Pickett Wesberry will celebrate his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta; and

Whereas, Dr. Wesberry is one of Georgia's most highly respected citizens who is loved by thousands of people throughout the world; and

Whereas, he has dedicated himself to the betterment of his fellowman and is an outstanding representative of the great principles of Christianity; and

Whereas, his remarkable ability and devotion to the improvement of mankind have been widely recognized for many years as demonstrated by the numerous positions of honor, trust and responsibility which have been placed upon him; and

Whereas, in recognition of the great contributions he has made to his City, State and Nation, many honors have been bestowed upon him; and

Whereas, he is the father of a distinguished former member of the State Senate, Honorable James P. Wesberry, Jr.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate that the members of this body do hereby commend Dr. James Pickett Wesberry for his many years of dedicated service to his fellowman and congratulate him on the occasion of his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta.

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of the Senate is hereby authorized and directed to transmit an appropriate copy of this Resolution to Dr. James Pickett Wesberry.

Adopted in Senate March 4, 1969.

GEO. G. SMITH,

President of the Senate.

HAMILTON MCWHORTER, Jr.

Secretary of the Senate.

DR. JAMES PICKETT WESBERRY

Dr. Wesberry is known and loved by thousands of people throughout the world. He is in his twenty-fifth year as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church of Atlanta. . . . He was born in the little town of Bishopville, South Carolina, and reared in Columbia, the state's capital. He was destined to walk in paths of service as a humble, devoted Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ—Preacher, Pastor, Teacher, Counselor, Author, Statesman, and Friend—keenly sensitive to the heart throbs of humanity, a devoted lover of souls, and a true zealot for the cause of righteousness.

On September 5, 1929, he was married to Ruby Lee Perry of Columbia who died Christmas Day, 1941. To this union was born one son, James Pickett, Jr., who is a Certified Public Accountant and former Georgia State Senator, now Financial Consultant to the Government of Peru in Lima. He later married Mary Sue Latimer, of Greenville, South Carolina, a graduate of Furman and the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary (M.R.E. Degree), the daughter of the late Dr. and Mrs. Leon M. Latimer.

As a boy Dr. Wesberry attended public schools in his hometown of Columbia. During his high school years, except for the time he was manager of student athletics, he was employed by the Federal Land Bank of Columbia, working before and after school hours. He holds the A.B. and M.A. Degrees from his beloved Alma Mater, Mercer University; the B.D. and S.T.M., from Andover Newton Theological School; and has received four honorary Doctor's Degrees: LL.D., D.D., L.H.D., and Lit.D. He was a special student at Harvard in 1931; attended summer conferences at Union Theological Seminary in New York City, 1935 and 1965, Yale

School of Alcohol Studies in 1946, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary in 1957, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1958. While at Mercer University he received the highest honor accorded a student in 1931 by both faculty and fellow students, that of Master Mercerian.

On June 4, 1962 Dr. Westberry was signally honored by LaGrange College by being the first minister outside the Methodist denomination to receive an honorary degree from this 137-year-old institution. The citation read by President Waites Henry said: "LaGrange College takes note of the qualities of life and contribution that have brought honor to your name," and referred to him as a "faithful servant of the Church." "In particular," it read, "we hereby recognize your special service to the people of Georgia in the report of this Commission (State Literature) and, in token of our appreciation, confer on you the honorary degree of Doctor of Humanities." Dr. Westberry cherishes his friendships with those of all denominations, and has contributed much to the ecumenical spirit of Atlanta.

At the age of 20 Dr. Westberry was ordained to the Gospel Ministry by his home church, Park Street Baptist, Columbia, South Carolina, J. Dean Crain, Pastor, while a sophomore at Mercer University serving country churches in Georgia. From 1928 to 1931 during his last three years at Mercer he was Pastor at Soperton, where he led his people in the erection of a beautiful new church and made many lasting influential friends. He later served as Pastor of the South Medford Baptist Church, Medford, Massachusetts; the Kingstree Baptist Church, Kingstree, South Carolina; and the Bamberg Baptist Church, Bamberg, South Carolina for eleven years before coming to Morningside.

Dr. Westberry has distinguished himself as a true statesman, extending his influence beyond denominational lines into many other avenues of life. From July 27 to August 25, 1949 he served as Acting Chaplain of the U.S. House of Representatives, receiving the confidence and esteem of every member. In his book of *Prayers* published by Congress, the Honorable Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House, wrote this tribute: "His daily ministrations were helpful and inspiring, lifting all who heard him to a deeper realization of their need for divine guidance." Since 1953 as Chairman of the Georgia Commission on Literature, his voice has been no uncertain sound regarding the evils of obscene literature, arousing and stimulating similar action throughout the nation. And, he has just completed an appointment on the Governor's Citizens Penal Reform Commission in which he served as Chairman of the Editorial Committee to compile and write its Report to the Governor, The General Assembly and The People of Georgia.

In addition to his Book of *Prayers*, he is the author of the *Life and Work of William Screven; Every Citizen Has a Right to Know*, a Report of the Georgia Literature Commission, 1954; *The Georgia Literature Commission, 1957 Report; Rainbow Over Russia*; and *Baptists in South Carolina Before the War Between the States* which was published in 1968. In 1962-63 he published a newspaper column, *The People's Pulpit*, in forty-five county weeklies in Georgia and South Carolina. He has contributed editorials, articles, and sermons to various sources, including the Young People's Training Union Quarterly of the Southern Baptist Convention, and Dr. Andrew W. Blackwood's latest *Special-Day Sermons for Evangelicals* carries his sermon, "Beating Swords into Plowshares."

Dr. Westberry has traveled extensively to at least thirty-five different countries of our world including the Holy Land (twice), the Pacific (twice), and Soviet Russia. On five different occasions he has been chosen by the Department of Chaplains, United States Air Force, Washington, as Missioner for

Preaching Missions or as a Special Representative of the Chief of Chaplains visiting some thirty odd Air Bases in Korea, Japan, Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, Guam, Hawaii, Newfoundland, Labrador, Spain, and also as a Co-Ordinator for a Spiritual Life Conference at Lake Tahoe, Nevada, such engagements being in 1960, 1962, 1963, 1964, and 1966.

In 1962, he was Protestant Chaplain on the M.S. Bergensfjord 45-day summer North Cape Cruise to eleven countries, including Russia. More recently, in 1967 and 1968, he visited his son in Peru, conducted the first Revival meeting ever held in English in the First Baptist Church in Lima, and served as a missionary to the missionaries there. . . .

On March 1, 1969 Dr. Westberry celebrated his Twenty-fifth Anniversary as Pastor of the Morningside Baptist Church, becoming the third Baptist minister in Atlanta in terms of years of service.

THE PACIFIC: TOO BIG TO SEE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, it is somewhat paradoxical that the largest ocean on this planet—the Pacific—should be the one often overlooked by Americans.

Traditionally, America has looked eastward to the Atlantic, and understandably so. For the roots of the Nation were largely transplanted from that side of the globe.

But to those who live in the Pacific, like the people of Hawaii, it is both painful and annoying to continue to see instances of oversight concerning the importance of that vast ocean area.

I invite attention to an article aptly titled, "The Pacific: Too Big to See," written by William H. Ewing, editor emeritus of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PACIFIC: TOO BIG TO SEE

(By William H. Ewing)

Those of us who live in the middle of the Pacific world and comprehend its basic dynamism and potential are sometimes jolted by the almost subconscious manner in which some of our most important opinion-makers ignore it.

The case in point is a new book by the Lowell Thomases, father and son, called "Famous First Flights That Changed History." It lists these as 16 aviation achievements beginning with Louis Bleriot's flight across the English Channel in 1909 and ends with a jet's circling the globe by way of the Poles in 1965. The Thomases were aboard the latter flight.

Nowhere does the book mention the John Rodgers flight of 1925, in which a Navy seaplane flew 1,870 (nautical) miles from San Francisco toward Hawaii, ran out of gasoline and literally sailed the remaining 450 miles to Kauai.

The first successful flight from California to Hawaii, that of Army Air Corps Lts. Lester J. Maitland and Albert F. Hegeberger, in June, 1927, is likewise ignored. So is the first civilian flight over the same route by Ernest Smith and Emory Bronte in July that year.

The Dole Air Derby, which followed in August, is mentioned mainly as a tragedy, though two of the eight planes entered made the flight successfully, those flown by Art Goebel and Martin Jensen. Crashes and loss of life were no novelty in those early days of overloaded airplanes trying to cross oceans.

Interestingly enough, the Dole flight came about because of the circumstance mentioned in the first paragraph above—the widespread

disposition on the Mainland to look eastward toward the Atlantic.

In 1927 the managing editor of the Star-Bulletin was Joseph R. Farrington. His father, Wallace R. Farrington, was publisher and also Governor. The Star-Bulletin was the then Territory's most vocal advocate of Statehood, an often lonely distinction at the time.

The attention concentrated on the Atlantic by air crossings such as Lindbergh's and Rear Adm. Richard E. Byrd's prompted the younger Farrington to seek a sponsor who could attract the same interest in the Pacific. He found one in James D. Dole, founder and then president of the company bearing his name. Dole offered a \$25,000 first prize and \$10,000 second prize for a flight to Hawaii.

The winning team was Goebel and his navigator, Navy Lt. William Davis, who arrived at Wheeler Field Aug. 17. Jensen came in second.

Years later, on one of a number of trips to Honolulu, Goebel told a group of friends how he happened to get into the Dole Derby and how it had affected his life.

"I was in the business of testing airplanes," he said. "One of the planes was a fighter for the Navy. No matter how I tried I couldn't get it into a spin." A spin was considered a necessary test of airworthiness.

"Somebody came up with the idea of weighting the tail with a couple of hundred pounds of sand packed in sacks. I took her up and kicked her into a spin. She spun, all right, but I was almost to the ground before I could get it out.

"After that sort of work the danger of flying to Honolulu seemed hardly worth considering. Actually I never doubted for a minute that we could make it."

In 1927, \$25,000 was a nice slug of cash to come by. Goebel didn't say how he split with Davis, but he kept enough to invest for himself in ventures which later made him a relatively wealthy man.

The only Pacific flights included in the Thomas top 16 were those of the Southern Cross, manned by two Australians and two Americans, which flew from Oakland to Brisbane in 1928 by way of Honolulu and Fiji; and that of Clyde Pangborn and Hugh Herndon, Jr., who flew 4,558 miles nonstop from Japan to the United States over the northern route in 1931.

These were unquestionably outstanding achievements in the early days of flight, especially that of the Southern Cross led by Charles Kingsford-Smith. Pangborn and Herndon barely preceded the first exploratory commercial flights by Pan American in the Pacific.

The preoccupation of the authors with parts of the world other than the Pacific is perhaps best demonstrated by their allotting a chapter to the non-stop cross-country flight of Army Air Corps Lts. Oakley Kelly and John Macready in 1922 while overlooking the Maitland-Hegenberger crossing from California to Hawaii. Kelly and Macready hardly made history; Maitland and Hegenberger certainly did.

SENATOR RICHARD B. RUSSELL, OF GEORGIA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, crisis and challenge are no new experiences to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). During his many years of distinguished service in the Senate, RICHARD RUSSELL has put his substantial energies and skills into meeting and resolving a great many serious problems that have plagued his own State and the United States.

It is with these qualities of stout-hearted and dauntless courage and fortitude that Senator RUSSELL now faces his

own personal test. He has my prayers, and my family's prayers, for a complete recovery, and we are confident that his health will be fully restored.

Senator RUSSELL has long been the leading statesman of the South, and an influential and much respected public figure throughout the country. I have been privileged to serve under his committee chairmanship for a decade. He has always acted out of devotion to the Senate, loyalty to his State, and love of country.

I salute RICHARD RUSSELL as a great Senator and public servant, and one who has been a model and inspiration to me. My petitions for his recovery will include the hope that he will be serving many more years in this institution to which he has given so much.

BIRTH RATES CANCEL ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS GAINS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, a recent report by the Agency for International Development to Congress reveals the disturbing fact that the high hopes of North and South Americans alike for economic growth through the Alliance for Progress have been largely disappointing. According to the report, the average annual increase in gross national product has been about 4.5 percent, but the annual increase in population has been 3 percent. As a result, the actual increase in the gross national product, when computed on a per capita basis, was only 1.5 percent in the first 7 years of the Alliance. This is well below the Alliance goals of an annual growth rate of 2.5 percent per capita.

As one specific example of the way population growth has thwarted economic development, it is calculated that enrollment in primary schools has increased from 24 million in 1960 to 36 million in 1967. But at the same time, there were 27 million children not enrolled in 1967 which represents an increase of nearly 1 million over the children not enrolled in 1960. Even by running forward full speed in the education field, many of the Latin American countries are slipping backwards because of the exceedingly high birth rates. A substantial number of children are therefore deprived of the opportunity for adequate education largely because their parents have been deprived of access to modern methods of family planning. The blame for not providing adequate family planning facilities must rest upon the policies of many Latin American governments as well as our own programs which have in fact impeded economic development which is their ultimate object.

Mr. President, the report further indicates that population control has not been considered one of the goals of the Alliance for Progress. At the same time it is clear that "until these problems are better recognized and addressed in most of the hemisphere countries, the question of attaining a satisfactory level of development remains uncertain."

Mr. President, I believe this report has significant implications for the total AID program in Latin America as well as

other parts of the world. It indicates increased needs to focus our efforts in the field of population and family planning to increase the funds, staff, and activities of AID in this area.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a New York Times article on this subject.

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

AID AGENCY REPORTS BIRTH RATE OFFSETS LATIN ALLIANCE GAINS

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—The Agency for International Development reported to Congress today that the goals of the Alliance for Progress with Latin-American countries were neither realistic nor attainable until the people of the region took steps to control population growth.

In a report to a House "watchdog" committee, the Agency said that although there had been substantial progress toward economic, political and social objectives of the Alliance since its inception in 1961, such gains had been "largely canceled out" in per-capita terms because of "staggeringly high" birth rates.

The United States provided \$9.2-billion in the Alliance through loans and grants and other economic aid through last June 30, with \$4.1-billion of it coming from the aid agency. Other assistance was provided through the Peace Corps, the Food and Peace programs, the Export-Import Bank and the Inter-American Development Bank.

Total United States economic aid since 1949 to the Latin-American countries has been about \$13.2-billion. Project loans and technical assistance grants from 1949 through 1960 totaled \$3.9-billion.

One of the chief goals of the Alliance set forth in the Declaration of Punta del Este, named for the meeting in 1961 at which the Alliance was created, was an annual increase of 2.5 per cent in the combined gross national product of the 18 member nations. All citizens and social groups were to share in this economic advance through high income and living standards.

In the first seven years of the Alliance, the combined gross national product of member countries actually showed an average annual increase of 4.5 per cent. But on a per-capita basis, this was an increase of only 1.5 per cent, because birth rates in those countries were among the world's highest, the agency reported.

"It is evident that Latin-American nations, with population increasing at some of the fastest rates in the world, must attain total growth rates of 5.5 per cent and more—higher than the United States average of 5.1 per cent for the same seven-year period—to attain the Alliance goals of 2.5 per cent per capita," the agency's report said.

The agency noted that population control, "because of its political volatility," was not mentioned among the goals of the Alliance. It said that "while there are growing signs of growing recognition of the population issue throughout the hemisphere, there are few countries in which the issue is yet being squarely met." The report added:

"Until these problems are better recognized and addressed in most of the hemisphere countries, the question of attaining a satisfactory level of development remains uncertain."

The report came in response to a demand from the House Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information that the agency reassess Alliance goals in the light of the last seven years' experience.

The report said at the outset that realization of Alliance goals was not possible in the 10 years originally contemplated. It said "the

framers of the charter erected a goal structure which anticipated too much too soon and in recognition of this, the time frame of the Alliance has been extended beyond 1971."

The House subcommittee noted in a report last August that United States administrators of the Alliance had extended the time period to 18 years, or three six-year periods. The first was described as an organization and mobilization phase, the second as one of social and political development and the third as one of integration of the market economies of member countries.

The subcommittee chairman, Representative John E. Moss, Democrat of California, said he welcomed the agency's report as "an honest evaluation of performance toward Alliance objectives and of the need to restate its goals."

"Unquestionably real progress has been made toward these goals," said Mr. Moss, "but I feel that Congress and the people are weary of financing programs that fall short of stated goals. I want to be able to say for once that our objectives have been achieved, but this requires their restatement in more realistic terms."

The agency's report said that "despite the initial unrealistic 10-year time frame, the goal structure still affords an attainable set of priority guideposts for development of the hemisphere." It added that "the development progress and momentum generated under the alliance justify promise for the future and merit continued United States support."

On the other hand, the report made it clear that if the Alliance's goals were to be attained even in the extended 18-year period, the population issue must be made a matter of priority concern by all major governments.

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE CITED

Illustrative of the impact of birth rates on other Alliance goals, the report said:

"The number of school-age children not in school tends to grow at the very moment when new schools are being built at a record rate. Substantially increased food production and remarkably expanded educational facilities barely keep pace with population increase."

The report made the following points regarding progress toward other Alliance goals:

Taxation: Although tax collections have increased by 30 per cent since 1961 for all Latin America, there is need for more effective enforcement.

Public Health: There has been "dramatic progress" in this area but much remains to be done. The target of providing potable water to 70 per cent of the urban populations will be achieved by 1971. New or improved water supplies already have been provided for 43 million city dwellers, or 69 per cent of the total, but only 19 million out of a rural population of 128 million have been so benefited.

Deaths from communicable diseases have been reduced markedly since 1961, but still are 10 times the rate for North America.

Agrarian reform: The member nations with some exceptions, such as Mexico, Venezuela and Chile, have not yet effectively "tackled this major issue." The reason is that the breaking up of large land holdings immediately brings "a confrontation with an element of the power structure well represented in national government."

Monetary and Fiscal Stability: Most countries have managed to keep a reasonable degree of price stability despite increased public expenditures. Nine countries had inflation of less than 3 per cent annually. In three others, price increases amounted to about 6 per cent a year. But stabilization is still "precarious" in Brazil, Chile and Colombia.

Income Distribution: The only indicators available show little change from 1960. A study showed remarkably similar income structures, with the top 10 per cent of the

population receiving 40 per cent of the income in Argentina, Brazil and Mexico. The bottom 40 per cent of the population received 10 to 14 per cent of total income in those countries.

Education: Enrollment of school-age children in primary schools increased by about 50 per cent between 1960 and 1967, or from 24 million to 36 million. But there were 27 million children not enrolled in primary schools in 1967—740,000 more than in 1960.

With an expansion by 1979 of primary education facilities sufficient to give all school-age children six years of schooling before their 15th birthday, the adult illiteracy rate would be reduced to about 37 per cent or some three-fifths of the 1964 rate, which was 62.1 per cent.

CIGARETTE ADVERTISING—RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY GEORGIA ASSEMBLY

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution adopted by the Georgia General Assembly meeting in Atlanta be printed in the RECORD.

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

H.R. 181-470

A resolution expressing opposition to the Federal Communications Commission's proposal to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television; and for other purposes

Whereas, the Federal Communications Commission plans to ban all cigarette advertising on radio and television unless the United States Congress intervenes to prevent said Commission from carrying out said plan; and

Whereas, if carried out, this proposed ban on cigarette advertising would do violence to the principles of free enterprise which have been the source of the greatness of our country; and

Whereas, the tobacco industry has always been and still is of fundamental importance to the economy of the South; and

Whereas, the importance of the tobacco industry to our own State is demonstrated by the fact that Georgia growers produced an average of over 78 million dollars worth of tobacco per annum during the past three years; and

Whereas, the impact that tobacco has on the Georgia economy is further demonstrated by the fact that there are over 26,000 tobacco growers in this State, and many times that number of people depend on the tobacco industry, either directly or indirectly, for their livelihood; and

Whereas, at a time when further taxation of our citizens is being considered, it should be noted that over thirty-seven and one-half million dollars in cigarette and tobacco taxes was collected by the State of Georgia during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968; and

Whereas, cigarette advertising is directed toward people who already smoke and amounts to competition among brands rather than an inducement to people to begin smoking; and

Whereas, while convincing evidence has been presented to show that cigarette smoking is harmful to health, the alleged impact of cigarette advertising on actual smoking is sheer speculation which has not been backed up by objective and factual information; and

Whereas, since no reasonable justification for banning cigarette advertising on radio and television has been demonstrated and such a ban could have far-reaching adverse effects on the economy of our county, the Federal Communication Commission's plan to implement such a ban should be abandoned.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that the members of this body do hereby express their firm opposition to the proposal by the Federal Communications Commission to ban cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that all members of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress are hereby requested and urged to use their power and influence in prohibiting the implementation of the proposed ban of cigarette advertising on radio and television.

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and directed to transmit appropriate copies of this resolution to Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States; Honorable Clifford M. Hardin, Secretary of Agriculture; Honorable Phil Campbell, Undersecretary of Agriculture; each member of the Georgia delegation to the United States Congress; the Federal Communications Commission; Honorable Lester Maddox, Governor of Georgia and Honorable Thomas T. Irvin, Georgia Commissioner of Agriculture.

In House, read and adopted March 3, 1969.
GLENN W. ELLARD,
Clerk.

In Senate, read and adopted March 17, 1969.

HAMILTON McWHORTER, Jr.
Secretary.

PARTICIPATION AND ALIENATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on several occasions in the past I have spoken about "Toward a Social Report" and its relation to the Full Opportunity Act of 1969—S. 5. Today I invite attention to the last chapter of that report: "Participation and Alienation." Some of the other chapters of this report have dealt with relatively more simple topics. This is one area where, at present, it is more intelligent to concentrate on the formulation of the proper questions than it is to seek answers to irrelevant questions. The seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report" does precisely this.

This chapter attempts to pose questions which will enable us to judge not simply whether our institutions accomplish their tasks but, equally important, how they accomplish their tasks. Such questioning will "remind us of the range of considerations we should keep in mind when setting public policy, and encourage the collection of needed data in the future." In time, perhaps, we will be in a position to know how to reform our institutions so as make certain that they respect the rights of individuals; facilitate democratic participation; provide congenial group affiliations, and insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

The chapter asks questions in three major areas. We can all agree that our institutions should function in a manner which will not unduly infringe on our individual liberties. Accordingly, the first section of the chapter "asks questions about the degree of freedom and constraint in American life." The report suggests:

We need to develop survey data that can discern any major changes in the degree of tolerance and in the willingness to state unpopular points of view, as well as information about the legal enforcement of constitutional guarantees.

We can also agree that the protection of the individual liberties of only a selected few is not sufficient. It is necessary that every American's civil liberties are protected. Therefore, the second section of this chapter "raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of equality and justice is realized." Once again we are faced with the situation where those who are least educated and who have the least income often have the least chance to make their interests known. We must ask, How can the groups with the least organized power assert their interests against those with the most? This question urgently needs to be answered.

Finally, we can agree that even if people "enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system" they can still lack a "sense of community." That is, they can still feel alienated: from their family, neighborhood, Nation, or any other social group. It is in this section where we come face to face with a problem which most Americans are deeply concerned about: the problem of a nation divided against itself. We desperately need to know how deep or serious "are the divisions in our society." It is only after we have such information that we will be able to act intelligently to eliminate the divisions which are not socially advantageous.

I wish to stress one other point which is highlighted in "Toward a Social Report." Social reporting is not a panacea. The difficult policy decisions we face will not be solved automatically by social reporting. As the report notes:

Social Reporting cannot make the hard choices the Nation must make any easier, but ultimately it can help to insure that they are not made in ignorance of the Nation's needs.

What social reporting can do is to keep us from continually "stumbling into the future."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the seventh chapter of "Toward a Social Report," entitled "Participation and Alienation," be printed in the RECORD.

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

CHAPTER VII. PARTICIPATION AND ALIENATION WHAT DO WE NEED TO LEARN?

The preceding chapters neglect many of the Nation's major concerns. They have, for example, scarcely mentioned the divisions in our society which separate young and old, black and white, left and right. Yet these divisions trouble many Americans, and help explain the demonstrations at universities, the disorders in cities, and the manifestations of racist and extremist strength. The preceding chapters have similarly neglected the controversies about court decisions defining our individual liberties, demands for "democratic participation" in the organizational life of the society, and the concern some Americans have about the viability and stability of family life.

The most notable of the problems that have been neglected are those that concern the functioning of our social and political institutions. To the extent that these institutions have promoted health, deterred crime, and the like, their achievements belong in preceding chapters. But we also care about *how* we combine our efforts to achieve our goals, about our loyalty toward our institutions, about our attitudes toward each other, and about the implications of our social and

political institutions for the future of the Nation. However good our health or high our incomes, we would not be satisfied with institutions that failed to respect individual rights, allow democratic participation, provide congenial group affiliations, or insure the survival and orderly development of our society.

Unfortunately, it is concerns such as these that we know least about. It is more difficult to assess the extent to which our political and social institutions satisfy democratic values, or prevent alienation, than it is to assess the level of health, income, or crime.

Therefore, we can do little more than ask the right questions. Yet it is important that these questions be asked. If assessments of the state of the Nation take account only of those variables that are readily measurable, our social priorities and public policies will be distorted. It will not be possible to obtain the needed information in the future unless the questions are asked now.

Since the primary purpose of this report is to examine the condition of American society, the questions should pertain to the basic functions our social and political institutions perform, rather than to their structures or characteristics.

One purpose our institutions should surely serve is that of protecting our individual liberties—one of the first ideals of our Nation. Democratic processes are meaningless if citizens do not have a large measure of freedom, particularly freedom to dissent from the policy of the Government and the views of the majority. Thus the first section of this chapter asks questions about the degrees of "Freedom and Constraint" in American life.

In a modern democracy, individual liberty cannot be the privilege of a few; it must be available on an equal basis to every law-abiding citizen. A system in which some stand above the law, while others are denied its protection, is repugnant to the idea of justice. Equality before the law in turn implies that every citizen have access to public services on an equal basis according to law. The citizens must also be able to influence public policy, and in the aggregate influence it decisively, or they are not truly free. There must be meaningful voting, and the vote of each citizen must count equally. The second section of this chapter therefore raises questions about the extent to which the ideal of "Equality and Justice" is being realized.

A people may enjoy freedom, and a just and equal political system, yet lack any sense of community. Many may be alienated, not only from the Nation, but also from their families, neighborhoods, and other social groups. Some degree of alienation and disunity is acceptable in a society that values individual freedom, and the alienated may be creative and bring about reforms which benefit society as a whole. But if alienation becomes so pervasive that all sense of community is lost, the result can be disaster.

The degree of alienation also depends on the functioning of all the social groups in the society. A person may be alienated because of the failure of his family, the shortcomings of his neighborhood, the lack of a congenial club, or the policies of the National Government.

Thus the third section of this chapter, on "Community and Alienation," asks how strong are the bonds which maintain our relationships to social institutions, from the family to the National Government. Here we encounter what many Americans find the most worrisome questions of contemporary life: How serious are the divisions in our society? How can we bridge the generation gap that divides families and universities, and the racial and ideological differences that divide neighborhood and Nation?

QUESTIONS ABOUT FREEDOM AND CONSTRAINT

It is a sign of the profound value placed on freedom that many use this word to describe

a great many of the things they want. Better education, more goods and services, and higher incomes give people the freedom to do things they could not have done before. But we are discussing freedom here in its most ancient and basic sense: those rights that allow an individual to use his time, talents, and resources in whatever way he pleases, so long as this does not interfere with the rights of others.

Freedom of expression

Democracy cannot be meaningful if those who disagree with the policy of the government have no opportunity to persuade their fellow citizens to vote it out of office. Thus freedom of expression, both for individuals and for groups, is absolutely indispensable to a democratic society.¹ We must therefore ask particularly about the freedom to express dissenting and unpopular views.

There can be little doubt that court decisions in the recent past have expanded the legal protection for free speech. Important as these legal developments have been, they are by no means the whole story. Freedom of expression can be restricted not only by government officials, but also by popular intolerance. However, the extent of such intolerance is not known.

There is some evidence that a majority of Americans on occasion have wanted to deny free speech to their fellow citizens, and that this disposition has been more prevalent among the rank and file than among community leaders. In the period of the Red scare of the early fifties, only 27 percent of Americans thought that an admitted Communist should be allowed to make a speech in their communities; but 51 percent of community leaders felt such a speech should be permitted. Among the general population,

only about 37 percent thought that a person who wanted to speak against religion should be allowed to speak in their communities. Again, community leaders were more tolerant; 64 percent of them believed such a speech should be allowed.²

There is a need for tolerance not only in national political forums, but also in daily life. How much tolerance of dissent is there in our schools, factories, and offices? We do not know, but some approximate answers could be obtained, as one study shows.

In this study, representative samples of persons in the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Italy, and Mexico were asked about the extent to which they had as students felt free to discuss unfair treatment in school or disagree with the teacher, and whether they had participated in school debates on political and social issues. As tables 1 and 2 reveal, American respondents were more likely than those in any of the other countries surveyed to say that they had felt free to disagree with their teachers, discuss unfair treatment with them, and participate in school discussions and debates. Americans were also more likely to be consulted about job decisions and to protest job decisions than those in most of the countries surveyed.

The lack of information about the extent of our liberties may suggest that we are not as vigilant about the state of our freedom as we purport to be. Here we can do little more than pose the question of how well the Nation is protecting the individual rights its rhetoric emphasizes. But the question is itself important. If it is asked more often, we will in time be able to provide better answers.

TABLE 1.—FREEDOM TO DISCUSS UNFAIR TREATMENT IN SCHOOL OR TO DISAGREE WITH TEACHER. BY NATION

Percent who remember they felt—	[In percent]				
	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Free.....	45	35	34	29	40
Uneasy.....	23	18	24	19	16
Better not to talk to teacher.....	25	41	30	36	39
Don't know, don't remember, and other.....	8	6	12	16	5
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100
Total number.....	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 332.

TABLE 2.—FREEDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN SCHOOL DISCUSSIONS AND DEBATES, BY NATION

Percent who remember they felt—	[In percent]				
	United States	United Kingdom	Germany	Italy	Mexico
Could and did participate.....	40	16	12	11	15
Could but did not participate.....	15	8	5	4	21
Could not participate.....	34	68	68	56	54
Don't know and other.....	11	8	15	29	10
Total.....	100	100	100	100	100
Total number.....	969	963	953	907	783

Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," p. 333.

QUESTIONS ABOUT EQUALITY AND JUSTICE

Equal treatment is a cornerstone of our society. We believe in equality before the law: The judicial system must deal equally with the great and the small, or there is no justice. We believe in the right to equal access to public services: The administrative apparatus should treat all citizens in the same way, according to law. We believe in the one-man-one-vote ideal: The political system should give each citizen equal access to

the electoral process so that no group can wield political power disproportionate to its numbers. These ideas of equality and justice are not only enshrined in our rhetoric; they are essential to the viability and integrity of our democratic processes. If those who oppose the existing leadership cannot depend on the protection of the courts, or equal access to public services, or voting power comparable to their numbers, democracy is threatened.

¹ If there is freedom of expression and organization, there is automatically a good deal of religious freedom as well.

² Samuel Stouffer, *Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1954), pp. 26-44.

Justice in the courts

A democratic society must always ask whether everyone accused has a right to counsel and all of the other requisites of a fair trial; whether justice is so long delayed it is in effect denied; whether every citizen has equal access to publicly provided services.

The American system of justice with its ancient roots in the common law, its elaborate rights of appeal, and thoroughgoing system of judicial review, is properly a source of national pride. Yet there is evidence that some suffer rough and ready justice at the hands of the police; that some are tried without adequate counsel; that publicity and prejudice may sometimes prevent a jury from rendering justice. In some parts of the country, the punishment of those accused of rape has varied with their race and the race of their victims.

One reason why so little is known about the exact extent of such inequities in our system of justice is that virtually any such wrong is a matter of great seriousness. It can result in the impeachment of a judge, or the expulsion or loss of pay of a policeman. Because so much is at stake, it is extremely difficult to collect information on shortcomings as a matter of statistical routine. Yet, if we believe in justice, we are obliged to ask to whom it has been denied.

Access and redress in large organizations

A growing group of Americans, especially among the young and the black, are intensely concerned about the relationship between the individual and the large bureaucracies. They are concerned about the relationship between the citizen and the police force, the student and the university, the claimant and the insurance company, the welfare client and the public assistance office, the tenant and the housing authority, the employee and the hierarchy.

The concern about the relationship between the individual and the bureaucracy is coming from diverse segments of the political spectrum. Historically, those on the right have been most anxious about the evils of bureaucracy and most enthusiastic about decentralization. But recently, the "new left" seems on its way to putting democratic participation in large organizations, including some forms of decentralization, above the left's traditional advocacy of central planning and the nationalization of industry.

The problem is this: How can the individual citizen, especially the citizen who is lacking in education, influence, and self-confidence, get the services he should expect from large bureaucracies, or get redress from the wrongs they may commit against him? The

person accused of a crime has recourse to an elaborate system of justice replete with features designed to protect those unjustly accused. But the citizen who cannot get the police protection he needs, or who suffers rude treatment from the police, may find that the courts are irrelevant, or so costly and cumbersome that they are of no use. The man who can't get a license to work, or get a public utility bill corrected, or have an insurance claim processed promptly, may not have the option of turning to the courts. He may know that "you can't fight city hall," or influence a large corporation.

It is always possible to complain, and complaints sometimes help. Yet all too often complaints get lost in a snarl of red tape. This is especially true for the person who lacks education, or experience with large organizations, or who lacks the stamina, resources, and gall needed to make a large issue out of what the bureaucracy may take to be a small matter.

Today, as never before in our history, people seem to be at the mercy of huge, impersonal bureaucracies. Even when large bureaucracies function efficiently, there still may be resistance and resentment. People want to be treated personally and humanely. They do not want to be only a cog in a machine. The courtesy of an explanation, or a sympathetic ear, may make all the difference.

The expansion of government services, both at Federal and local levels, has increased the multiplicity of offices and agencies with which the citizen must deal. Millions of Americans think of their government as distant and unresponsive, though paradoxically many seem to think the city government more remote than the Federal.

The decline of the political machine typical of the 19th century city may also be a factor. Corrupt as these machines were, they nonetheless were responsive to the needs of many of the immigrants from Europe, and helped assimilate them into American life. The mid-20th century immigrants to the city are mainly Negroes from rural areas of the South who have not been assimilated into the political structure nor had the personal relationships with the city government that the political machines afforded earlier immigrants.

The difficulty of the relationships between bureaucracies and Negroes is illustrated in table 3. Whereas 87 percent of the whites expect "equal treatment" by administrative officials, only 49 percent of the Negroes do. Negroes are also less likely to feel that administrative officials will pay attention to their point of view, less likely to expect equal treatment from the police, and less likely to think the Government or the Congress pays much attention to what people think.

TABLE 3.—RESPONSIVENESS OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

	Total	White	Negro
Percent who expect equal treatment in administrative office ¹	83 (970)	87 (866)	49 (100)
Percent who expect equal treatment from the police ¹	85 (970)	88 (866)	60 (100)
Percent who expect administrative official to pay attention to their point of view ¹	48 (970)	50 (856)	30 (100)
Percent who feel elections make the Government pay much or some attention ²	56 (970)	58 (866)	36 (100)
Percent who feel most Congressmen pay much or some attention to what people think ²	89.2 (1,450)	90 (1,291)	83.8 (148)
	79.2 (1,450)	79.3 (1,291)	78.4 (148)

Note: Numbers in parentheses refer to the bases upon which percentages are calculated.

¹Source: Almond and Verba, "The Civic Culture," 1960.

²Source: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, Election Survey, 1964.

A study of the attitudes of Southern whites and Negroes, on what they would do about the problem of a dangerous school crossing, again shows the Negro's sense of uneasiness in dealing with officialdom. Though Negro responses indicated they would be about as likely to take action about a dangerous school crossing as whites, they were less likely to deal with the official di-

rectly, and more likely to speak to "influential" private persons. Whereas 49 percent of the whites would talk to the school officials, only 33 percent of the Negroes would. Though only 1 percent of the whites would talk to an influential private person, 8 percent of the Negroes would.

We need to consider a wide variety of new options that will improve participation

and help individuals to deal with bureaucracies. Many things can be done. We must consider the merits of ombudsmen or independent investigators who can look into citizen complaints against administrative actions; neighborhood city halls that can bring local government closer to the people; neighborhood service centers that help people find their way to the right agency; consumer protection units; expanded legal aid for the poor; improvement in administrative law, so that the protection of the courts can be broadened; decentralization of police forces, schools, and other governmental functions; effective employee grievance procedures; councils of student representation in university communities, so that student reactions can effectively reach faculty and administration; and informal networks of communication that tell the administrator what his clients are thinking.

Large organizations are a fixture in today's world. How to keep them from colliding with the individual need for identity and participation is a complex problem. It will take a great deal of study to understand this problem, and probably a wide variety of policies to deal with it.

Political inequities

Universal suffrage, with one vote for each citizen, is one of the requisites of a system in which every individual, whatever his economic or social status, has an equal voice. As recent Supreme Court decisions about "reapportionment" suggest, there is in our constitutional and democratic ethic a concern that each group of citizens have the opportunity to play a role proportionate to its numbers.

Are any groups denied the role in the political system to which their numbers should entitle them?

In some Southern States, most Negroes have historically been denied the right to vote, and the proportion of Negroes registered in these States is still often a great deal smaller than the proportion of whites that are registered. Such inequities are an affront to democracy. Yet it is also significant that these differences in registration rates are steadily getting smaller, partly because of the Civil Rights Acts of recent years, and that in the Northern States Negro registration rates are not much different from those of whites.

There are also distinct differences in the proportion of the total population that is registered in the Nation's major cities. A study of 104 major cities showed that rates of voter registration were greater than 90 percent in some cities (such as Detroit, Seattle, and Minneapolis), and less than 70 percent in others (such as Baltimore, Newark, and New York). If literacy tests, methods of purging registration rolls, and inconvenient arrangements for registration are among the factors that account for these differences, they have distinct implications for the distribution of power among different socioeconomic groups.

There is also the question of the fairness of the apportionment of state legislatures and state congressional delegations, but again there is a clear trend toward more equal representation. Gerrymandering also appears to be declining, though this defies accurate measurement.

Insofar as the right to vote and apportionment are concerned, the situation is one of distinct, if not rapid, improvement.

Political power, however, involves more than the right to vote. It can require, among other things, money to finance campaigns, effective political organization, and lobbying or other pressure on the officeholder between elections. In many cases a group will have a major influence on public policy only if it is organized.

Although America has been called a nation of joiners, the fact remains that most Amer-

icans do not belong to any organization that represents them in the political system. Only one American in 25 reports membership in an explicitly political club or organization, and only 24 percent report belonging to any organization that they consider to be involved in political or governmental affairs. Only 57 percent report belonging to a voluntary association of any kind, including religious groups. A number of surveys indicate that less than 8 percent attend any political meetings or rallies.

Thus most Americans are without any organizational affiliations that would give them an organized voice in the governmental process.

The frequent lack of significant organized representation for major groups should not be surprising. When a large group of citizens has some common interest of purpose to seek in the political arena, the typical individual in that group often finds that it is not in his self-interest to contribute his money or time to an organization that attempts to further that common interest. He would get the benefits of any legislation that the organization succeeded in getting passed whether he contributed to that organization or not. And the typical individual in a large group could not by himself be decisive in determining whether or not the desired legislation would be passed. Thus he has little incentive to support an organization working in his political interest, and may very well not do so. The voluntary association seeking favorable legislation for a large group is in a position analogous to that of a government, in that it produces a service that cannot usually be sold in the market, yet it lacks the power to collect taxes, which governments (however popular their policies) require. Accordingly, we cannot assume that every large group of citizens will organize whenever its interests are threatened.

Industries with a small number of large firms will, because the resources are great and the number that need to be organized is small, usually be able to establish trade associations to further their political and other interests. Similarly, some professions, such as medicine, are well organized in part because each doctor can get professional advantages from joining his medical association. Labor unions can sometimes confer some similar benefits through grievance procedures and shop stewards, and often have the benefit of "union shop" provisions as well. Some farm organizations restrict the benefits of their cooperatives and mutual insurance companies to their members, thereby making it more advantageous for farmers to join.

Whereas some groups have the benefit of organization for reasons such as these, other groups, whose interests should have as much claim to attention, do not have these organizational advantages. This introduces an important inequality into our political system, which explains some of the unevenness in governmental attention to different problems.

This inequality particularly affects those with the least income and education. A survey by the National Opinion Research Center found that 52 percent of those with an income over \$7,000 belonged to some voluntary association, but only 24 percent of those with an income under \$2,000 did. Some 53 percent of the professionals, proprietors, managers, and officials belonged to voluntary associations, but only 32 percent of the skilled laborers, and 21 percent of the unskilled. Forty-two percent of farm owners, belonged to such organizations but only 13 percent of farm laborers.

Organizational inequities such as these help us understand the paradoxical strength of "special interests" in a democratic system formally designed to treat everyone alike.

How can the groups with the least or-

ganized power assert their interests against those with the most? Enlightened public officials can help. A government can set up an office of consumer affairs, or an agency for migrant workers, and so on. But, in the end, can the problem be solved unless we organize the weak, or weaken the strong?

QUESTIONS ABOUT COMMUNITY AND ALIENATION

The concern about social division and alienation in American society seems greater now than it has been for some time. The rising tempo of protest, especially among the young and the Negro, and the recent manifestations of right-wing discontent, have prompted some Americans to ask why the Nation faces these divisions now.

There are undoubtedly many reasons. The sharp differences about the war probably explain some of the division. Another factor is our growing affluence and new social legislation which lift the expectations of some people and, at the same time, arouse resentment and fear of change among others. A complete analysis of social cohesion would also have to consider, among other things, the ways children are brought up and educated, and the effectiveness of society's mechanisms for mediating and resolving disputes. It would also have to do justice to the positive functions of alienation and division, as sources of innovation and reform.

The alienation from the university, neighborhood, and family may well be of greater concern than the national political divisions. This alienation suggests one of the most fundamental causes of national division—the lack of satisfactory group relationships. People need a sense of belonging, a feeling of community, in some small social group. If such associations are lacking, they will feel alienated; they will have a tendency either to "cop out" of the central life of the society, or else try to reverse the direction of the society by extreme or even violent methods. The more numerous and stronger the social ties that bind an individual to the social order, the more likely he is to feel an attachment to the society, and work within existing rules to improve it.

We then need to ask questions about some of the principal social relationships in the society, and particularly the family, the neighborhood, and the voluntary association.

The effects of marital status

The need for social relationships may be seen in the association between marital status and health. Married people have distinctly lower death rates and lower rates of suicide, alcoholism, and mental illness than those who have never married or whose marriages have been disrupted by death or divorce.

With the important factors of age, race, and sex accounted for, differentials in death rates by marital status are very great. For every age, race, and sex, married persons have the lowest death rates. This cannot be explained by any difficulties those who are ill might have in getting or keeping a spouse, for the death rates for widowed persons, at all ages and for both sexes, exceed those of the married. Nor are the differences in suicide rates large enough to account for the differences in mortality rates.

Such statistical associations are particularly important here because they illustrate the pervasive and far-reaching consequences close social relationships can have. They add plausibility to the observations which suggest that alienation from society often reflects a lack of satisfactory relationships in small, primary groups, rather than solely global or national developments, and they show the need to inquire into the functioning of all types of social groups.

The condition of the family

The family has undergone profound changes in modern times. It was once the

basic unit of society—the source of cohesion and security, the unit of economic activity, the means of education and recreation. Today, many of the functions of the family are performed by other institutions, from the Social Security Administration to the school.

The change in the structure and role of the family has had two important consequences. First, young but unmarried adults have had less family affiliation in recent times than in earlier periods. For many Americans now between 18 and 22, the college or university is *in loco parentis*. For some others, a hippie community may play the role the extended family served in earlier periods. Neither the college nor the communities of drop-outs bring different generations together on the intimate terms the extended family once did, nor do they provide the same kind of emotional security and support.

The second consequence is that changes in the family as an institution are sometimes read as signs of the collapse of family life. Thus, increases in divorce rates suggest to some that the value put upon family life is declining, yet the proportion of the population that is married has been increasing.

Between 1940 and 1965 the proportion of the population, after age-adjustment, that is married increased by 7.5 percent, but the proportion divorced increased only 1.3 percent. Those with disrupted marriages tend to marry again, and fewer stay single. Longer life expectancy means that marriage partners have a longer life together, much of it without the obligations of young children. We need much better information on what such changes mean for our well-being and the strength of our institutions.

The Negro family has suffered adversities going back to the days of slavery. A large percentage of Negro children live in disrupted families. In 1965, about 38 percent of the Nation's Negro children did not live with both parents, whereas only 10 percent of white children were in that situation. About twice as many nonwhite children were living with their fathers only, four times as many with their mothers only, and five times as many with neither parent.

A substantial part of this difference is due to the greater rate of illegitimacy in the Negro population. In 1965, 1.2 percent of single white women had a child, but 9.8 percent, over eight times as large a proportion, of the nonwhite women did. This difference can, however, easily be misinterpreted because white couples are more likely to use contraceptive techniques, or to marry after the discovery of a premarital conception. Moreover, the illegitimacy rate among whites appears to be increasing, whereas that of nonwhites is, if anything, going down.

Still, Negroes are much less likely to belong to intact families than whites. This fact adds interest to the question of whether there is more alienation among the Negro population than the white.

Voluntary associations

There is some evidence that membership in voluntary associations reduces an individual's sense of powerlessness and alienation. One survey³ attempted to measure the extent to which a sample group felt they had control over the events that affected them. The responses, especially those of manual workers, suggested that members of a labor organization consistently had lower "powerlessness" scores than those who did not belong to any organization. The results are given in table 4.

³ From A. Neal and M. Seeman, "Organizations and Powerlessness: A Test of the Mediation Hypothesis," *American Sociological Review* (1964), 29, 216-226.

TABLE 4.—MEAN SCORES ON POWERLESSNESS FOR UNORGANIZED AND ORGANIZED MANUAL WORKERS, WITH INCOME CONTROLLED (N EQUALS 244)

Income	Unorganized	Organized
Under \$3,000.....	2.50 (14)	2.20 (5)
\$3,000 to \$4,999.....	3.20 (46)	2.81 (52)
\$5,000 to \$6,999.....	3.20 (25)	2.55 (75)
Over \$7,000.....	3.00 (4)	2.65 (20)
Total (mean).....	3.08 (89)	2.64 (153)
S.D.....	1.5	1.8

Note: Scores on the powerlessness scale ranged from 0 to 7

Though the evidence is ambiguous, those with the most pronounced sense of powerlessness and alienation often seem to display an ambivalent attitude toward political participation. On the one hand, they are less likely to vote, keep track of political issues, and the like. On the other hand, there is also some evidence that they are disproportionately active in particular circumstances. Some studies have suggested, for example, that alienated and powerless voters are especially likely to be vigorous opponents of fluoridation and school bond issues.⁴

These results are consistent with a theory advanced by a number of sociologists: alienation usually leads to political apathy; yet alienated people become easily aroused in certain circumstances, such as when extremist and totalitarian forces are gaining strength. We need to continue seeking further evidence on this and other explanations.

The neighborhood

The immediate neighborhood, though not so important as a social unit as it once was, still has some significance. The slum neighborhood is of particular interest, since it generally has less organization and social structure. Slums have disproportionate numbers of people who suffer from social pathologies, and slum communities lack the internal structure to deal with these problems.

In fact, social problems—from family disruption to suicide—cluster in the slum. This does not necessarily mean that the problems could disappear if there were no slums. It is logically possible that people with problems gravitate to the slum.

However, there is evidence that suggests that personal and social pathologies are contagious, and that slums generate many problems which they have no way of controlling.

If the probability of falling victim to a social pathology is greatly increased if one is brought up in a slum, then the slum is more than a private problem. It is a public and social problem. Private action cannot be expected to cure the social contagions of the slum environment any more than it can deal adequately with contagious diseases. They demand organized action, and organization is what many slums above all lack.

The lack of organization and social structure in the Negro slum therefore appears to be a major problem, and probably one that is related to the recent civil disorders. Cohesion or solidarity would be a great asset for it would give Negroes collective strength both in making external demands (e.g., on city government, or employers), and in enforcing internal constraints (e.g., against delinquency and crime). Its relative absence leaves the individual Negro particularly vulnerable to the unrestrained predations of

persons within his community or outside it. The examples of the solidarity of other ethnic groups, such as Jews and Chinese, indicate the tangible assets community solidarity provides: political power, aid to those in trouble, and lending arrangements for those establishing or expanding businesses.

Alienation

The net effect of an individual's participation can be partially revealed by surveys which seek to find out whether the individual feels he has control over his own destiny, an intelligible part to play in social life, and values he shares with others. According to such surveys the degree of alienation is substantially different for different groups.

Negroes are much more likely to feel powerless and alienated than whites. A comparison of white and Negro employed men in Los Angeles, for example, showed the following results:

(In percent)

	Negro choices (N=312)	White choices (N=390)
1a. Becoming a success is a matter of hard work; luck has little or nothing to do with it.....	58	77
1b. Getting a good job depends mainly on being in the right place at the right time.....	42	23
2a. By studying the world situation, one can greatly improve his political effectiveness.....	58	70
2b. Whether one likes it or not, chance plays an awfully large part in world events.....	42	30
3a. Wars between countries seem inevitable despite the efforts of men to prevent them.....	69	66
3b. Wars between countries can be avoided.....	31	34

Studies have also indicated that the difference in the sense of powerlessness between Negroes and whites is not explained solely by differences in education. When a sample of whites and Negroes were asked to react to the statement that "There is not much I can do about most of the important problems that we face today," the proportions responding affirmatively, at different educational levels, were as follows:

	Percent
Negroes:	
Less than 12 years education.....	73
12 years or more.....	60
Whites:	
Less than 12 years education.....	57
12 years or more.....	34

Most other minorities also show a high degree of powerlessness, though the Jewish minority appears to be an exception.

Some surveys have suggested that Negroes in integrated areas, or with relatively integrated life styles, tend to feel less powerlessness than Negroes in highly segregated circumstances. The willingness to use violence, by contrast, appears to be greater among Negroes with a high degree of powerlessness, at least according to one survey of the Watts area of Los Angeles.

Among white Americans, alienation is apparently less likely to show up as a feeling of powerlessness and more likely to show up as a conviction that socially disapproved means must be used to attain objectives. Alienation in this sense is greatest among those with lower socioeconomic status. Those who are the most alienated, moreover, tend to have considerable prejudice against members of minority groups.

Alienation accordingly appears to play a role both in the discontents of the black minority, especially those who feel violent means are necessary, and also among those in the white population who show most prejudice against minority groups. Its importance among disaffected young people is not in dispute.

Conclusion

A sense of community, which would do a great deal to lessen alienation, is only one of our social and political objectives. We also cherish individual freedom and equality which too much cohesion in our social groups can sometimes restrict. Some alienation may also be related to intellectual and artistic creativity, and thus socially desirable. Moreover, it often strengthens the forces of reform, and enables the society to change with the times.

Thus a sense of community is not the only good. But, as the present divisions in our society reveal, it is very much worth asking whether we have as much as we need.

PROTECTION OF CERTAIN SPECIES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have joined the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) in cosponsoring S. 335, a bill to prohibit the importation of species which are in danger of extinction and to protect certain species in the United States.

Mr. President, this is a good piece of proposed legislation. We in Alaska know and value the beauty and pleasure that are derived from our wild animals, and anything the Federal Government can do to help to preserve this priceless natural heritage is for the better.

I hope that S. 335 can be passed quickly; every day of delay will mean further loss to the world's dwindling irreplaceable supply of wild creatures.

RELOCATION FROM KANSAS CITY NOT JUSTIFIED

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, for some time rumors have been circulating that the administration was considering reorganization in several of the most important departments, with a possible relocation of regional offices. We had heard reports that this relocation would involve moving the regional offices of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity from Kansas City, with a consequent transfer of hundreds, if not thousands, of career employees from that community, all for the commendable objective of improved service.

The possibility of transferring these offices from Kansas City has been advanced several times in the past, but was always tabled after careful study revealed the superb transportation and communication facilities at Kansas City, as well as its central location for the majority of the people to be served.

Only yesterday, the Kansas City Star, in a story by Mr. Joe Lastelic of the Washington bureau of that newspaper, gave what appeared to be a more authoritative report than we had previously been able to obtain from the administration about this possible relocation.

Immediately, Senator EAGLETON, Representatives BOLLING, HULL, RANDALL, and I joined in a telegram to the President asking that before any such change is made, the civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City, representing both Missouri and Kansas, be given an opportunity to present the facts as to what

⁴ J. S. Coleman, *Community Conflict* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957); W. A. Eamson, "The Fluoridation Dialogue," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1961, 24, pp. 527-537; J. E. Horton and W. E. Thompson, "Powerlessness and Political Negativism," *American Journal of Sociology* 1962, pp. 485-493.

that metropolitan area has provided over the years and will continue to provide in outstanding services for these Government functions. I ask unanimous consent that our telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

MARCH 26, 1969.

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

The Kansas City Times this morning reports the administration is considering reorganization of Labor, HEW and OEO regional offices with transfer of 825 employees from that community.

With its central location and unexcelled transportation and communications facilities centered in the Kansas City area, it is impossible for us to understand how such a move would add to Government efficiency or save money.

Before any such change is made we would appreciate opportunity for civic and business leaders of Greater Kansas City, Missouri and Kansas, to present the facts as to what this metropolitan area provides and will continue to provide in outstanding services for these Government functions.

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
Congressman RICHARD BOLLING,
Fifth District.
Congressman W. R. HULL, Jr.,
Sixth District.
Congressman WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
Fourth District.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, we understand that members of the Kansas delegation who represent the western part of Metropolitan Kansas City area have made a similar request to the President.

This morning, however, we learn that the President does plan to issue a directive to the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and the Office of Economic Opportunity to move their regional offices from Kansas City.

A telegram yesterday afternoon from the mayors of Kansas City, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., and the presidents of the chambers of commerce of the two cities reports they also wired the President offering their cooperation in further study of the facts. I ask unanimous consent that that telegram be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
March 26, 1969.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following telegram has been sent to the President, White House, Washington, D.C.

"We are concerned in the national interest at local press reports this date alleging relocation in Denver of regional offices of Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and Office of Economic Opportunity.

"We commend your desire to effect economy in government and increase efficiency. Respectfully urge delay in final decision by Budget Bureau and your personal study of all facts. Some factors for consideration follow.

"Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight task force studying same proposal found it more economical to operate from Kansas City than from Denver. Subsequent transfer of some Department of Labor operations from Denver

to Kansas City and recommendation that regional office of HUD be located in Kansas City are consistent with task force findings.

"States involved are Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Utah, Wyoming. Functions of all offices are concerned basically with people and population center are found mainly in States of Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota and Missouri.

"Strong orientation of Department to urban problems suggests better service may be provided from Kansas City's closer proximity to population centers than in Denver nearer to more sparsely populated States.

"Travel costs and time of Department employees traveling from Denver back through Kansas City to population centers certain to increase with proposed relocation.

"Kansas City air service superior and current development of Kansas City International Airport sure to achieve cost and time reductions in future.

"Departments now located in Federal facilities in Kansas City. Denver relocation would require Federal Government leasing space from private sector. Estimate eight hundred employees at one hundred and thirty square feet per employee at Denver rate of four dollars and fifty cents per square foot indicates conservative estimate of four hundred and sixty eight thousand dollars per year continuing additional cost to Federal Government for space alone.

"Relocation of Federal employees and families taking into account number of homes owned and inevitable commission on sale of homes, actual movement of individuals and personal belongings estimated conservatively at four thousand dollars per employee resulting in additional three million, two hundred thousand dollar cost to Federal Government.

"No estimate of moving supplies in equipment of various offices available at present but again certain to be additional cost to Federal Government.

"Relocation constitutes personal hardships to many competent, dedicated and loyal Federal employees.

"Once again respectfully urge reconsideration and further study. We stand ready to assist.

"Appreciate all immediate assistance you can give.

"ILUS W. DAVIS,
Mayor, Kansas City, Mo.
"JOSPEH H. McDOWELL,
Mayor, Kansas City, Kansas.

"BERT BERKELEY,
President, Chamber of Commerce,
Greater Kansas City.

"JAY DILLINGHAM,
President, Kansas City, Kansas Area
Chamber of Commerce."

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the purported objective of this proposed relocation is decentralization of authority from Washington through centralization in eight cities away from Washington. It is our understanding that the headquarters for our region would serve 11 States—Colorado, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming—and would be located in Denver, Colo.

On a map of this region, without any consideration for the distribution of population, Denver would appear to be centrally located, at least geographically. In that the mission of these Federal agencies is to serve people, however, we believe the greatest service at the lowest cost can be given by continuing these offices in the city nearest the center of population. According to 1967 census estimates, 11 million people reside in Mis-

souri and the three States adjacent to Missouri in the proposed 11-State region, whereas 6 million people reside in the other seven States.

It is difficult to understand how relocation of the regional offices to a point more distant from the major concentration of population is going to aid the quality and promptness of service. Surely it would be better to keep these three regional offices where they are and put the proposed subregional offices at the point of lower population density.

According to newspaper reports, city mayors have been asking for this relocation. This would not appear to hold true in our region, as I have received wires from the mayors of the two largest metropolitan areas, from affected Federal employees, and from business groups served through these offices. They are uniform in expressing their opposition to removal of the regional offices from Kansas City and their belief that such a move would, in fact, impair the services that can be rendered our region.

The largest metropolitan area to be served in this region is also disturbed about this possible move. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a telegram received this morning from Mayor A. J. Cervantes of St. Louis, Mo.

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

ST. LOUIS, Mo.,
March 26, 1969.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urgently request you to assist in delaying any decision regarding the moving from Kansas City, Missouri, to Denver of the regional offices of the Department of Labor, HEW and OEO. Kansas City business and civic leaders are preparing economic and professional facts and figures concerning this matter. The move would be a severe blow to St. Louis programs.

ALFONSO J. CERVANTES,
Mayor, City of St. Louis.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a telegram from Eifton A. Stanfield, manager of the National Electrical Contractors Association of Kansas City, expressing the views of that organization.

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

KANSAS CITY, Mo.,
March 27, 1969.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Re proposed relocation of regional offices of U.S. Department of Labor, HEW and OEO from Kansas City, Missouri to Denver, Colorado. Urgently request that you oppose the proposed relocation of regional offices, U.S. Department of Labor, HEW, and OEO, from Kansas City. Cost of such relocation would, in opinion of membership of this large trade association, result in exorbitant expenditures in these austere times. Furthermore, due to mid America location of Kansas City, relocation would, obviously, result in added travel and per diem expenditures above and beyond that now in force. Relocation expenses of families, per diem and travel wise,

shall, obviously, result in unnecessary expenditures of tax payers money. Finally, such relocation shall drastically affect the economic welfare of the greater Kansas City area. Due to untimeliness of this announcement, together with reported imminent decision of the President, your opposition to this relocation effort is urgently requested.

Respectfully yours,

EFTON A. STANFIELD,
Manager, National Electrical
Contractors Association.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, before Congress is asked to appropriate funds to pay for this relocation, it is to be hoped we will be given the facts and figures upon which this recommendation is based, and working with the State and local officials to be served, we will also be given the opportunity to present the facts as to why we believe these agencies have best been able to serve the people by the maintenance of their regional offices in Kansas City.

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE AWARD TO LEO WEISFIELD, SEATTLE, WASH.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, last fall, a distinguished citizen of the State of Washington received the American Jewish Committee Award at the Jewelry Industry Dinner of the American Jewish Committee Appeal for Human Relations at the Hotel Plaza in New York City.

This gentleman is Mr. Leo Weisfield, a prominent businessman of Seattle, Wash.

I have just received a transcript of that meeting which was highlighted by an excellent address by Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, former Assistant Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A wire that I sent to Dinner Chairman M. Fred Cartoun was read. It said:

It is indeed fitting that the Jewelry Industry Human Relations Award sponsored by the American Jewish Committee Appeal for Human Relations should be given to Leo Weisfield. It has been my honor to have known and worked with Leo Weisfield over a period of 30 years. He is not only a distinguished Northwest businessman, honored and respected by our people, but he has been able to find the time to give of himself in behalf of those causes that have been for the betterment of mankind. He is a kind and gentlemanly man, who has never hesitated to come to the aid of the poor and the oppressed. He has been a firm defender of civil liberties and civil rights. He has never hesitated to speak out, no matter how unpopular the cause. As he is a man of integrity, his influence for good has made our own area a much better place in which to live. I am honored to salute my long-time good personal friend Leo Weisfield, and extend to him my warmest congratulations on this occasion.

Among those gathering for this outstanding event were Walter Karlan, Tobias Stern, Irving Abel, Simon C. Gershey, Milton Weill, Norman M. Morris, Arthur B. Sinkler, Henry Peterson, Julian Lazrus, Ben Natchez and Henry M. Margolis. Mr. Ben Lazrus, in making the presentation to Mr. Weisfield said:

Leo has done much to improve the lives of others. He is a busy man. Leo is chairman of the Weisfield chain of some 43 stores, yet he's devoted to many civic and philanthropic endeavors. The list is too long to remember, so let me read a few of his community achievements. He is Chairman of the Washington State Committee for the Handicapped,

President of the Jewish National Fund for the Pacific Northwest Region; a Board member and former President of the Jewish Federation in Seattle; Treasurer of Greater Seattle, Inc.; and a former regent of Washington State University. He holds the Jewish National Fund's John F. Kennedy Peace Award.

Leo Weisfield's career has been a contributing one, and we of the Northwest who know him best, are especially pleased on his receiving this high award which had most recently been given to General of the Army Omar Bradley.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Mr. Weisfield's acceptance remarks.

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

REMARKS BY MR. LEO WEISFIELD ON RECEIVING HUMAN RELATIONS AWARD OF AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE, OCTOBER 9, 1968

Thank you very much. I was first advised that this was merely a group of the American Jewish Committee. I did not know until I arrived in New York that I was being honored. I accept it in this manner more graciously and with more enthusiasm and with more love, because it's from my fellow jewelers.

Now, I know from experience that one who receives an award should stand up and be trembling and nervous and accept every statement made about him as being factual and thanking the person and telling him how humble he is and how much he appreciates all these comments that were made about him.

I asked for the privilege of making a few comments when I found out that this was really a group of friends. I haven't had the pleasure of meeting all of you but I know most of you. I never leave a meeting or accept an award without trying to leave one thought. By the way, before I get started, I cried a little bit this evening because, without my knowing it, my daughter and my grandson—and we are that type of a family—flew in without telling me. When I saw them coming here to be part of this meeting and sharing with me the pleasure of receiving this award, tears came to my eyes. Then my nephew, whom I love so much and is part of our business and who is the local chairman of the American Jewish Committee in Seattle, surprised me as well, and so that added more to the historical event of this particular evening. I want to tell you that I really feel honored and flattered that the Jewelry Division selected me to receive this honor. And I do accept it in the spirit in which it was presented. I accept it in this spirit. I want to tell the Committee that I have never accepted an award in my life for what I did in the past. It is true that one likes to be respected for what he did in the past, and in accepting an award, as I do, I accept it for what I shall do in the future for the American Jewish Committee, not for the past. That has been my life and that will always be my life. I shall merit this award when I prove that statement to the Committee.

I couldn't help looking over the Committee's activities of the years 1967 and 1968. I don't know who drew up the AJC pamphlet; it's marvelous; it's wonderful; and although I haven't been too active in this particular organization, I have been a dedicated Jew since the day I could say, "Mother" and "Father." I was brought up that way, and I shall always be.

This is the thought that I want to leave with each and every one of you and for how long you will carry it in your mind, I don't know. I am not only speaking as a representative of a Jewish organization, but I am also speaking in the broad terms of all religions. I

was looking very carefully to the future. Who would carry on the work of the American Jewish Committee? At a glance, I can see there are some young men in this audience; I, too, am a young man of 76; and I shall remain young as God gives me life. I am challenging the American Jewish Committee to accept as a responsibility the carrying on of their work to the youth—the Jewish youth. By Jewish youth, I mean Jews mostly in the religious sense. This can apply to any religion, because, in my humble opinion, most of the problems today must be decided by future generations; and even you, sir, as a public relations man, know that.

We have many problems, and we are going to solve them. The majority of the young men are good Americans and will be as good as anyone in this audience. But there are problems that must be solved, and we as Jews have one of the most serious problems in relation to that particular phase of life. We are not teaching our youth, the Jewish youth, the proper respect for their religion and love, as some of us were taught. I can dare to say to the world, as well as to you, that the foundation of religion was created by the Jews, and I can dare to say to you that one of the most important gifts to the world was religion.

I can make a personal confession; recently my wife was ill for a few months, and I prayed every moment of my life at that time for her recovery. God answered my prayer, and I shall never forget it as long as I live. That's the reason I chose that particular thought to leave with you this evening. Yes, it's true that everyone sitting at this front table and most of those sitting around listening to us are good Jews and dedicated Jews; but I dare to stand before you this evening and say to you, you are neglecting one of your most important responsibilities. I know it from experience and by every-day action. You are not inculcating in the lives of your children what you were taught in respect to what Judaism really means. What is the good if every part of this particular program of 1967 and 1968 was developed? What is the good of it all if it cannot be carried from generation to generation? I defy anyone to tell me what good it is if it will die with the Jewish religion. I dare to say "die," and I have talked with many a rabbi on this particular problem.

I am not going to abuse the program by taking more time than I said I would, but this is the thought I want to leave with you tonight. When you think of anti-Semitism, when you think of the help you are giving the American Jewish Committee, don't think of it as a personal matter as it relates to you or your wife or, casually, to your children. Think of it for the future generations of the Jewish people, and you will get a different concept and accept that responsibility in a different matter.

In conclusion, with all my heart, I accept this award and appreciate the thought behind it. With all my heart, I consider this as one of the great evenings of my life, because I have not only my friends, not only the members—a good many members and leaders of the jewelry industry, to which I have dedicated my most precious possession, my life—sitting around these tables and sharing with me this pleasure and this hour, and my family. I pledge you, through my family and myself, my dedication and my willingness to accept any responsibility that the American Jewish Committee gives to me or asks me to do. I want to thank each one of you for coming here this evening. I more than thank you, because I know you so well, for sharing with me this honor.

YOUTH CAMP SAFETY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, with the coming of spring, millions of par-

ents will turn their thoughts toward finding a suitable summer camp for their children. They will talk to neighbors. Fancy brochures will come in the mail. Perhaps, on rare occasions, they will find it possible to actually travel to a campsite. But in the end, it is likely that a son or daughter will be sent off to a camp when in fact very little is known about the place, its personnel or its safety record.

The real tragedy is that far too many camps in America are not very safe or healthy places for children. Less than half the States have comprehensive safety regulations to govern the establishment and operation of camps. Many fail to set standards for the type and ability of the staff who will act as "summer parents" for periods ranging from 1 week to 2 months.

Mr. President, I recently reintroduced a bill (S. 809), to establish Federal minimum safety standards for camps. Under this bill, all the States would be encouraged to set up programs to insure compliance with the standards. It is a reasonable and commonsense way of providing a safer environment for our children. It will allow parents to ask one simple question of camps: "Do you meet Federal standards?"

On March 24, the New York Times published an editorial supporting the proposed legislation. In the spring issue of Family Safety, a publication of the National Safety Council, an article on the subject of camp safety, written by Harris Edward Dark, also discusses this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial and article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1969]

WAITING FOR DISASTER

If twenty or thirty children were to die at a summer camp, the public outcry would probably force Congress to approve a bill establishing minimum Federal standards for camps. Senator Ribicoff of Connecticut believes that it should not be necessary to wait for a disaster to occur before Congress takes action. We agree.

Between seven and eight million children go to camp in the summer. The exact number is not known and neither is the number of camps in existence. What is known is that camping is a booming business, and that most camps operate totally without Government supervision. Nearly half of the states have no regulations governing camps at all, and most of the rest have no training requirements of counselors, no regulations about the condition of buses and trucks used to transport children or the qualifications of the drivers and no annual camp inspection.

Information about injuries and deaths at camps is hard to come by. Astonishingly, the only survey of camp safety was made back in 1929. That study concluded that two-thirds of all accidents at camp could have been prevented by better supervision or higher standards of camp maintenance. Even the most conscientious parents cannot be expected to know that a camp's bridge path follows a hazardous route or that all of the water sports counselors are not fully trained in life-saving techniques or that any one of a hundred other conditions at camp may in some way be deficient.

The Ribicoff bill would authorize the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to

establish minimum standards and would reimburse each state that adopted those standards for one-half of the administrative costs. A dozen co-sponsors from both parties have joined in support of the bill. Senator Ralph Yarborough of Texas, the new chairman of Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee ought to begin moving this bill toward final enactment before another summer camping season begins.

[From Family Safety, spring, 1969]

WHAT DO YOU KNOW ABOUT YOUR KID'S CAMP?

(By Harris Edward Dark)

The accident prevention specialist for the U.S. Public Health Service was making a spot check of children's summer camps for research purposes. He was appalled by what he found at one camp.

The camp's director said that hazardous equipment and substances were carefully kept in his living quarters under lock and key at all times. But in walking across the cluttered yard to the director's door, the PHS man tripped over a can of gasoline. Nearby were two beat-up power mowers and other equipment, just the kinds of things that curious children get in trouble with.

This wasn't all. The camp director spoke very positively about how a camp's staff should continually look for hazards around the grounds and make necessary corrections immediately. Yet the inspector, who could not restrain himself from sarcasm, wrote in his report, "I know he feels deeply about this because the broken steps going down to the bathing area are going to get fixed one of these years."

In the same vein, the inspector commented on the "very unique garbage disposal" system at the camp: "I found out, much to the director's embarrassment, that when the cooks think the meat is spoiled, they throw it out the window for the stray dogs and other animals around the camp."

But perhaps worst of all from the standpoint of danger was this camp's poor security system. The director told the inspector that a strict policy of the camp made it mandatory for each counselor to know where the children were at all times. At the swimming and dock area the director displayed a board on which the children's numbered badges were placed; the badges indicated whether the children were in a canoe or rowboat or in swimming. At that time, the canoes and rowboats were in, and there was apparently no one in swimming. Yet the badges indicated that three children were in a canoe. The lifeguard remembered seeing the missing children bring in the canoe and walk into the woods. No one seemed alarmed, reported the inspector, since "the children always show up at mealtime."

Children don't "always show up at mealtime." In the unfamiliar setting of a summer camp, every child needs special instruction and a kind of super-supervision—compared to what he is used to at home—until he becomes thoroughly familiar with the new environment. Most children never get enough camping experience to reach that point. So they will always need alert supervision. Without it, a child can get lost, suffer a serious injury or even be killed while at camp.

Only a small minority of states have regulations specifically pertaining to resident camping. There are public-health laws that deal with such things as water supply and sewage disposal, but in most of our states there's no check, for example, on the age or physical, mental or moral qualifications of the camp director or any of the counselors. Often, the only person who has had to qualify for his or her job is the lifeguard.

Yet simple incompetence is only part of the problem. There's ample evidence that many camp counselors can be woefully ill-

equipped to take on the responsibility of safe-guarding the activities of young folk.

The fancy brochures published as sales promotion pieces by many camps don't always tell the whole story. As an isolated case in point, a camp that published a folder extolling its excellent safety record continued to mail them, even though a season with several accidents made the claim untruthful.

A parent may use the brochures as a general guide, but there's no reason to accept them as gospel. The only really good way to judge a camp is to go there yourself—fore-armed with the right questions to ask.

About 6 million American children go to camp each year—that's about 1 in 7 of the 6-to-16-year age group. There are no national figures on how many campers and counselors are injured each year but the number would be in the thousands if all injuries were reported.

Certain patterns do show up in surveys made of camping accidents. Continental National American Group's commercial special risks division, the insurer that handles the nation's largest load of camping children, found that the 11-year-old age group—both boys and girls—is the most accident-plagued. But the insurance company says that boys have far more accidents than girls do. Professor Arthur E. Gjertsen, a member of the faculty at the State University of New York, conducted a study of accidents that occurred in 69 camps in a midwestern state. His survey showed that of all camping accidents, 41 per cent occurred during supervised periods of the day, including waterfront and game times. Collisions of the people-to-people type were high on the list of injury causes. Older children, ages 10 to 14, are more likely to be involved, and their accidents tend to be more serious, probably because of their greater physical venturesomeness.

Far and away the greatest cause of death at camp is drowning, in spite of the fact that the waterfront of the average camp is the best supervised area. This points up the risks in swimming, boating and canoeing that every parent should keep in mind when checking on a prospective camp for a child.

No one knows this better than Mitch Kurman, a furniture dealer of Westport, Connecticut, whose 15-year-old son, David, drowned in what the father considers a senseless camping-trip accident about four years ago. The Kurmans had picked the camp in upstate New York because it offered canoe trips into Maine, New Hampshire and Ontario. Kurman says the family simply assumed the camp and its side trips were safe.

But after checking into the death of his son, spilled from a canoe on the west branch of the Penobscot River in Maine, Kurman realized his assumption was tragically wrong. He learned from other campers on the trip and from Ontario and Maine police that the young counselor guiding the boys had previously had a narrow escape on a river he had been warned against, and that a forest ranger had specifically warned the same counselor not to try the river where David was lost (described as "wilder than the Niagara Gorge"). Yet the counselor had rashly led his boys into danger in canoes that lacked fast-water safety equipment—life preservers, ropes or snubbing poles.

"If David hadn't been able to swim, if he had wandered off by himself, if he had been ill, it would have been one thing. But this was too raw to let (camps) get away with."

Transformed by tragedy into a crusader, Kurman carried his case to Washington and then virtually all over the country at his own expense. His dead son, a Connecticut resident, had been sent to camp in New York and had suffered his fatal accident in Maine. So Kurman went to Washington first to explore the possibility of national legislation to insure the safety of the estimated 10,000 summer camps from coast to coast. At

Washington, he was told that camp safety is a state matter.

At the New York attorney general's office, it was explained to Kurman that the state's camp safety is governed by the sanitation code—in Kurman's words, "safe food and safe water." There are no regulations for screening camp personnel in most states, Kurman found.

Also, Kurman found that camps do not have to record publicly any accidents or injuries except fatal ones. Thus, as he puts it, "A kid breaks his arms, gets first aid, is sent home and only the camp and parents know it." This accounts in large part for the dearth of camp-accident information.

With so little regulation and inspection, what assurance does a parent have for the reasonable safety of his children? This—and more specific questions—have been pondered by the American Camping Association for a long time.

The ACA has developed a set of specifications over the years that must be met and adhered to by its 3,000 member camps, roughly one to every three or four camps in the nation. A camp requesting membership is first visited by a pair of inspector-advisors who spend a couple of days, sometimes longer, looking over the facilities and observing how activities are managed.

Seldom does a camp come up with a perfect record. The ACA has no police power; the consultants who visit the camp make recommendations for improvement, and in most cases the camp management is anxious to comply. In the rare case of a flagrant defect and a refusal of cooperation on the part of the management, the camp can only be denied ACA membership.

Of the 10,000 to 11,000 youth camps across the nation, less than one-third are accredited by the ACA. And 14 to 17 percent of the camps that apply for accreditation do not meet the ACA standards the first time around. Some camps, of course, could meet the standards but do not choose to apply for ACA accreditation and membership. Organizations such as the YMCA and Boy Scouts of America have their own standards, though many such camps are also ACA members. The ACA has the only set of standards that call for on-the-spot inspection. There is no way to determine how many of the thousands of non-ACA-member camps could meet ACA standards.

Well aware of this, Kurman wrote to Connecticut Senator Abraham Ribicoff, whom he knew to be a grandfather: "Would you, with all your power and resources as a senator, have any better way of determining a camp's safety than I have?"

That letter started the legislative ball rolling, but both Senate and House bills died in committee last year. The type of bill that's most likely to become federal law is one which defines the safety standards and encourages the 50 state governments to enforce them. There may be a provision allowing complying camps to advertise that they meet federal and state standards.

This type of federal-state cooperation takes time—years. In the meantime, late figures show that only 17 states require that a camp operator be licensed; only 26 states have general regulatory guidelines of any sort; only four states prescribe age requirements for counselors.

If you have a child to send to camp this summer, how can you possibly select a camp that will be relatively safe?

First, an important "don't"—don't attempt to judge any camp merely by its literature. You must visit the camp and make up your mind from personal observation, or rely on the recommendation of someone in whom you have implicit confidence. This pertains to day camps as well as resident camps, and it is as important for sports, music, religious and other specialized camps as for general camps.

But merely inspecting a camp will have limited value unless you know what to look for. Use the following guidelines, extracted from detailed information from various camping authorities:

PERSONNEL

Is the camp director at least 25 years of age, with camping education or training within the past three years and at least 16 weeks of active experience in administration or supervision of an organized camp?

Does the camp have a carefully written job description for each position, to be used in selecting the staff?

Are the minimum age levels for counselors maintained, according to type of camp; day camp, 18; family and resident camp, 19; travel camp, 21. Do the travel counselors have the extra qualifications in age and experience prescribed by the ACA?

Does the counselor/camper ratio meet recommendations? In a resident camp this should be one counselor to eight campers who are 8 years old and over, and one to six campers under 8.

SITE, FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

Is the waterfront area shelving safe, adequately roped and free from treacherous currents and underwater hazards?

Are foot trails kept separate from vehicular roads to the greatest possible extent?

Are there unusual natural hazards (cliffs, swamps) that require special protective measures?

Are all sleeping accommodations on the ground level or, alternatively, are fire escapes and protective devices provided on all other floors?

HEALTH

Is a physical examination by a physician and a medical history required for all people at the camp within three months before camp starts? Is a physical checkup also given to each person, either immediately before departure to camp or upon arrival, by a doctor or registered nurse? Does the camp require all inoculations stipulated by public health authorities? Is a daily record of all first aid and other medical treatment kept by the doctor, nurse or director?

If a family or resident camp, is there a doctor or registered nurse in residence at all times? If a day camp, is a doctor or registered nurse on call at all times, and is there a person on the camp site who holds a current ARC certificate in advanced first aid?

Are all staff members drilled on standard procedures to follow in event of health emergencies?

Is a night patrol operated after hours?

GENERAL SAFETY

Is the waterfront program at all times under the direction of an experienced person over 21 who holds a current American Red Cross water safety instructor's certificate? In addition to the waterfront director, is there on duty a *minimum* ratio of one *senior* lifesaver for every 25 persons in the water? Do all waterfront practices and equipment, including watercraft, comply with American Red Cross and U.S. Coast Guard standards or equivalent? For example, can all watercraft be locked up when not in use, and are they always locked at night? Is the swimming pool fenced?

Does the riflery program comply with National Rifle Association standards? Are the archery and riding programs planned and conducted in a manner to ensure the safety of all participants?

Are tools, including power tools, as well as their safety devices such as guards, used and maintained in good repair, and are they operated only under qualified supervision? Are gasoline, kerosene, explosives and inflammables stored away from inhabited buildings and kept away from children, under lock and key?

Is firefighting equipment adequate, are all staff members knowledgeable and practiced in its use, and have arrangements been made with the nearest local fire department or with fire wardens or forest rangers for special help if needed? Are disaster procedures planned and regularly practiced in the form of drills?

SANITATION

Does the camp comply with all applicable sanitation laws? Has it been recently verified that the water supply is approved as safe? Is the milk pasteurized or certified? Is storage for milk and perishable foods adequate and safe? Do dishwashing procedures and care of equipment comply with all applicable laws? Are waste disposal and toilet facilities adequate and in compliance with all applicable laws?

TRANSPORTATION

Is all equipment maintained in top condition? Is there a program of safety education for all camp personnel that is properly adjusted to the transportation practices of the camp? Are all persons who operate vehicles qualified under law to do so? Are all transportation units covered by adequate liability insurance? Do units provide safe seating for all passengers? Do chartered transportation units meet ACA transportation standards?

Concern shown by you and other parents will alert camp directors to the fact that the public is interested in first-class standards. A camp that is spending time and money to meet top standards should be anxious to answer questions, and personnel will make arrangements to show you around. Evasiveness may be a sign that all is not high-caliber.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO IRANIAN AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION FOR CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agreements for Cooperation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I wish to inform the Senate that pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission on March 17, 1969, submitted to the Joint Committee proposed amendments to the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Iran in the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954 requires that such proposed amendments lie before the Joint Committee for a period of 30 days while the Congress is in session before becoming effective.

The main purpose of the proposed amendments is to extend the period of the existing Agreement for Cooperation due to expire on April 26, 1969, for an additional 10 years. In addition, various provisions of the Agreement for Cooperation are being updated in order to reflect changes that have been made in the Atomic Energy Act relating to private ownership of nuclear materials. Moreover, the provisions providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency are being updated to reflect the fact that such transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and that that agency will continue to apply the safeguards.

In keeping with the committee's general practice of including such agree-

ments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of interested Members of Congress, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of the proposed amendments to the civilian Agreement for Cooperation with Iran, together with supporting correspondence.

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

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1969.

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States

DEAR MR. HOLIFIELD: Pursuant to Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, there are submitted with this letter copies of the following:

a. a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy";

b. a letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment; and

c. a letter from the President to the Commission containing his determination that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and approving the amendment and authorizing its execution.

The amendment has been negotiated by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It will revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Iran which was signed on March 5, 1957, as amended by the agreement signed on June 8, 1964.

The two most significant aspects of the amendment are the extension of the term of the agreement and changes occasioned by the 1964 "private ownership" legislation. The present agreement is scheduled to expire on April 26, 1969. It will be extended for ten years, pursuant to Article VI of the amendment. Pursuant to Article II thereof, authority will be incorporated for authorized persons in either the United States or Iran to make arrangements directly with authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other for the transfer of special nuclear material; such transactions would also be permitted between either government and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other.

The purpose of the remaining articles of the amendment is to update the aspects of the agreement, as discussed below.

Article I modifies the fuel article, Article IV, to (a) permit fueling of reactor experiments in addition to research reactors; (b) discontinue the obsolete requirement that title to enriched uranium, purchased from the Commission, be retained by the Government of Iran until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material; and (c) discontinue the present options of the United States to retain special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin leased material, following reprocessing, and to purchase special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin material which Iran acquired by means other than lease. The United States, however, will have the right to approve transfers of such produced special nuclear material from Iran to any other nation or group of nations. The formulation governing the quantity of material, which may be transferred under Article IV of the current agreement, will be retained under the amended article. Also, the authority to provide this material enriched to greater than 20% in the isotope U-235 will

be continued, subject to a finding of technical or economic justification for such enrichment.

Article III brings the present comprehensive safeguards article, Article VIII, into conformity with the similar provision in current agreements and incorporates changes in cross-references necessitated by the new fuel article.

Article IV extends Iran's "peaceful uses" guarantee in the present Article IX to cover special nuclear material produced through the use of material, equipment and devices transferred under the agreement.

Article V updates the article providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency [Article IX(A)] to reflect that such a transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and to provide for the continued application of safeguards by the Agency.

The amendment will enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for entry into force.

Cordially,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 17, 1969.

HON. GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SEABORG: In accordance with Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the Atomic Energy Commission has submitted to me a proposed "Amendment to Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy" and has recommended that I approve the proposed Amendment, determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 123b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

a. Approve the proposed Amendment, and determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States of America.

b. Authorize the execution of the proposed Amendment on behalf of the Government of the United States of America by appropriate authorities of the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

U.S. ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Knowing of your deep interest in furthering the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, I am pleased to enclose for your consideration a proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy."

In submitting to you for the first time an action relating to our program of Agreements for Cooperation, I should like to note that other such submissions will be forwarded to you from time to time pursuant to Section 123a of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Some, as in the case of the agreement with Iran, will pertain to cooperation in the research

aspects of nuclear energy; others will include not only research but power applications as well and will provide for the supply of uranium enriched in U-235 to fuel power reactors over periods of up to thirty years. The purpose of these agreements will be to extend and develop, on a peaceful basis, the humanitarian and economic benefits of scientific and technological advances in nuclear energy. They will also serve to help keep the United States in the forefront of international developments of both an economic and scientific nature in the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the proposed amendment to the "Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy," determine that its performance will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and authorize its execution. The Department of State supports the Commission's recommendation.

The proposed amendment has been negotiated by the Department of State and the Atomic Energy Commission pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended. It would revise and extend the Agreement for Cooperation between the United States of America and Iran which was signed at Washington on March 5, 1957, as amended by the agreement signed on June 8, 1964.

The present agreement is scheduled to expire on April 26, 1969. Accordingly, the main purpose of the amendment is to extend the agreement; an additional period of ten years would be established pursuant to proposed Article VI.

In extending the agreement, the opportunity has been taken to bring other aspects of the agreement up to date. As regularly reflected in other recent amendments and agreements, changes have been occasioned by the 1964 "private ownership" legislation. Pursuant to proposed Article II, therefore, authorized persons in either the United States or Iran would be permitted to make arrangements directly with authorized persons in the other country to transfer special nuclear material; such transactions would also be permitted between either government and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other.

The other articles of the amendment would update the aspects of the current agreement as noted below.

Article I of the amendment would modify the fuel article, Article IV of the agreement, to (a) permit fueling of reactor experiments in addition to research reactors; (b) discontinue the obsolete requirement that title to enriched uranium, purchased from the Commission, be retained by the Government of Iran until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title to such material; and (c) discontinue the present option of the United States to retain special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin leased material, following reprocessing, and to purchase special nuclear material produced in U.S.-origin material which Iran acquired by means other than lease. The United States, however, would have the right to approve transfers of such produced special nuclear material from Iran to any other nation or group of nations. The formulation governing the quantity of material, which may be transferred under Article IV of the current agreement, would be retained under the amended article. Also, the authority to provide this material enriched to greater than 20% in the isotope U-235 would be continued, subject to a finding of technical or economic justification for such enrichment.

Article III would bring the present comprehensive safeguards article, Article VIII, into conformity with the similar provision in

current agreements and incorporate changes in cross-references necessitated by the new fuel article. At Iran's request, proposed Article III would also amend the safeguards article to make the present U.S. right to consult with Iran on health and safety matters a mutual right.

Article IV would expressly extend Iran's "peaceful uses" guarantee in the present Article IX to cover special nuclear material produced through the use of material, equipment and devices transferred under the agreement.

Article V would update the article providing for the transfer of safeguards responsibilities to the International Atomic Energy Agency [Article IX(A)] to reflect that such a transfer has been accomplished under a trilateral safeguards agreement signed in 1964 and to provide for the continued application of safeguards by the Agency.

Following your approval, determination, and authorization, the proposed amendment will be formally executed by appropriate authorities of the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran. In compliance with Section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the amendment will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully yours,

GLENN T. SEABORG,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF IRAN CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran,

Desiring to amend the Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy, signed at Washington on March 5, 1957 (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation"), which was amended by the Agreement signed on June 8, 1964,

Agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

Article IV of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. As may be agreed, the Commission will transfer to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 for use as fuel in defined research applications, including research reactors and reactor experiments, which the Government of Iran decides to construct or operate or authorizes private persons to construct or operate in Iran. Contracts setting forth the terms, conditions, and delivery schedule of each transfer shall be agreed upon in advance.

"2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred under this Article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran shall not at any time be in excess of six (6) kilograms of contained U-235 in enriched uranium plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of such reactors or reactor experiments while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Iran or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the six (6) kilograms of said material.

"3. The enriched uranium supplied hereunder may contain up to twenty percent (20%) in the isotope U-235. All or a portion of the foregoing special nuclear material may be made available as uranium enriched to more than twenty percent (20%) by weight in the isotope U-235 when the Commission finds there is a technical or economic justification for such a transfer for use in re-

search reactors and reactor experiments, each capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed six (6) kilograms of the isotope U-235 contained in such uranium.

"4. When any source or special nuclear material received from the United States of America requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after removal from a reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

"5. Special nuclear material produced as a result of irradiation processes in any part of fuel leased by the Commission hereunder shall be for the account of the lessee and, after reprocessing as provided in paragraph 4 of this Article, shall be returned to the lessee, at which time title to such material shall be transferred to the lessee.

"6. No special nuclear material produced through the use of material transferred to the Government of Iran or to authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this Agreement, will be transferred to any other nation or group of nations, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer.

"7. Some atomic energy materials which the Commission may be requested to provide in accordance with this Agreement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials, the Government of Iran shall bear all responsibility insofar as the Government of the United States of America is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any source material or special nuclear material or reactor materials which the Commission may, pursuant to this Agreement, lease to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Iran shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States of America against any and all liability (including third party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such source material or special nuclear material or reactor materials after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Iran or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction."

ARTICLE II

Article VII of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. With respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party for the transfer of equipment and devices and materials other than special nuclear material and for the performance of services with respect thereto.

"2. With respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, it is understood that arrangements may be made between either Party or authorized persons under its jurisdiction and authorized persons under the jurisdiction of the other Party for the transfer of special nuclear material and for the performance of services with respect thereto for the uses specified in articles IV and V and subject to the limitations of Article IV, paragraph 2.

"3. The Parties agree that the activities referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall be subject to the limitations in Article II, to the applicable laws, regulations

and license requirements of the Parties, and to the policies of the Parties with regard to transactions involving the authorized persons referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2."

ARTICLE III

Article VIII of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment or devices made available to the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

"2. Except to the extent that the safeguards rights provided for in this Agreement are suspended by virtue of the application of safeguards of the International Atomic Energy Agency, as provided in Article IX(A), the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this Agreement, shall have the following rights:

"(A) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any

"(1) reactor, and

"(2) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards,

which are to be made available under this Agreement to the Government of Iran or to any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

"(B) With respect to any source material or special nuclear material made available under this Agreement to the Government of Iran or to any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source material or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment or devices so made available:

"(1) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission,

"(2) reactors, and

"(3) any other equipment or devices designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this paragraph 2 (B) will apply,

"(i) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials, and

"(ii) to require that any such materials in the custody of the Government of Iran or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this Article and the guarantees set forth in Article IX;

"(C) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in paragraph 2 (B) of this Article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Iran and which is not transferred pursuant to Article IV or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties;

"(D) To designate, after consultation with the Government of Iran, personnel who, accompanied, if either Party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of Iran, shall have access in Iran to all places and data necessary to account for the source material and special nuclear material which are subject to paragraph 2 (B) of this Arti-

cle, to determine whether there is compliance with this Agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

"(B) In the event of non-compliance with the provisions of this Article or the guarantees set forth in Article IX and the failure of the Government of Iran to carry out the provisions of this Article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this Agreement and to require the return of any materials, equipment and devices referred to in paragraph 2 (B) of this Article.

"3. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran shall have the right to consult one with the other in the matter of health and safety.

"4. The Government of Iran undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this Article."

ARTICLE IV

Article IX of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"The Government of Iran guarantees that:

"(1) Safeguards provided in Article VIII shall be maintained.

"(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this Agreement and no special nuclear material produced through the use of such material, equipment or devices, shall be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purposes.

"(3) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Iran or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this Agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Iran, except as the Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation or group of nations, and then only if, in the opinion of the Commission, the transfer of the material is within the scope of an Agreement for Cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation or group of nations."

ARTICLE V

Article IX (A) of the Agreement for Cooperation is amended to read as follows:

"1. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Iran note that, by an agreement signed by them and the International Atomic Energy Agency on December 4, 1964, the Agency has been applying safeguards to materials, equipment and facilities transferred to the Government of Iran under this Agreement for Cooperation. The Parties agree that Agency safeguards either as provided in the trilateral agreement, as it may be amended from time to time, or as provided in a new supplanting trilateral agreement shall continue to apply to such materials, equipment and facilities transferred under this Agreement, recognizing that the safeguards rights accorded to the Government of the United States of America by Article VIII of this Agreement are suspended during the time and to the extent that Agency safeguards apply to such materials, equipment and facilities.

"2. In the event that the applicable trilateral agreement referred to in paragraph 1 of this Article should be terminated prior to the expiration of this Agreement and the Parties should fail to agree promptly upon a resumption of Agency safeguards, either Party may, by notification, terminate this Agreement. In the event of termination by either Party, the Government of Iran shall, at the request of the Government of the United States of America, return to the Government of the United States of America all special nuclear material received pursuant to this Agreement and still in its possession

or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction. The Government of the United States of America will compensate the Government of Iran or the persons under its jurisdiction for their interest in such material so returned at the Commission's schedule of prices then in effect in the United States of America."

ARTICLE VI

Article XI of the Agreement for Cooperation, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"This Agreement shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Agreement and shall remain in force for a period of twenty years."

ARTICLE VII

This Amendment shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall have received from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such Amendment and shall remain in force for the period of the Agreement for Cooperation, as hereby amended.

In witness whereof, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Amendment.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this _____ day of _____, 1969.

For the Government of the United States of America:

DONOVAN Q. ZOOK,
Director, Office of Atomic Energy Affairs,
International Scientific and Technological Affairs, U.S. Department of State.

BARBARA H. THOMAS,
Foreign Affairs Officer, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Iran:
His Excellency HUSHANG ANSARY,
Ambassador E and P from Iran.

Initialed: February 17, 1969.
Certified to be a true copy:

BARBARA H. THOMAS.

FELLOWSHIP AWARD TO GARY H. LAMBERT, SALT LAKE CITY

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I have received word that a junior medical student from the University of Utah has received a fellowship for 10 weeks of study at a mission hospital in the West Indies.

I am proud of the fact that Gary H. Lambert and his wife, the former Jane Barber, will be participating in this very worthwhile project.

I ask unanimous consent that the report announcing the fellowship be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON, D.C., March 21, 1969.—Gary H. Lambert, a junior at the University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, has been awarded a \$555 Fellowship which will permit him to assist for 10 weeks this summer at a mission hospital in the West Indies.

Lambert, the son of Mr. and Mrs. Norval H. Lambert, of 3787 Springhollow Drive, Salt Lake City, is one of 31 American medical students selected to receive Smith Kline & French Foreign Fellowships from the Association of American Medical Colleges. The fellowships are supported by a grant from the Philadelphia manufacturer of prescrip-

tion medicines and other health-related products.

Lambert, accompanied by his wife and two sons, will leave May 1 for L'Hospital Bon Samaritain, in Limbe, Haiti. The medical student will work under the supervision of William H. Hodges, M.D.

The hospital at Limbe serves the rural tropical area of northern Haiti which has a population of about 20,000. The usual number of in-patients is 90, and the outpatient clinic is visited by some 3,000 persons monthly. Lambert will assist with all of the work of the hospital, including complicated maternity cases and surgery.

Lambert's wife, the former Jane Barber, plans to assist in the hospital laboratory. Mrs. Lambert has a Bachelor of Science degree in medical technology and three years of experience as a registered technician at the University of Utah Medical Center.

Lambert was graduated magna cum laude from the University of Utah, where he was a three-year letterman on the track and cross-country teams. In 1962 and 1963 he served a mission in England for the Latter Day Saints church.

The Lamberts live at 3787 Springhollow Drive, Salt Lake City.

Now entering its tenth year, the Smith Kline & French Foreign Fellowships program was established to permit American medical students to widen their medical horizons in cultures different from their own.

In the past nine years, 277 Fellows representing 80 medical schools have served in 52 countries of Africa, Asia, Latin America and Oceania.

JUVENILE DECENCY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, juvenile delinquency is a phrase with which Americans are all too familiar. Hardly a day goes by when our newspapers and broadcasters fail to tell us about the juvenile delinquents and the trouble they have caused and are causing.

Therefore, it was indeed a refreshing and welcome relief to read of the recent Teenage Rally for Decency at the Orange Bowl in Miami. According to the reports, there were some 30,000 young Americans gathered together to voice their support of the cause of decency in America, their support of their country, and their belief in God.

These young Americans, 30,000 strong, decided it was time to stand up and be heard. They told it like it is, Mr. President. They spoke up, not for juvenile delinquency, but for juvenile decency. They gathered not to protest something, or to be against something, but to be for something.

Mr. President, it is my belief that the demonstration in Miami last Sunday could be duplicated in virtually every city in America overnight, and it is my hope that it will. Because an overwhelming majority of our young people are good people. I believe that our youth has taken a bum rap for the few misfits and malcontents in their midst.

Let us all take a closer look at our young people and let us all gain a new perspective by which to judge their conduct. In many ways, the actions of our young are mere reflections of our own youth. Let us not be so eager to condemn so many because of the misdeeds of so few.

To the thousands of young people in Miami, and to the many adults and personalities who took part in Sunday's

rally, we owe our thanks for restoring our faith in the young people of America, who are the future caretakers of the greatest heritage known to mankind.

THE AIR TAXI

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, as many of us here know, the aviation industry is one of the most dynamic segments of our economy today. The air industry far outpaces the growth of our national economy and transportation in general. One indication of the health and maturity of this industry, I think, has been its ability to broaden and diversify its scope of activity. Within the aviation community new areas of economic activity are springing to life, and this activity is creating intense competition for the transportation dollar.

An article written by Guy Halverson and published in the Christian Science Monitor describes one area of aviation which is booming—the air taxi business. The article points out that the air taxi business has jumped from 12 operators in late 1965 to 185 today—nearly 15 times over in a period of 3 years. Many other favorable trends in this business are also discussed.

The need for air taxi operation exists because there are nearly 8,000 airports in this Nation which are not served by the airlines. The air taxi makes it possible to go anywhere in the Nation or in the world which has a legal airstrip. When there is no airline to a particular destination, you can take the air taxi. Routes develop where demands exist; they grow as the need and traffic does.

Air taxi companies generally fly light or medium sized aircraft, and their operators are licensed by the FAA. But I think their operators would be quick to point out that they meet standards even higher than those required by the FAA.

I am particularly proud that the Kansas aviation industry provides aircraft which are helping to meet this public demand.

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

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

(By Guy Halverson)

CHICAGO.—Paul G. Delman, president of Chicago-based Commuter Airlines, is "flying high."

For not only is Commuter (the nation's largest "third-level," or air-taxi service) now entering its fourth year of operation, but in that time it has established 11 routes (all but one direct), built a hefty fleet of modern Beechcraft propeller and turboprop all-weather aircraft, cracked the \$1.5 million barrier in operating revenues, and trail-blazed an entirely new approach in air service.

"The 'hub approach,'" says Mr. Delman, a former Sioux City, Iowa, insurance man and World War II B-26 bomber pilot. "I saw that most third-level lines were starting with inadequate capital, poor equipment, and maybe one or two multistop routes. What we did was to start with strong capitalization, a first-rate fleet, and, using a central city—Chicago—as a hub, extended nonstop direct routes outward."

For time-conscious businessmen who balk

at often seemingly interminable taxi rides to outlying big-city jet airports as well as for residents of towns of 50,000 or less whose limited airports have been virtually by-passed by the national and regional carriers like United, American, Western, and Ozark, third-level lines have filled a crucial need.

NET LOSS RECORDED

Under federal regulations, however, third-level airlines need not adhere to their published schedules. Passengers with reservations on smaller lines have occasionally come out to airports only to find the operator refusing to fly with just one or two passengers because he would lose money on the run.

Well-established lines such as Commuter and Executive Airlines in New England do stick to their schedules, though. In Commuters' case, Illinois is one of the few states to require it.

Since the first nine-passenger Commuter Beechcraft Queen lifted into the Iowa sky in November, 1965, the industry has galloped from 12 to 185 companies, including such other established carriers as Cable Commuter Airways in California and Suburban Airlines in the mid-Atlantic states. Industrywide 1968 revenues are expected to pass \$40 million, up from \$35 million in 1967.

For the investor, the publicly listed third-level carrier represents a long shot indeed. Many lines remain poorly financed and equipped. Few expect to turn a profit during their first half-decade. And yet the mere growth of the industry, as well as the professional performance of the larger third-level carriers, suggests the eventual profit potential.

Commuter was capitalized at \$2.75 million, most of that sold in Iowa by Mr. Delman, who, after an initial \$250,000 investment by associates, issued 1,250,000 shares of stock at \$2 a share. (A 1967 public offering of 400,000 shares by McCormick & Co. went for \$4.75 per share. The stock has been traded over the counter since November 1966.)

Though operating revenues, like passenger miles, continue to soar (projected at \$2.5 million for the 1969 fiscal year ending May 31, compared to \$1.5 million in fiscal 1968), Commuter officers don't expect to post a profit for another two years. The company had a net loss of \$770,000, or 50 cents a share, for fiscal 1968, compared with a loss of \$181,000 or 14 cents a share for the year-earlier period.

A net loss is again expected for fiscal 1969, mainly reflecting changeover costs in converting to an all turbo-prop fleet.

Still, the company expects that the smaller break-even load factor of the newer 15-passenger Beechcraft 99's—40 to 45 percent, compared to 60 to 65 percent for the present older nine-passenger aircraft—will substantially speed that expected fiscal 1970 profit.

As with most third-level carriers, Commuter's main growth potential is still its businessman passenger traffic, though students and housewives plus charter tours are being actively courted through extensive newspaper advertising.

CARGO RUN DROPPED

Cargo traffic, which currently accounts for only 5 percent of sales, is expected to reach 10 percent next year. (One test-run nighttime all-cargo flight between Chicago and Sheboygan, Wis., was scuttled due to poor volume.)

The carrier presently operates flights to Wisconsin, Iowa, Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan, as well as within Illinois. Under the "hub concept," each two-man crew and plane will fly back and forth along the same route. All told, 112 flights are made daily between Chicago and a dozen midwest cities.

Mr. Delman says that Commuter's main problem at this time is what he feels to be lack of adequate instrument-approach and

landing facilities at Chicago's downtown Melg's Field.

Mr. Delman predicts that as many as 500 third-level lines will be established within the next few years. By 1980, however, through mergers, or surprise tender offers by growth-conscious conglomerates, he expects that number to be chopped to about 50.

The prospect of such heavy consolidation is prompting many carriers to snap up new routes as quickly as possible—both to forestall competition, and as an "asset" in any possible merger negotiations. Commuter, for example, opened six routes in a three-month period earlier this year (even while closing off an unprofitable route to Milwaukee).

But there remains another reason explaining such feverish activity. While equipment and pilot standards for third-level carriers are certified under federal regulation, there is no present Civil Aeronautics Board control over routes or fares. Congressional pressures continue to mount for regulation, however, and it's believed that when the CAB does eventually establish jurisdiction, it will honor most established routes.

Whatever the case, Mr. Delman expects Commuter to continue to be "first among the remaining few," just as it's now first among the almost 200 third-level air-carriers.

SEABED ARMS CONTROL AGREEMENT

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in the midst of the ABM controversy, I am compelled to draw attention to the reopening of the 18-nation disarmament conference and the momentous pronouncement from Geneva during the last week. After a delay of almost 2 weeks, the conference reopened on Tuesday last, and the news was well worth waiting for: both the United States and the Soviet Union recommended the formulation of a treaty prohibiting the emplacement of weapons of mass destruction on the ocean floor. When one considers that the area under discussion encompasses approximately 70 percent of the globe, the significance of such a joint recommendation is readily apparent. Moreover, to those of us who have an awareness of the weapons systems which are possible for this vast, virgin area, the discussions now going on in Geneva take on an even greater meaning, if not a sense of the utmost urgency. As chairman of the Consultative Subcommittee on Ocean Space of the Foreign Relations Committee, I applaud President Nixon's decision to move this country toward a seabed arms control agreement.

At my request and based on prior commitments to the Foreign Relations Committee, I have been in close contact during the past week with the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, and I am convinced that serious negotiations toward such an agreement are now underway. Although I am personally disappointed that the United States was unable to table a draft treaty, such as the Soviet Union has done, I fully appreciate the variety of views within the executive branch which thus far have precluded our doing so. But, now is the time for a harmonization of views within the administration; our negotiators must be allowed to respond meaningfully to the Soviet proposal, as I am informed was

done today on at least three of the Soviet's four major points. On the fourth point, the boundary issue, I myself would urge acceptance of the broadest zone possible to be devoid of mass destruction weaponry.

I can assure Senators that the Subcommittee on Ocean Space will keep close watch on the developments in Geneva. If an early agreement can be reached on the arms control aspect of the seabed issue, I am certain that progress in fashioning a new regime for the international marine environment will be accelerated. As one of the U.S. congressional advisers to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed, I urge the United States and the Soviet Union to fulfill their commitment to this Committee by reaching as soon as possible a viable, workable seabed arms control arrangement.

Mr. President we all owe a deep debt of gratitude to Mr. Gerard Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, for his unswerving perseverance in moving this country toward banning the emplacement of nuclear weapons on the ocean floor. Mr. Smith and his fine staff certainly deserve our full support on this crucial arms control issue.

NATIONAL FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, during this week the national youth organization, Future Homemakers of America, is observing National FHA Week. More than 600,000 members in over 12,000 local FHA chapters throughout the country are carrying out projects and activities to give exposure to what youth is doing in a positive way to promote the principles of good citizenship.

I rise to commend this organization on its endeavors. FHA members continually stress constructive activities indicating that they are dedicated to improving life for all citizens of our country. They are proving that youth is aware, that youth does care, and that youth can contribute constructively.

I am most pleased that there are 35,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America in the State of Tennessee, located in 415 high school chapters. I am particularly proud of Miss Carolyn Walker, of Greenbrier, Tenn., who is the national secretary of this organization.

CIGARETTE CURBS IN CANADA

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, since we have under consideration in this country proposed regulations of cigarette advertising on radio and TV, it is interesting to note that our neighbor to the north—Canada—is also moving toward curbing the promotion of cigarette smoking.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on this subject which was written by James Post for the Christian Science Monitor be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 18, 1969]

CIGARETTE-PROMOTION CURB GAINS IMPETUS IN CANADA

(By James Post)

OTTAWA.—The Canadian Government is moving inexorably toward introduction of legislation curbing promotion of cigarette smoking. This move has the recently avowed support or organized medicine.

Legislation could be ready for presentation to Parliament before the end of the year and is seen as a direct result of the growing strength of antismoking forces.

The Canadian Medical Association (CMA), official voice of the country's doctors, recently abandoned its guarded role on the subject of smoking health hazards.

It told a parliamentary committee conducting a smoking inquiry that prevention of smoking is an important preventive measure.

The CMA suggested the federal government ban outright cigarette advertising and cigarette packages be labeled to warn of health hazards.

It is not yet certain whether the Liberal government will seek an outright ban on the advertising of smoking which it considers to be a social and health problem.

CONTROLS SOUGHT

Health Minister John Munro says that cigarettes must come under legislative control, especially in regard to their advertising and labeling.

At the moment, the administration of Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Trudeau is in the conflicting position of spending about \$200,000 a year on a public antismoking campaign while spending more than double that amount (through the Agriculture Department) on tobacco-crop research.

Although the tobacco-growing industry in Canada and the cigarette manufacturers are not strong enough to prevent antismoking legislation, it is thought possible that they could have some success in weakening the proposed legislation.

The government still has a number of alternatives. These include partial rather than complete bans on advertising, as well as no ban at all.

But partial bans are not viewed with much favor because of the likelihood that tobacco companies will merely switch their advertising emphasis to the permitted avenues.

A Health Department study notes that in Britain "the elimination of cigarette advertising on television was followed by increases in overall promotional budgets and in coupon gift schemes."

Despite its modest \$200,000 budget, the government's public-education campaign seems to be having some effect in curbing of smoking. But it is only marginal.

A study shows that the proportion of regular cigarette smokers among men 15 and over decreased from 55 percent in September, 1965, to 52 percent in October, 1968. The program has been in effect for four years.

DATA PUBLISHED

One contradictory note is that the trend does not apply to women. In the same period, regular smokers among women increased from 31 to 33 percent of the female population over 15.

During the same time, smoking among girls 15 to 19 increased at the same rate. Smoking among boys in the same age group has remained unchanged.

The study was conducted by the Federal Health Department, which does many things to convince people to stop. There is a fairly extensive television advertising campaign.

Periodically, the Federal Health Department publishes a list of the nicotine and tar

levels of various cigarette brands for people who feel they cannot quit but want to reduce their intake of these substances.

Mr. Munro recognizes the inequality of the completion between the tobacco industry and the antismoking forces. The advertising budgets of the manufacturers total millions of dollars, but he feels some progress has been made.

WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS CRIME CLOCK

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the Washington Daily News "Crime Clock" for March 27, 1969.

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

CRIME CLOCK

Here is the Washington Daily News tally of robberies and crimes of violence—many of them accomplished with guns—reported in the District of Columbia in the 24-hour period ending at 8 a.m. today.

1:30 p.m.: Thomas Clark, 79, Negro, was in the rear of his Northwest home when two Negro men, one armed with a knife, walked up to him and took his wallet containing \$15.

2:15 p.m.: Franklin L. Pergerof, 29, white, Carroll Durkitt, 65, white, and Edward J. Woodrow, 25, white, were painting a building behind 1413 5th-st nw when three Negro men, one armed with a knife, demanded money. The bandits escaped with \$6.

2:20 p.m.: James Clemens, 68, Negro, was standing near Fifth and Kennedy streets nw when three Negro men walked up to him, one grabbing him while the other two took \$21 from his pockets.

2:30 p.m.: A Negro gunman walked into the St. Vincent DePaul's Store, 1432 U-st nw, and forced clerk Beatrice Jordan, 63, Negro, to hand over \$160 in cash and checks.

3:55 p.m.: A Negro man walked into the High's Store, 4601 Sheriff Road ne, and demanded money at gunpoint from clerk Evelyn Douglas, 51, Negro. The bandit escaped with an undetermined amount of money.

5:25 p.m.: Maxine Huff, 20, Negro, of Northeast was at Seventh and U streets nw, when she was robbed of \$3 by a lone Negro bandit.

6:25 p.m.: Two Negro men, one with his hand in his pocket as tho he had a gun, walked into Helen's Grocery, 1418 12th-st nw and took \$130 from owner Helen Nakahara, 49.

6:30 p.m.: Jesse James, 15, Negro, was riding his bicycle near 14th-st and Rhode Island-av nw when three Negro youths took \$10 from him.

6:50 p.m.: William B. Boswell, 56, white, was held up in the 1600 block of Lamont-st nw by a Negro man who had his hand in his pocket, as tho he had a gun.

7:25 p.m.: Alice Tally, 25, Negro, a cashier at the Central Cardozo Credit Union, 2418 14th-st nw, lost \$1,000 to a Negro man, who asked if he could join the credit union and pulled a gun.

8 p.m.: Jesse White, 20, Negro, of Northwest, was at 15th and Belmont streets nw, when he was robbed at knifepoint of \$5 and his leather coat by a Negro man.

9:15 p.m.: Charles Anderson, 17, Negro, a clerk at Campbell's Drug Store, 4730 14th-st nw, said a Negro man and Negro woman took an undetermined amount of money. The woman had a .45 caliber automatic pistol.

8:40 p.m.: Joan Francis Gardfall, 33, white, said two Negro teenagers, about 15 years old forced her into her car in the 1500 block of Ogden-st nw, and took \$15 and her purse at gunpoint.

9 p.m.: Jennifer Butler, 12, Negro, was near her home near 14th and Euclid streets

nw, when she was struck in the head with a bottle by a 15-year-old Negro youth, who took \$4.

10:45 p.m.: Lewis Sharp, manager of the Hot Shoppe at 1400 Rhode Island-av ne, said two Negroes walked up to the cash register and one pointed a revolver at him. Mr. Sharp walked to the back of the store, the men ran out with no money.

11:30 p.m.: Margaret Gilbert, 23, Negro, cashier at the Hot Shoppe, 2230 New York-av ne, refused to give any money to one of two Negro bandits, who pointed a gun at her. The bandits left with no money.

2:25 a.m.: Luther Whitaker, 24, Negro, a clerk at the Macke Vending Company, 12th and O streets nw, was robbed at gunpoint of an undetermined amount of money by two white bandits.

TWENTY-FOUR TEXAS CONSERVATION ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORT S. 4, BILL TO ESTABLISH A BIG THICKET NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, public support for the preservation of a portion of the Big Thicket area in Southeast Texas has been growing steadily since I introduced the first Big Thicket bill in Congress in 1966. Many persons, groups, and organizations have endorsed my bill, S. 4, which calls for the establishment of a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. They have recognized the value of this beautiful and unique land, and are working diligently to preserve the remaining forest lands, river bottoms, and wildlife habitat areas.

The preservation of the Big Thicket has now gained national support and recognition. The National Park Service has made a thorough study of the area, and has made two different recommendations regarding its future development. Such prestigious groups as the Sierra Club, the Isaac Walton League and the Wilderness Society have also endorsed the project, and are lending their support to my efforts to establish a national park in the area. In addition, President Johnson called for the protection of the Big Thicket in a statement issued on January 18, 1969.

Mr. President, since the publication of the National Park Service proposals and the introduction of my bill, S. 4, 24 different Texas conservation organizations have endorsed a policy statement on the preservation of the Big Thicket. These groups have called for broadening of the Park Service proposals, and are supporting my bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the "Policy Statement on Big Thicket National Monument" and a list of the organizations supporting this statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLICY STATEMENT ON BIG THICKET NATIONAL MONUMENT

We favor a Big Thicket National Park or Monument which would include a minimum of the 35,500 acres proposed in the Preliminary Report by the National Park Service study team, with the following modifications and additions:

1. Extend the Pine Island Bayou section southward and eastward down both sides of Pine Island Bayou to its confluence with the Neches River.

2. Extend the Neches Bottom Unit to cover a strip, a maximum of three miles, but not less than four hundred feet, wide on both sides of the Neches River from Highway 1746, just below Dam B, down to the confluence of Pine Island Bayou.

3. Extend the Beaumont Unit northward to include all the area between the LNVA Canal and the Neches.

4. Incorporate a Village Creek Unit, comprising a strip up to one mile wide where feasible, and no less than 400 feet wide on each side of Big Sandy-Village Creek from the proposed Profile Unit down to the Neches confluence. Wherever residences have already been constructed, an effort should be made to reach agreement with the owners for scenic easements, limiting further development on such tracts and preserving the natural environment. Pioneer architecture within these areas should also be preserved.

5. Incorporate a squarish area of at least 20,000 acres so that larger species such as black bear, puma and red wolf may survive there. An ideal area for this purpose would be the area southeast of Saratoga, surrounded by Highways 770, 326 and 105. Although there are pipeline crossings in this area, they do not destroy the ecosystem; therefore the National Park Service should revise its standards pertaining to such incumbrances, in this case, leaving them under scenic easement rules instead of acquiring them.

6. Connect the major units with corridors at least one-half mile wide, with a hiking trail along each corridor but without new public roads cutting any forest. A portion of Menard Creek would be good for one such corridor. The entire watershed of Rush Creek would be excellent for another.

Such additions would form a connected two-looped green belt of about 100,000 acres (there are more than 3 million acres in the overall Big Thicket area) through which wildlife and people could move along a continuous circle of more than 100 miles.

We recommend that the headquarters be in or near the line of the Profile Unit.

We are absolutely opposed to any trading or cession of any National Forest areas in the formation of the Big Thicket National Park or Monument.

In addition, but not as a part of the Big Thicket National Monument, we recommend: (a) the establishment of a National Wildlife Refuge comprising the lands of the U.S. Corps of Engineers around Dam B, (b) a state historical area encompassing communities of typical pioneer dwellings, farms, etc., such as that between Beech and Theuvenins Creeks off Road 1943 in Tyler County, and (c) other state parks to supplement the national reserve.

Adopted by the following organizations: Texas Committee on Natural Resources; Conservation Federation of Texas; Texas Ornithological Society; Texas Explorers Club; Northeast Texas Nature and Wildlife Association; Tyler Audubon Society; Travis County Audubon Society; San Antonio Audubon Society; Fort Worth Audubon Society; Fort Worth Conservation Council; the Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Outdoor Nature Club of Houston, Tex.; Houston Sportsman's Club; Dallas County Audubon Society; East Texas Nature Club; Lone Star Chapter of the Sierra Club; Waco Ornithological Society; Texoma Outdoor Club; Stephen F. Austin Ornithological Society; Isaac Walton League of America; the Texas Academy of Science; the Magnolia Garden Club of Beaumont, Tex.; Texas Federation of Women's Clubs; Marianne Scroogs Garden Club of Dallas, Tex.

SUPPORT FOR ABM FROM WASHINGTON POST EDITORIAL PAGE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, today the Washington Post editorial page contained a letter of support concerning the current ABM controversy that I think is worthy of being included in the record of debate.

This correspondent's thinking, I believe, coincides with that of the vast majority of Americans. He calls the anti-ABM arguments "balderdash."

Mr. Frederick Ayer obviously has more knowledge in this area, because of his experience in the intelligence profession, than most Americans. The logic he applies, with the publicly revealed facts to back them up, is sound. To quote just one paragraph from his letter:

To restate the obvious but often forgotten—an anti-ballistic missile is not an offensive weapon any more than were city walls, bronze shields or drawbridges. The earth is deep with the dust of civilizations which believed when it was said to them "you have no need for those defenses, we will never attack you"—or who were too slothful, corrupted or misguided to look to their own defense.

The speech which I made in this Chamber on Monday, March 24, puts me squarely in agreement with Mr. Ayer's conclusion:

President Nixon has looked to the best advice obtainable and, acting thereon, has taken a reasoned, balanced, and courageous stand.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter by Mr. Frederick Ayer, Jr., published in the Washington Post of March 27, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

BACKING THE PRESIDENT'S ABM DECISION

As a former civilian inmate of the Pentagon for eight years as assistant for intelligence matters to a series of secretaries of the Air Force, I protest.

And, as a citizen I protest the spate of spurious logic pouring into print and inundating the airwaves on the subject of the Anti-Ballistic Missile. Setting up a Sentinel system will provoke the Russians and escalate the arms race and, likewise the presence of ABM sites will imperil the neighboring residents, furthermore, it will do no good. The scientists, the social commentators and the political hacks all say so. Therefore these things must be so.

To use a good old-fashioned epithet, balderdash! There are presently 83 reported ABM sites around Moscow alone. Has this provoked us into escalation? If missile interceptor systems are valueless, why has Russia with far less economic riches than have we wasted their substance on useless toys? Has the presence of hundreds of Nike Zeus missiles and launchers surrounding our population centers visibly endangered the residents or provoked the Soviets. The Nike Zeus has a thermonuclear warhead, but most people I know were glad to see them around—just as an honest citizen walking a darkly ominous street is cheered at the sight of an armed patrolman.

Probably one reason for the vocal distrust of the present ABM plan was the ridiculous justification given for its predecessor under the Johnson Administration—that it would

be built to counter any Chinese threat. That really was balderdash.

The Nixon-Laird Sentinel system is designed to protect our own ICBM launching sites and nothing more. And it is essential. The Russians have pinpointed our sites as we have theirs. If the Soviets know that they can knock out our retaliatory weapons on their first strike we have obviously lost all deterrent power. If they know that they cannot do so, the stalemate remains. Admittedly, the situation may reasonably be designated a balance of terror, but this is better than no balance at all.

It is obvious that with a power balance between nations, and if there be good will, negotiation is always possible and can become ever more likely. If, however, one nation holds all the cards, it can say "Now we will negotiate, but on our terms and ours alone." History has surely demonstrated that such a sentence is not unknown in the Russian lexicon. What one can wonder would have been the situation had the Soviets been successful in installing a concentration of ICBM launchers and warheads in Cuba?

Dr. Robert Oppenheimer once likened Russia and the United States, with their potentials for thermonuclear destruction, to two scorpions in a glass jar each with the power simultaneously to sting each other to death. I venture to say that if one scorpion knew that he could, with impunity, destroy the stinger of his rival he would not hesitate to strike. On the other hand, if these two scorpions were capable of reason, as we must assume Americans and Russians still are, they might become wearied of this endless confrontation of terror and agree gradually to empty their poison sacks and move around more happily in their narrow glassed-in world.

To restate the obvious but often forgotten—an anti-ballistic missile is not an offensive weapon any more than were city walls, bronze shields or drawbridges. The earth is deep with the dust of civilizations which believed when it was said to them "you have no need for those defenses, we will never attack you"—or who were too slothful, corrupted or misguided to look to their own defense.

It is my considered opinion that President Nixon has looked to the best advice obtainable and, acting thereon, has taken a reasoned, balanced, and courageous stand.

FREDERICK AYER JR.,

WASHINGTON.

PENN CENTRAL NONSTOP METROLINER SERVICE BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND NEW YORK

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the Penn Central Railroad yesterday announced that it will initiate nonstop service between Washington and New York next week utilizing the new high-speed Metroliners. The nonstop service will reduce running time between the two cities to two and a half hours.

Mr. President, this is another significant advance in providing modern and convenient high-speed ground transportation between these two major centers in the congested northeast urban complex.

It is an important addition to the existing limited Metroliner service which makes the Washington-New York run in 2 hours and 59 minutes.

I bring this development to the attention of Senators because the Metroliner demonstration is a direct product of the High Speed Ground Transporta-

tion Act which the Senate approved in 1965. I ask unanimous consent that articles, published in yesterday's Washington Star and today's Washington Post on the new nonstop service be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Metroliner service, even in its initial limited offering of two round trips a day, has been an outstanding success. The public has responded enthusiastically. The Metroliners have been running at near capacity, and because of the limited number of trains now running and the public demand for tickets, the Penn Central has placed the service on an advance-reservation basis.

The success of the Metroliner has brought with it new problems. I refer particularly to the inconveniences required in obtaining reservations. I have personally received many complaints about the problem from individuals, businessmen, and government officials who are eager to use the Metroliner service.

In the not-too-distant future, I would expect this difficulty to be largely resolved by the implementation of a full schedule of Metroliner service. When the Metroliner is running 11 round trips a day between New York and Washington, I would hope that advance reservations, at least for coach accommodations, would not be required.

In addition, I have been informed by the Penn Central that plans are underway to install in the very near future a new ticket system that will improve the handling of ticket sales and eliminate much of the inconvenience and confusion that now exists.

It is regrettable that these ticket sales problems have occurred. I take some comfort, however, in the fact that these are problems of success, and that the Penn Central has focused its attention on providing an early solution.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 27, 1969]

METROLINER'S NONSTOP RUNS DUE IN WEEK

Nonstop Metroliner train service between Washington and New York will start next Wednesday, cutting the travel time to 2½ hours and putting rail schedules for the first time into direct competition with those of the airlines.

The first nonstop trains will operate from New York to Washington in the early morning and return to New York in the late afternoon Mondays through Fridays. This will permit New Yorkers to spend a full business day in the Nation's Capital and return home the same night.

Present Metroliners, which began service Jan. 16, take 2 hours and 59 minutes and make two round trips a day with five stops. Standard trains take from 3 hours 35 minutes to 4 hours.

Alfred E. Perlman, president of the Penn Central Co., announced the new service yesterday at the railroad's Philadelphia headquarters.

"This is an important breakthrough in rail passenger transportation," Perlman said. "It is designed to provide an all-weather 'ground shuttle' that will be competitive with other modes of travel from center city to center city in this crowded corridor."

The nonstop trains will average 90.6 miles per hour for the 227-mile trip.

The new trains will leave Pennsylvania Station in New York at 7:10 a.m. and arrive at Union Station in Washington at 9:40 a.m. They will leave Washington at 4:30 p.m. and arrive at New York at 7 p.m., just 1 minute before the Metroliner that leaves Washington at 3:55.

The other existing New York-bound Metroliner leaves Washington at 8:30 a.m. The trains leave New York at 8:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1969]

METROLINER TO SLASH NEW YORK TRIP TO 2½ HOURS (By Lee Flor)

The Penn Central Railroad announced today it is adding nonstop, 2½-hour Metroliner service between New York and Washington on April 2, cutting its present fastest schedule time by 29 minutes and placing the Metroliner in direct competition with the air shuttle.

Alfred E. Perlman, the railroad president, said the special nonstop service, at the present fare, would provide "the fastest service ever to operate on the 226-mile New York to Washington route."

The new trains will leave New York at 7:10 a.m. and arrive here in Washington at 9:40 a.m. The return service will leave Washington's Union Station at 4:30 p.m. and arrive at the Penn Central station in New York at 7 p.m.

Perlman said the new service was started in prime travel time so it could be directly competitive with the air shuttle now offered by airlines between Washington and New York. The "ground shuttle" will run in all kinds of weather, from center city to center city, he noted.

ALLOCATION OF IMPORTED NO. 2 FUEL OIL TO NEW ENGLAND AND ESTABLISHMENT OF OIL REFINERY AT MACHIASPORT, MAINE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts urging the President of the United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine.

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

Resolution urging the President of United States to order an immediate increase in the discriminatory allocation of barrels of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England and to establish an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine

Whereas, The consumers of home heating oil in the Commonwealth, as well as those of the other New England states, have been discriminated against for the past decade because of stringent quotas relating to the imports of No. 2 fuel oil; and

Whereas, According to the Massachusetts Consumers' Council the consumers of Massachusetts are overcharged forty-two million dollars annually because of the imposition of such quotas under the Eisenhower Administration; and

Whereas, Said Consumers' Council and the New England Council consistently presented the facts of such discriminatory policies before the appropriate federal bodies; and

Whereas, There has been no decision to

rescind the executive order establishing such quotas; and

Whereas, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall during his term of office reportedly indicated a willingness to recommend an allocation of 30,000 barrels a day of imported No. 2 fuel oil to New England; and

Whereas, The proposed Foreign Trade Zone in Portland, Maine could help to correct the inequities occasioned by the #2 fuel oil quota discrimination, by (allowing) making available an addition 90,000 to 101,000 barrels of #2 fuel oil in New England at reduced prices; and

Whereas, The establishment and operation of an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine would relieve the shortage of #2 fuel oil for the consumers of heating oil in the Commonwealth in peak heating seasons and retard price increases of this necessity of life; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate respectfully urges President Nixon to direct the Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce to implement forthwith the Udall recommendations relative to the allocation of additional oil imports to New England; and be it further

Resolved, That the Massachusetts Senate supports the efforts of Senator Kennedy and other members of the Massachusetts Congressional delegation to gain approval of the application by the Maine Port Authority to establish, operate and maintain a general-purpose foreign trade zone in Portland, Maine and a subzone for the purpose of oil refining in Machiasport, Maine; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of State to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, March 12, 1969.

NORMAN L. PIDGEON,

Clerk.

Attest:

JOHN F. X. DAVOREN,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

FRONTIER ALASKA

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article from the February 24 U.S. News & World Report be printed in the RECORD.

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

FACTS ABOUT THE "LAST FRONTIER"

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA.—If Alaska seems to be out of step with the rest of the U.S., there is a reason.

This is America's last frontier. Its people think in the same terms as the rough-and-ready pioneers who pushed the boundaries of the U.S. westward to the Pacific Ocean by the end of the nineteenth century.

Up here, the drive is to open land for development, rather than fence it off for parks and recreation as in the "lower 48" States. That is understandable when you learn that 97 per cent of Alaska's land still is owned by the Federal Government. Most of it remains untouched by the plow, bulldozer, chain saw or drilling tool.

Though more than twice as big as Texas, Alaska has fewer highway miles than Massachusetts. Along the Alaska Railroad, which runs 481 miles from Seward to Fairbanks, live two thirds of the State's people. The pack horse and the dog sled still are common means of transportation.

ROOM FOR FREEWHEELERS

Alaska's rugged scenery, its forbidding climate and its vastness are a magnet for the frontier breed. It is the land of the free-wheeler, a term of approval in the 49th State.

Men with "git-up-and-go" are drawn here by the opportunity to branch out on their own. Up here, the fellow who is first with a new product or a new idea can make it big.

Don't be fooled by the veneer of sophistication in Alaska's cities. In Anchorage and in Fairbanks, there are posh hotels, high-rise apartment buildings, fancy supermarkets. But you don't have to go far to find the sights and hear the sounds of the frontier. Dress is casual, often rough, dictated by climate rather than fashion. Bars are crowded, noisy and sometimes disorderly.

The airplane has replaced the cow pony of the nineteenth-century West. Alaskans are the most air-minded of all Americans. They have to be, with so few highways. The State has 749 airports and seaplane facilities, a total of 4,500 licensed pilots, and nearly 3,000 aircraft—one for every 100 people.

You see small planes parked in front yards, blocks from any landing field. An Alaskan explains:

"One of the great attractions of living up here is the freedom to move about. We can jump in a plane, go where we want, and when we want, for fishing or hunting, or just to get away from the crowds."

That last is a shocker. What crowds? Anchorage, with 50,000 population, is Alaska's largest city. The people of the State, if spread out over its 586,000 square miles, would have 2 square miles apiece.

Here you can rear a family without facing problems that proliferate in cities and suburbs of the "lower 48" States. Theodore F. Stevens, one of Alaska's two new U.S. Senators, plans to have his five children go to school back home at least half the time "so they can grow up loving it as much as I do."

A 20-minute flight in a bush plane from Anchorage, says Senator Stevens, "will put you in wilderness where you probably won't see another person." After only a few weeks in Washington, he says with deep feeling:

"When you see that sun come up over the snow-capped Chugach Range on a clear winter morning, then you know what it means to be in Alaska."

THE INDIVIDUALISTS

This country draws all kinds of people. Along with the frontier builders come the misfits. "We have our share of them," says a federal official with long experience in Alaska. He adds:

"They are people who by temperament are unable to adjust to the demands of big-city life, or of the more settled community. Many of them find their place, become useful citizens. Some are crackpots, and some give us endless trouble. But they are the sure mark of the frontier."

Business—like life—tends to be free and easy. Says an Alaskan official:

"We have our so-called robber barons. They are the ones who get the things done that must be done. If these fellows were hedged in too tightly, they wouldn't stay and Alaska wouldn't be growing at the rate it is."

YOUNG AND TOUGH

Youth dominates for the most part. Median age is 23.3 years, compared to 27.7 years for the U.S. as a whole. Most of the young frontiersmen are skilled workers, lured by high wages in oil, mining, lumbering and construction.

The harsh climate, the isolation, the sometimes primitive housing send about half the immigrants back to the "lower 48."

"If you sweat it out for a year, you'll never leave, or if you do, you'll come back," says Paul Choquette, a broker in Juneau. "If the wife can last it, you've got it made."

RIDING THE BOOM

Alaska's growth in recent years has been based largely on mineral and forest development. Advances in fishing methods, however, have brought rich new fisheries in the Gulf of Alaska and Bristol Bay.

The future of the oil boom that is giving new thrust to the Alaskan economy is said by officials to depend upon opening more of the federally owned lands for leasing and drilling.

For the 800 or so men involved in the oil boom on the North Slope, cold down to minus 50 degrees is compensated by earnings of \$15,000 to \$25,000 a year. In addition the men get free room and board and transportation to and from Fairbanks for two weeks' rest after four weeks of work.

Another boom is in tourism.

"This is the most beautiful place I have ever seen," said a California businessman visiting Fairbanks. "Up here you can look as far as you can see."

Nature is on a lavish scale. In spring, there is a wild profusion of flowers. In summer daylight lasts almost 24 hours a day. For hunters and fishermen, there is every kind of quarry.

FACING THE FUTURE

Perhaps Alaska was best described by a young serviceman who chided "U.S. News & World Report" for failing to mention his home State in an article about wilderness areas. He wrote:

"I would like to say that the author of that article must be unaware that Alaska has been a part of the union since 1959. . . . Alaska is the only State left with wildlife and habitat untouched by civilization. Alaska is the next wonder of the world."

Alaskans are determined that this wondrous State is not going to be ruined by the debris of twentieth-century technology. Says Senator Stevens:

"Alaska is a land where conservation is a watchword. There is no smog and little pollution, and if humanly possible there never will be more because Alaskans know and value pure air, pure water, and virgin country."

THIS IS ALASKA: ONE-SIXTH OF THE ENTIRE UNITED STATES

Population: Smallest State. 280,000 people, or 1 person for every 2 square miles.

Largest city: Anchorage, with 50,000 people. Juneau, State capital, has 8,000 people.

Size: Largest State. 375 million acres. More than twice as big as Texas.

Airplanes: Flyingest State in the union, with 1 airplane for every 100 Alaskans.

Statehood: Became 49th State on Jan. 3, 1959.

Highest mountain: McKinley. 20,320 feet, highest peak in North America.

Coastline: 6,640 miles, or more than that of all the rest of the U.S. combined.

Railroads: Two, with 500 miles of track.

Economy: Fishing, mining, lumbering are biggest industries. Oil boom is under way. Tourist trade growing fast. Federal Government owns 97 per cent of land, but State is promised 104 million acres by 1984.

Acquired by U.S.: 1867. Bought from Russia for 7.2 million dollars, or about 2 cents an acre.

Highways: 6,042 miles. Less than Massachusetts has.

A TRIBUTE TO NORTH CAROLINA'S MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT CORP.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in carrying out our function of legislative oversight, there is a natural and proper concern—especially with respect to experimental social welfare programs—which leads us to speak largely of the failures and the debacles, leaving the successes to speak for themselves. This is much as it should be. But there are some local success stories of such far-reaching significance for the Nation at large as to mandate their telling in the national forum.

One such story has been unfolding over

the past year in my State—that is the story of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp.

MDC is a private, nonprofit corporation with a statewide board of directors elected to represent industry, the public sector, and the population to be served. Luther H. Hodges, Jr., senior vice president of North Carolina National Bank and son of the former Secretary of Commerce, serves as chairman of the board. The corporation's staff is directed by George B. Autry, formerly chief counsel for the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights.

Using both Federal and private financial support and the technical assistance of the National Association of Manufacturers, MDC is moving toward its objective of increasing productivity and improving per capita income through the fullest possible development of our State's neglected manpower resources. MDC is, in effect, working toward the establishment of the Nation's first technology-based, statewide manpower model. If this goal is reached, other models, including perhaps a national one, can be fashioned after it.

Mr. President, in order that Senators and other interested parties may acquaint themselves with the accomplishments of MDC and with the corporation's plans for the future, I ask unanimous consent that a sampling of articles and editorials dealing with the various facets of MDC's program be printed in the RECORD:

"North Carolina's Dire Waste of Manpower," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., December 1, 1967.

"Opening More Job Opportunities," from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N.C., December 11, 1967.

"NAM-OEO 'Marriage of Convenience' Bears Promise of Cure for Jobless," by Don Riding, from the Carolina Financial Times, Chapel Hill, N.C., March 18, 1968.

An editorial by C. A. McKnight, from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N.C., March 24, 1968.

"A Promising Tool Blunted by the Poverty of Policy," from the Greensboro Record, Greensboro, N.C., March 30, 1968.

"Training Key to Stemming Manpower Loss," by Luther H. Hodges, Jr., from the American Banker, May 3, 1968.

"Manpower Center Reaches Goal," by Rick Gray, from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N.C., July 11, 1968.

"Moving People to Jobs," by Charles B. Garnett, from the Employment Service Review, September 1968.

"Computer Matches Workers and Jobs," by Stacie Steele, from the Durham Morning Herald, Durham, N.C., September 10, 1968.

"To Find the Jobless, To Find the Jobs," from the North Carolina magazine, published by the North Carolina Citizens Association, November 1968.

"He 'Freshed Up' on Schooling, Got Job," by Dwayne Walls, from the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N.C., November 24, 1968.

"Manpower Project Looks at Results, They're Impressive," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., November 30, 1968.

"At MDC—Success Stories," by Owen Lewis, from the Greensboro Daily News, Greensboro, N.C., January 1, 1969.

"Labor Pool Going Dry, Hodges Says," from the Charlotte News, Charlotte, N.C., February 6, 1969.

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

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Dec. 1, 1967]

NORTH CAROLINA'S DIRE WASTE OF MANPOWER

(EDITORS' NOTE.—Following are excerpts from a speech made by Luther H. Hodges, Jr., chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation's board of directors, in Winston Salem yesterday.)

In our industrialized society with much capital going into new plants and equipment, we require an increasingly skilled manpower pool, in fact, manpower resources, in terms of availability and skill have become almost the single most important economic and industrial development ingredient.

The question, then, is whether or not, in this kind of society, our manpower is being properly developed and efficiently allocated. I would like to suggest that, not only because it is necessary, but because it is right, we must make a 180 degree turn and face the handicapped, disadvantaged, citizen of our country, and more specifically, our own state. He has been excluded, in most cases through no fault of his own, from participating in a full society, from realizing what we have come to think of as the American Dream—namely a job, decent housing, education for himself and for his children, and a place in the decision making processes which affect his life.

ARBITRARY STANDARDS

This person has been excluded from employment offices entirely on a middle-class frame of reference, by job descriptions which set arbitrary standards without regard to aptitudes and potential for training; by the economics of poverty which forces him to become a school drop-out; and by the inferiority of education offered in slum and poor rural schools.

I hope that our society has made a decision that America cannot afford the luxury of poverty in its midst and that we are moving toward what Kruger calls a policy of inclusion. I hope that what the economist Norton E. Long wrote in his monograph on the reduction of poverty isn't true. He has said, "We are in danger of drifting into cosmetic cures. We already have a model for how an affluent society might deal with surplus people the way we deal with surplus grain . . . store it and keep it off the market so it won't hurt the price. We do the same with the poor—we store them in slums and public housing to keep them off the labor market so they won't reduce wage rates or otherwise complete in the only way they can . . . the evil of this agricultural storage policy for dealing with people is not simply that of keeping needed resources from meeting human wants but that of creating traditions by which the evil multiplies rather than diminishes."

WITHIN A PROBLEM

In all of this there is a problem within a problem which cannot be ignored; namely, that of our disadvantaged minority citizens. The Negro will not live as long, be housed as well, nor earn as much as his white counterpart no matter what level he achieves. I decry the irresponsibility of those in the public eye and elsewhere who invoke convenient "whipping boys" to explain our difficult society while making no analysis of causes and no constructive suggestions for our country or our state.

What about North Carolina? What is our

situation in regard to manpower and human resource development and all the ramifications of these problems? Let me quote some statistics which I have quoted before, but which bear repeating:

Nearly a million and a half adult North Carolinians cannot read well enough to qualify for jobs paying a living wage.

One-third of our work force is below an eighth-grade level of education. Many of the persons presently employed cannot advance past entry-level jobs because of lack of education.

Diversification of industry is not proceeding as rapidly as it could because we lack a skilled manpower pool.

Past development has not benefited all North Carolina citizens equally. For example, there were 37,000 fewer jobs for non-white males in 1960 than there were in 1950.

We are 44th in per capita income and 49th for average hourly industrial wages.

LOSE FEDERAL MONEY

In spite of this situation, hardly a year goes by that we do not lose federal money allocated to this state. For example, in 1966, we failed to apply for our total guideline allocations under the Economic Opportunity Act and the Appalachia Bill.

We know that one of our major resources in North Carolina is our manpower. The problem is that we have failed to develop this valuable resource.

What is the answer to all of these problems? If there is one answer, it is jobs. Jobs to upgrade our economy, jobs to reduce the burden of the taxpayer, jobs to keep families together, jobs to provide dignity and decent standards of living. The November 20th Newsweek magazine said, "If Negroes alone among the poor had been full participants in the economy last year, the President's Council of Economic Advisors has calculated they would have added \$23.7 billion to the gross national product."

If you are poor, how do you get a job? Training—literacy training and skill training, along with essential supportive services. Who is going to attack and solve this massive problem? And why haven't we succeeded before?

AMERICAN DREAM

Dick Cornuelle, executive vice president of the National Association of Manufacturers, in his book "Reclaiming The American Dream," has two chapters entitled: "Why the Liberals Can't Win" and "Why the Conservatives Can't Win." He says, "As the conservative is losing his battle because he has no program at all, the liberal is coming to a different dead end. He finds out he can't achieve his ideal—that of a society that solves social problems—with the program he has." I would like to suggest that we discard these nomenclatures, for as applied to this problem they are unrealistic. Instead of right and left, liberal or conservative, we are either outside or inside, a participant or a spectator, and we can't afford many spectators.

No one segment of our society can solve these problems alone. The federal government, state and local governments, the whole public sector must join the private sector or else we will be licked.

INDUSTRY MOVES

Within our economy, industry can move the quickest; it is geared to pragmatic and efficient problem-solving and to getting a job done. In addition there is not only great interest on the part of industry in these problems, but characteristically, industry has already moved. You probably read in the paper a few weeks ago about Ford Motor Company's setting up two employment offices in ghetto areas in Detroit. In this experiment, seven hundred disadvantaged have been employed—without written tests. Aerojet General has a plant in Watts; and Honeywell is also ready to build in a slum area;

Corn Products has instituted inplant literacy training in locations all over the country; and Xerox is employing hard-core unemployed. Moreover some 300 insurance companies in the country have participated in a billion dollar financing program for ghetto housing. The National Association of Manufacturers, which helped start the ball rolling in this effort, has so many calls from companies asking for help in reaching the hard-core unemployed that they are unable to meet the demands.

Is all this consistent with the profit motive? Here is one quote recently reported in the press: Gerald L. Phillippe, Chairman of General Electric, said: "We have to say to our shareholders that we just have to deal with this problem, or in five or 10 years there will be nothing left."

Now, at last, we come to the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation. As a solution to the problems of our economy, this particular project is meaningless unless we are all aware of, and committed to accepting the challenges I have been discussing. This corporation was not developed to create administrative jobs or bring money into North Carolina, rather it was planned with a single goal in mind—to provide the unemployed and unemployable with jobs, and to stay with them until they are productive.

MDC'S PLAN

MDC, as I shall call our corporation, is a sophisticated program. We are contracting for a series of action-oriented studies and surveys relevant to the problems of manpower development. These studies include: Outreach techniques, supportive services, job-development, post-employment followup, a survey of North Carolina training capacity, basic education innovations—that is to say, what are the best literacy systems in existence and how is new technology being applied to this training; vocational skill training, with the same applications, economic development studies and the surveys which lead to the computer match project.

There are two current action components. First, computer match. This involves the development of a whole new system of computer technology as applied to the disadvantaged. With it we hope to match the unemployed either to training or to jobs . . .

TO STORE DATA

MDC will also use the computer to store data. For example, in addition to training available in the public sector, we will feed in data on vocational skill and on the job training available from private industry. We may use the computer for a talent bank—that is to say, to locate human resources, technical and otherwise. We may use it to match low income high school graduates to jobs or vocational training, and thus help prevent the top level youngsters in this group from searching for opportunity outside our state, as so many do now.

The second action component currently funded calls for the establishment of two Manpower Development Centers. These centers will offer basic literacy training through a system called Mind, developed by the National Association of Manufacturers. Mind uses technological equipment and programmed learning. It has been extremely successful so far, with early experiments revealing a gain of four grade levels in 180 hours . . .

PEOPLE ORIENTED

What we seek is a manpower training model which is both industry and people oriented. We think our industrialists will insure a practical problem solving approach and we are confident that our community action agency representatives will not let us forget or neglect the hard problems of the disadvantaged.

May I close with a few recommendations:
1. The industrial sector must become more

involved in solving the employment problems of the hard core poor. Industry must work with the community, as indeed it is doing right here in Winston-Salem.

2. The business community must temper its policies of excluding the disadvantaged and attempt to reach and train this population. Let us face the fact that many job standards are arbitrarily set and often bear little resemblance to the characteristics and backgrounds of persons who are successfully performing a given job.

3. There must be vigorous community leadership. Leadership which is willing to become involved in complicated social problems. Leadership which is willing to face what it finds, whether it likes it or not. This leadership must establish the fact that local control is required to effectively handle local problems.

4. Much money is required to meet our manpower development needs. We must stop fighting the federal government and become partners, for we need all its financing and then some to solve our problems. If we don't like the terms, let's have the leadership to change the terms.

5. We need a citizenry aware of our problems and willing to face them.

We must remember too that manpower and employment are not isolated problems and that we must also solve housing, race relations, health, educational and other problems.

Certainly I have not answered the questions I have raised. But for the time being my solution has to do with the effort in which I am engaged: namely, the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation. I am impressed with the commitment of our staff and of our board of directors. May I ask a similar commitment from you in your work.

In a nation where the gross national product approaches \$800 billion a year, there is little justification for the poverty and unemployment in our midst. It has been said that we in North Carolina are leading the way with our Manpower Development Corporation. Clearly it is in our own best interest to do so.

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Dec. 11, 1967]

OPENING MORE JOB OPPORTUNITIES

One of North Carolina's major resources, as long recognized, is its manpower supply. One of the state's major failures, as shown in its 44th ranking in per capita income and 49th place in average hourly industrial wages, is proper development of manpower resources.

That the state, in a several-pronged attack, is attempting to remedy the situation stands to its credit. But that progress often is slow, as the several approaches mesh gears, is apparent and understandable. The total task, in relationship to the total need, presents formidable problems.

How to speed improvements that will lead to more and better job opportunities has concerned itself, perhaps out of necessity, primarily with teaching skills to the large work force potential readily available for employment. Important as that phase is, however, it stands as only part of the total problem.

Luther H. Hodges Jr., chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation's Board of Directors, points to another vital area with his suggestion that "we must take a 180-degree turn and face the handicapped, disadvantaged citizen. He has been excluded, in most cases through no fault of his own, from participating in a full society, from realizing what we have come to think of as the American Dream—namely a job, decent housing, education for

himself and for his children, and a place in the decision making processes which affect his life."

Mr. Hodges, son of the former governor, speaks both as a business executive and as a person familiar, through personal observation, with problems in the area of concern he has cited. He, in fact, grew up with them around him when his father served as a textile executive. In later years, through association with the state's efforts to pull itself up by its own bootstraps, he has witnessed the needs of the many who have been denied, through various reasons, full opportunity to participate in the state's economic fortune.

The handicapped, disadvantaged citizen, as cited by Mr. Hodges, deserves every consideration, indeed extra effort, on the part of those who can help make him an asset instead of a liability in the economic and social community. He is, without regard to race, an important part in North Carolina's manpower potential so vital to the state's total development.

[From the Carolina Financial Times, Mar. 18, 1968]

NAM-OEO "MARRIAGE OF CONVENIENCE" BEARS PROMISE OF CURE FOR JOBLESS

(By Don Ridings)

With the Great Society's alphabet agencies almost as plentiful as Carolina basketball fans these days, it's tough coming up with an attention-getting gimmick. But a new organization with headquarters in Chapel Hill has one that just might succeed.

MDC—that stands for Manpower Development Corporation—is hard to miss because of an unlikely parentage: the National Association of Manufacturers and the Office of Economic Opportunity—what MDC Executive Director George B. Autry referred to in a Sea Island, Ga., speech recently as a "marriage of convenience," as well as a "marriage of logic."

As Autry sees it, the well-publicized differences of style between NAM and OEO have obscured some fundamental agreements concerning ends: productive people filling productive jobs.

MDC's corporate charge is broad enough to encompass both the poverty-fighters and the businessmen: "To plan and implement a comprehensive manpower development program for North Carolina. To experiment with and develop new systems for job training, job placement, and job upgrading . . . To carry on activities of whatever nature which have as their objective the improvement of economic and social conditions in North Carolina, including conditions of employment of persons employed in North Carolina."

Any mandate that large, of course, is easier to recite than to implement, and it is the implementation—or program development—that MDC is busily concerned with now.

MDC was incorporated in August, 1967, but Autry didn't leave his job as chief counsel and staff director of the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights until December, and the last of four directors working under Autry arrived only this month.

So the homework that has piled up on MDC desks—in the form of various consultants' studies—was assigned before the current MDC staff came on the scene. The North Carolina Fund, which through Director George Esser was instrumental in interesting NAM in the state manpower program, contracted for the studies.

The last director to join the staff, former Associate Editor Bob Smith of the Charlotte News, is responsible for developing programs with the help of the studies and is in the process of reviewing the early arrivals.

Originally, 15 studies were scheduled. These were reduced to nine, the general purposes of which are to reveal ways of finding people who need jobs and training, finding jobs

that need employees, giving skills and basic literacy training to the unskilled and developing basic facilities (such as transportation and housing) needed by the unskilled, and matching the jobs and the people.

More specifically, the studies break down this way:

Outreach techniques: ways of reaching and motivating the poor so as to attract them into manpower development programs and give them the attitude of success.

Job development (computer match): relating job vacancies to job potentials by use of computer techniques to determine what kind of training and upgrading to provide.

Supportive services: studying what sort of services must be supplied to make it possible for poor rural-oriented people to make the transition to an urban job market. One particular phase of the study will concentrate on experimental uses of transportation.

Basic education-skill training: how to tie literacy and skill training to the needs of the state's poor and the manpower demands of the state's industry.

Job development: ways of opening new avenues to employment for the poor through identification of the real job potential in the state and encouragement of industry to report vacancies and restructure qualifications.

New careers: studying the actual and potential effect of developing new careers on the employment of the poor. For example, such career opportunities as police patrolman assistant and caseworker aide are being studied.

Housing: ways of making low-income housing available to the poor being brought into job areas, including an effort to tie training to housing by providing a would-be worker on-the-job training in constructing homes for himself and his fellow workers.

Planning, Programming, Budgeting System (PPBS): how to modify these techniques (made famous by former Secretary McNamara at the Department of Defense) to MDC's needs in providing precise information on educational and training costs and thereby alternatives and their costs.

Survey of industrial training capacity: an in-depth study of what capacity now exists in North Carolina, actual and potential, for training the unemployed and underemployed. This includes both public and private.

Using the studies as a starting point, Smith hopes MDC can build a program that will "get the most out of the people and out of industry," as well as out of public agencies at all levels. He doesn't see MDC as a "super coordinator"—it has no legal authority—but as a method of generalizing methods that can be exported to other states.

In Smith's view, MDC should concern itself not only with training people for existing jobs, but for jobs not yet available—"but within practical limits, something that can be put to use."

One aspect of this approach is the new careers study described above, which will attempt to define new sub-professional jobs that now sometimes occupy the time of high-priced personnel with time-consuming detail work.

What has just been described is the broad framework for MDC, which mostly is in the study and development phase.

But there is something "on the ground" already: the first of two experimental manpower development centers, located in Greensboro, turns out its first "graduates" on the last day of this month. With the active participation of industry representatives and the backing of Greensboro Mayor Carson Bain, the center enrolled 70 people for the 10-week cycle.

The primary purpose of the cram course is to prepare "entry-level" people—that's the jargon for unskilled workers—for jobs by moving them up four grade levels in 10

weeks and acclimating them to the industrial job environment.

Day-class students spend four hours a day on literacy training and two hours on "H.R.D."—human resources development. This last piece of jargon refers to an effort to inject into people a worker's attitude: the importance of being at work on time, how to deal with personnel people and supervisors, etc.

Autry spoke of the manpower development center idea in that Sea Island speech:

"They will teach the functionally illiterate to read and write, not how to read sonnets or write plays . . . but that level of literacy only which is necessary to get and hold a job.

"They will teach country people who want to work in the city how to live in the city and how to do a new kind of job.

"This concept is not theoretical, but practical. . . . It has been worked out by private industry. . . . The literacy program was developed not by some English department trying to create Shakespearean scholars, but by the National Association of Manufacturers."

Night-class students, many of whom work during the day, spend two hours on literacy, one on H.R.D.

The day students get a weekly stipend of \$20, the night students \$10.

Greensboro's training program doesn't have a skill component. Industry personnel representatives, who will interview the students during the last days of the cycle, say they will provide their own skill training.

MDC's computer match program also will be tested in Greensboro, in conjunction with the manpower development center.

A second experimental center for Eastern North Carolina currently is being planned by MDC.

The people around MDC seem to think that an effective manpower development program is a continuing thing, which has to adapt to changing economic conditions, technology and the life—a job of continuous fitting, involving all levels of public agencies, as well as the private sector.

Funding being what it is, however, MDC's existence presently is guaranteed only through December, 1968. The money comes from OEO (\$1.182 million), the North Carolina Fund (\$73,000), and the Department of Labor (\$892,000). That last item is to finance the mobility program, which MDC expects to pick up from the North Carolina Fund. This has been an effort to transplant workers from job-short Eastern North Carolina to job-plentiful Piedmont North Carolina.

MDC came about because of the state's well-publicized position near the bottom of the nation in per capita income, industrial wages, and disturbing above-the-national-average unemployment and underemployment rates. Much of the impetus for the creation of the agency came from a North Carolina Fund Report, "The State We're In," published in June, 1967, which focused on these economic conditions.

Autry himself, who at 30 held an enviable position as well as respect in the U.S. Senate, said in an interview last fall that correcting this situation "was so important" that he had decided to leave Washington and return to his native state as executive director of MDC.

After graduating from Duke University Law School in 1961, Autry had gone to Washington as a Richardson Foundation Congressional Fellow and was assigned to the office of N.C. Sen. Sam J. Ervin, Jr.

When he left Washington late last year, it was as chief counsel and staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. He trailed elaborate praise from his former boss, Sen. Edwin, tribute in the Congressional Record from other senators, and complimentary press reports.

Autry's boss MDC's Board of Directors, is

heavily larded with businessmen, including Chairman Luther Hodges, Jr., as well as such people as educators representatives of other agencies, and the state NAACP president. This composition reflects what NAM Vice President A. Wright Elliott said in a Chapel Hill speech in January should be the stance of MDC: "We . . . envision the MDC as an effective interface between the public and private sectors, thereby enabling them to work together toward a goal desirable for both."

"Interface," of course, is another bit of jargon that means close-fitting coordination. It recalls President Johnson's first references to "creative federalism," when he talked about increasing private involvement in "public" matters—such as manpower development.

All of which demonstrates that even if the NAM-OEO marriages at MDC came as a surprise to some—it was only after a proper courtship.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer,
Mar. 28, 1968]

(By C. A. McKnight, editor)

I have been listening attentively but I have yet to hear our candidates for state offices speak out on one of the most urgent and distressing problems of the day, i.e., the nature and extent of rural poverty in North Carolina.

I made mention recently of the "scores of thousands of eastern North Carolina Negroes who will lose their jobs in the next five years through the mechanization of tobacco growing."

I also found fault with the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders because it looked only at the nation's urban ghettos and ignored the rural impoverishment and despair that forced the migration of poor whites and Negroes to congested urban areas.

Bob Smith, who recently left the associate editorship of The Charlotte News to join the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation, points out that the Johnson administration also doesn't seem to understand the nature of our manpower problem and the underlying cause of urban riots.

Smith notes that the President's manpower message of January 23 put all its emphasis on attacking unemployment in the big cities.

"Not many reporters picked this up, but while the administration took on the unemployment problems of 45 of the biggest cities it dropped plans to conduct two rural unemployment programs. . . . In brief, by setting up the National Alliance of Businessmen, the administration opted for \$350 million for urban unemployment and not a cent for rural unemployment."

FROM POVERTY TO POVERTY

"You know where those angry people in the cities came from and so do I," Smith writes.

"They came from deprived mountain-locked Appalachia and tobacco-poor towns like the one I saw in the course of a recent day's visit with as much bedrock poverty as I ever care to see in one place.

"Whites, Negroes, Indians—they are all out there waiting for farm mechanization to strip them of their last feeble excuse for staying. And they are leaving without skills, without realizable hope, with the blind unreason of a man sure that things can be no worse where he is going. Three hundred thousand North Carolinians got on that northern migration route in the 1950's, and we understand the half of those left on the farms may be off in the next five years.

"If they follow mindlessly the old migration pattern it will be in part because we as a nation helped convince them that jobs would be there. But it is precisely because jobs aren't there and the welfare rolls are swollen that trouble plagues these cities.

"So North Carolina's manpower oozes away and so the ghettos bloat and the thermostat rises and pretty soon some other President has to come up with an even bigger and more expensive program for employment in the poor, sick, big cities. Can this be sound national policy?"

MODEL MANPOWER PROGRAM

Smith's Manpower Development Corporation was spun off by the North Carolina Fund, which pioneered several experimental manpower programs in this state. The Fund is to end its five-year existence in October and its directors saw a need for a continuing manpower program.

Like the Fund, MDC sees North Carolina as America in miniscule. Our state has shrinking manpower needs in rural areas and small towns and growing manpower needs in urban centers, thus duplicating the national pattern.

Is it possible to establish a model manpower program for North Carolina that will be useful in developing the national policy of the future?

And in lieu of such a national policy, which would either make it possible for Americans to remain in rural areas or at least give them employable skills to take with them in the cities, is it possible to put out the fires that smolder in the ghettos, ready to be fanned into hot blazes?

In sum, if MDC, in Smith's words, "can demonstrate how a semi-literate, marginally productive tobacco farmer in Robeson County can become a skilled manufacturing worker in Fayetteville, the worker profits, industry profits, and we all have a national manpower model that just might work."

ONE OF THE GUT ISSUES

I don't want to hit this subject so frequently that you readers become bored with it, but I feel very strongly that rural poverty is one of the gut issues in North Carolina today.

I believe that the people of North Carolina ought to know more about the nature and extent of rural poverty.

I believe, also, that the State of North Carolina ought to involve itself deeply in a program to improve income and living conditions in our rural areas, instead of standing by while our undereducated, undertrained, underskilled rural residents pack their belongings and head toward an even more dismal fate in the Urban ghettos.

To that end, The Observer is making its own study of rural poverty in this state. The undertaking is complex and time-consuming but the results, I am quite confident, will shock the people of our state.

I hope they will also prompt candidates for state office to stop uttering banalities and address themselves to one of the basic issues of our day.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Record, Mar. 30, 1968]

A PROMISING TOOL BLUNTED BY THE POVERTY OF POLICY

It must have been with feelings mixed of "amen" and "so what?" that leaders of North Carolina's Manpower Development Corporation received the vice president's Thursday message.

Hubert Humphrey came to the state to shore up the farm vote for his superior. As is his custom, he said things both wise and true. He spoke primarily to the businessman farmer handicapped at the marketplace—the one able to sell products and buy supplies.

He also had something to say about a problem which weighs more heavily on that farmer's laborer than on that farmer.

Rural poverty has led to much of the poverty in city slums, said the vice president. "Rural trouble means city trouble. And, until rural America—all of it—becomes a re-

warding and inviting place to live, until we can make rural America worthy of America, we will be that much further from stopping the costly human and material waste in our cities today."

ACCURATE BUT OLD

The problems of deprivation in the countryside and rebellion in the cities are one. Mr. Humphrey accurately stated an issue; he did not define a new one.

Last October, President Johnson acknowledged it with the announcement of a test program to develop job opportunities for the hard-core unemployed. Initially, he said, \$40 million would be used to work with industry in salvaging the jobless who in hopelessness flee farms and choke cities. The experiments, he said, would be concentrated in five cities and in several centers of rural growth.

The secretary of commerce dutifully mailed out notices of the breakthrough. One went to the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation whose assignment it is to learn how a state can refine and use "the precious raw resource of its working people."

By January 23, the lessons of a cataclysmic summer having been more fully digested, the President turned again to the issue. Giving it place of highest priority after his State of the Union address, he delivered to the Congress his manpower message.

The sights, said he, were being raised. The objective was to prepare 100,000 men and women for jobs by June, 1969, and 500,000 by June, 1971. A National Alliance of Businessmen, headed by Henry Ford II, would direct the effort in the nation's 50 largest cities. The outlay would be \$350 million.

It was an assignment no more challenging than essential. It was a plan rooted less in Christian charity than in sound economics. It was also too little.

There was no call to expand the attack on rural seedbeds of poverty. There was no mention of rural centers promised in October.

The omission, MDC officials are by now convinced, was not one of oversight. The January goals have superseded those of October; the administration has made its choice—\$350 million to allay the cities' fever, nothing to treat the rural virus.

A director, sending up distress signals, judges that we are "missing a critical turn nationally in understanding the nature of our manpower problem and the underlying causes of urban riots". Subsequent to the President's restrictive message, he notes, the Civil Disorders Commission—for all its perceptive analysis of the dilemma—disclosed scant comprehension of "where all those angry people in the cities came from."

MDC—working in a state which sent 300,000 out on the trail north in the 1950s—believes it knows. And, it discerns, as many as half of those left on Tar Heel farms may depart in the next five years.

Ruefully contemplating a continuing flight to the urban ghettos, a director writes:

"They came from deprived, mountain-locked Appalachian and tobacco-poor towns like Lumberton where I saw in the course of a recent day's visit as much bedrock poverty as I ever care to see in one place. White, Negroes, Indians—they are all out there waiting for farm mechanization to strip them of their last feeble excuse for staying. And they are leaving without skills, without realizable hope, with the blind unreason of a man sure that things can be no worse where he is going.

"With shrinking manpower needs in farm and small town and expanding needs in cities, North Carolina is America in miniscule. If we can't keep our potential work force or at least give them skills to take away with them, no fire extinguisher program will be big enough to save the woes that will be heaped on the cities. And if it comes to fire

extinguishers all round, we shall probably need some right here in North Carolina where it is surely not lost on the poor that they lack a fire visible from Washington."

MDC'S STAKE

MDC is not merely concerned with principle wounded. It has a very real stake in challenge denied.

Its leaders—and they are men of vision and substance—believe that North Carolina is the ideal state for a test battle with rural unemployment and that their organization is ideally equipped to conduct it. They want to "demonstrate how a semi-literate, marginally productive tobacco farmer in Robeson County can become a skilled manufacturing worker in Fayetteville." They want to show that industry profits as worker profits. They want to provide for the nation a "manpower model that just might work."

In competition with the clamor from the cities—and that clamor must be heeded—their's is a small voice, of course. But reinforced by those of all who know treatment of a disease requires more than a soothing of symptoms that voice can carry to the White House and to the Congress.

We hope Mr. Humphrey hears it and moves to undergird with substance some persuasive ideals. We hope Mr. Johnson hears and applies the economy of foresight in healing the cities. We hope MDC gets the chance to prove its point. It is the best chance not alone for the Robeson sharecropper but for all of us.

[From the American Banker, May 3, 1968]

AMERICAN BANKERS TRAINING KEY TO STEMMING MANPOWER LOSS

(By Luther H. Hodges, Jr., senior vice president, North Carolina National Bank, Charlotte, and chairman, North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., Chapel Hill)

While other states try to lure industry inside their borders with promises of sunny economic skies, North Carolina is turning, through the auspices of a unique organization, to a comprehensive program for developing a trained manpower pool.

The North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. is unique in having sprung from an unusual parentage—the National Association of Manufacturers and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

For the first time businessmen and poverty fighters have united under one corporate charge to plan and implement a comprehensive manpower development program on a state-wide basis.

In North Carolina, manpower resources have become the single most important ingredient of economic and industrial development. MDC proposes to refine and replenish the supply of this ingredient with training.

By demonstrating that North Carolina can meet the manpower needs of presently existing industries, the state hopes to increase its attraction for out-of-state industry. Only through the combined efforts of industry, government, and the affected communities can this program succeed.

North Carolina, like most southern states, is in a period of transition. We are experiencing the pains as well as the rewards of industrialization. Three million of our five million people still live in rural settings. Many of these people have become victims rather than beneficiaries of industrial development. Mechanization has stripped them of their only livelihood—farming.

In the 1950s, 155,000 farm workers fled unproductive rural life for northern urban centers. Impending tobacco mechanization has spurred dire predictions for the future—80,000 farmers in North Carolina may be displaced in the next five years. Many of them will follow ancient migration patterns to northern ghettos.

Meanwhile North Carolina loses manpower very crucial to its industrial development. North Carolina is a state industrially on the go. In the 10-year period 1958-1967, investments for new and expanding industry totaled \$3.75 billion, more than any other state in the South. Industrial expansion in 1967 alone created jobs for 24,774 people.

Employers are frantic for competent help, yet thousands of workers leave the state for jobs that prove to be merely mirages on the northern landscape. The economic future of this state depends on its ability to stop wasting this manpower.

The North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. is initiating innovative methods to treat the ills of both the employer and the unemployed. The manpower development process is alive, but none too well, in this state. There are people and there are jobs, but in far too many cases the twin never meet.

MDC has to first answer these questions: What are the gaps in the present manpower process and how can we plug them? MDC is pinpointing the gaps, a few of which are locating and effectively contacting the hard-core poor, coordinating the efforts of supportive services, providing training (pre-vocational and skill), promoting nondiscriminatory hiring practices, and developing jobs and placement on a man-to-job match basis.

To plug these gaps, MDC has contracted a series of action-oriented studies:

Outreach to discover techniques to contact and motivate the poor; job development, a computer match of job potential to job vacancies; supportive services, especially in the areas of transportation and housing; basic education and skill training, applying new technology; a planning, programming, budgeting system to provide precise information about education and training costs; a survey of industrial training capacity; the development of new careers; post-employment follow-up, and techniques for promoting nondiscriminatory practices.

The results of these studies, many of which are near completion, should place MDC in a strategic position to remedy the manpower problems of North Carolina.

The initial program of MDC also calls for two pilot demonstration projects: the computer job match and two manpower development centers.

The job match project uses computer science technology to match specific factors about people to specified requirements of jobs or job-training. For the purpose of demonstration, this system will operate on a small scale, but is capable of expanding to serve the entire state.

The computer data system will resolve optimally the geographical imbalance of people and jobs. Piedmont industries will be supplied with a data pool of men and their job potential from all over the state.

Relocating industries will be able to obtain valid information about labor supply and demand in an area in question.

The computer shows additional promise for the corporation; it will be used to mobilize other necessary resources, supportive services for instance. It may also help place low-income high school graduates in vocational training or on jobs, or place college graduates of minority groups in high-level jobs, thus curbing the "brain drain" that this state suffers through the loss of talented citizens who seek out-of-state employment.

The second pilot project calls for the establishment of two manpower development training centers. These centers apply a new system of teaching basic literacy.

This system, called "MIND," developed by the National Association of Manufacturers, utilizes technological equipment and programmed instruction. It has a reputation of high success in upgrading the target population.

A human resource development component accompanies classroom work at the center. An experienced instructor leads sessions of sensitivity training in an effort to change attitudes and create self-esteem.

The importance of good employee-employer relations is stressed, as well as personal hygiene, punctuality, and overall conscientiousness. Human resources development, it is felt, contributes significantly toward the development of a productive worker.

The first training center, established in Guilford County of the Piedmont, has completed its first cycle. It graduated 57 trainees. Basic education test results show that average class improvement was as high as a 2.1 grade level increase in some cases.

Apathy, muteness and fear marked the general trainee attitudes at the beginning of the cycle. By the end, these had been displaced by confidence and assuredness reflected in the increased trainee involvement in center activities. The majority of these trainees have been placed on jobs or in advanced training, or have appointments pending.

The second center will be located in the eastern part of the state. These two centers, it is hoped, will demonstrate the need for a rapid establishment of a network of centers to serve all parts of the state.

The MDC centers so envisioned would be sophisticated operations capable of supplying flexible training to meet specific manpower needs. Newly trained rural farmers in the East would be able to find productive employment in their home state. Small businesses would surely benefit, since they cannot afford to do their own training. They must count on outside services, and in North Carolina, that service will be the Manpower Development Corp.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News,
July 11, 1968]

FACILITY UNIQUE IN STATE: MANPOWER CENTER
REACHES GOAL
(By Rick Gray)

The object of the Manpower Development Center in Greensboro is to train people to get jobs, and after the first cycle of classes, the center has obtained its objective.

The center, the only such center in the state and one of eight in the nation, graduated 57 trainees from its first 10-week program and placed 52 of those graduates in jobs. Of the five that were not placed in jobs, two left town and three are pregnant.

"The purpose of the center," says Training Director Al Varn, "is to train people so that they can either get jobs or progress in jobs they already have."

The 57 who graduated in March were all but 18 who began the first cycle of classes in January. Of the 18 who did not complete the program, according to Al Boyles, director of the center, five found jobs before the program was completed, four had family problems, three had illnesses which caused them to miss more than a tenth of the program, three moved out of town and three dropped out for miscellaneous reasons.

The average wage of the graduating class, according to Boyles is \$1.65 per hour (five cents an hour above the minimum), but some of the new workers are earning as high as \$2.50 per hour. The average weekly income is \$66.

If the graduates earn the national annual wage, Boyles says, the class will earn over \$170,000 per year, pay a total of \$16,000 in federal income taxes, pay over \$2,800 in state income taxes and approximately \$4,000 in sales taxes.

These payments by the graduating class would give the equivalent of a 25 per cent annual return on the costs of the school expended by the Office of Economic Opportunity, according to Varn.

"After four years (with total employment of the class) it's all free," he says.

When the graduates of this first class began the program, most were unemployed; however, a majority of the 44 women in the group had, at one time or another, Boyles says, been employed as domestic help, earning \$25-30 a week.

The training program concentrates on basic education and motivation training, Varn says. The trainees are tested for placement level when they begin classes, and they are then placed in individual education programs.

Varn stresses that advancement is on an individual basis with no competition for grades or the like among trainees. Educational programs include math, reading and English training.

The math program, for example, begins with elementary addition, subtraction, multiplication and division. The upper level combines these four processes into more difficult problems: "Twenty-seven divided by nine plus two times five plus seven divided by four minus seven plus nine. Write your answer."

In the motivation training, Varn says, "We use role-playing situations that enable the trainees to see both sides of the fence."

"In our civics class, for example, we pick out someone who says that the mayor has an easy job and let him be the mayor. Then we confront him with two people—one representing churches and the other grocers. Then, after listening to both representatives present their views on blue laws, he has to decide which would be best for the city."

"Sometimes the trainee will go through the rest of the day thinking about whether he did the right thing."

And that, Varn says, is the point of the motivation training—to get the trainees to think and to see both sides of a question.

The center uses tape recordings and video tapes of classroom proceedings to allow the trainees to see themselves as a personnel manager would, and then as a class they criticize the way that classmates play their roles.

"We try to show them that the man interviewing them has to hire qualified personnel to keep his own job," Varn says.

He concludes that when the trainees realize that the personnel manager is trying to keep his own job, they are motivated to prove that they are qualified so that they can get, and keep, the job.

[From the Employment Service Review,
September 1968]

A NORTH CAROLINA STUDY: MOVING PEOPLE
TO JOBS

(By Charles B. Garnett)

In an economy capable of sustaining high employment, how can we assure every American who is willing and able to work the right to earn a good living?

This is an era of prosperity and affluence for this Nation, yet there are many Americans for whom the right to earn a living has never been a reality.

There may be jobs available which require specific skills or training, but for the man who lacks those skills or that training they mean nothing. Those jobs may be in certain places, but for the man who isn't there and does not have the know-how or the means to get there, the "right to earn a living" does not exist.

This article is concerned with the man who isn't there. It deals with a group of jobless people—rural people—whose opportunity for employment was lost as mechanization and modern technology replaced manpower in agricultural production. It is about rural areas of one State where few, if any, nonagricultural jobs can be found.

It is a story about an experimental and demonstration project, financed by the U.S. Department of Labor, designed to find out if moving people to places where there are jobs is feasible. It is based on a monograph prepared by the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., to describe a mobility project it is conducting.¹

There are, in North Carolina, a great many people for whom society has not made a place. These are the people who have been displaced by mechanization or for whom there has never been a solid place in society. Among them are Negroes, Caucasians, and Indians, and they have one common bond—a great need of help in the solution of their economic problems.

The basic concept of mobility is to identify and recruit individuals from an area which offers them little or nothing and to place them in an area which can provide them with a new chance in life. This does not involve a mass movement of persons from one area to another, but rather a selective movement based on natural migratory patterns from rural to urban areas which will afford the people concerned the opportunity to become productive, self-sustaining citizens.

This effort is designed to equip a man and his family with the tools they need to effect that change. The objective of the person to be relocated is to find a job which means survival for himself and his family. Mobility provides him with help in securing the job, financial aid while looking for the job, assistance in locating a house that will afford him more than minimum shelter, and counseling.

To find a job in an urban environment is not exceedingly difficult—to keep it is. Finding a house to live in is not the biggest problem—adapting to a new type of living is. The purpose of the mobility project is to offer the many supportive services necessary to equip the family to make the adjustments. The accomplishment of that task requires extensive counsel through every step of the mobility process.

Counseling begins in the recruiting or supply area, where the counselor must determine the problems and prepare the person to be relocated for the transition to city life. Here he learns about the goals of the project and what it can mean to him.

Not every applicant will move; some are skeptical, some are apathetic, some will be eager to move, and still others will require a great deal of convincing.

THE NUMBERS INVOLVED

The many problems which are encountered during the convincing period can be best illustrated by citing the number of persons involved. In the areas of North Carolina covered in the report (Oct. 1, 1967, through Mar. 31, 1968) some 2,310 people were identified and contacted. Among those, 1,061 were found to be initially eligible for mobility services. Some 224 of those eligible actually were referred to specific out-of-area jobs and 190 individuals and their families were relocated.

It is obvious from the original number of persons contacted that time alone would prohibit too much concentration on the unconvincing, since available funds necessarily limit the number of counselors. Yet each of the individuals must be given the opportunity for participation.

Counselors must use many different approaches in the convincing process, including a full discussion of the benefits mobility will offer. For some people, a visit to the demand area is necessary. For others, supportive services from existing agencies are

required to help with social, physical, economic, or psychological problems. In this particular mobility project, all of those initially eligible received some service from the counselors.

Family ties often make people hesitant to move. In such a situation the counselor must make every effort to move several members of a family to the new location, or to move people to a place where there will be someone they know. An additional incentive for those who are reluctant to leave their families is the fact that assistance will be offered to get the family back together again once the move has been accomplished.

Some persons may have prison records or be on probation. In themselves, these are not disqualifying factors but do require more concerted effort on the part of a counselor. Because of legal considerations, the applicant must have permission from his probation or parole officer before he is able to move. If permission is granted, the whereabouts and the employer of the parolee must be reported to the responsible officer.

In addition, many seemingly trivial duties must be performed by counselors—checking on or helping to secure draft status or social security cards, and school records for children. As unimportant as those tasks may seem, they may make the difference between success and failure of the mobility program.

Many times, in his eagerness for a job, the applicant will insist that he is 1-Y or 4-F; that he has completed his military service; or that he has a social security number. A check of the facts may disclose that he is not registered at all or that his draft status is not updated. Upon the applicant's arrival in a demand area, employers request registration cards, discharge papers, and other documents. If they are not available, it is difficult to place the job seeker. Long delays are encountered in obtaining the papers. Therefore, the work should be completed before the individual leaves the supply area.

Once the decision to relocate has been made, the second step in the mobility process begins—preparation for the move. Again there is a great need for counseling and assistance.

The rural poor do not have the conveniences available in the urban area, nor do they even have most of the necessities. They have not been concerned with the social amenities which exist in urban situations. They are primarily concerned with getting a job and "doing better," but they must be made aware of the differences in attitude and of the style of life in the city.

Counselors are often faced with a fear, a negativism that has been inculcated since birth which must be overcome. Although the workers may have had earnings far below the poverty level, and perhaps been allowed to rent cheaply or live rent-free in a substandard shack, loyalties to landlords or employers may be strong. Counselors are frequently told that "He promised me it would be better this year; besides, he's been good to me and mine." Tactful counsel is required to change this attitude of acceptance and defeat and to prepare the individual for a new way of life.

As the person leaves his home area, he becomes more reliant upon the counselor. More often than not, he has never been to the big city. He often leaves his old home with the deep and abiding fear that his family will not be provided for adequately. Although this wrenching away from the loved ones is only temporary, it is a traumatic situation for many. This is a critical stage in the mobility process, for it is a period of transition from the known to the unknown.

Success or failure at this point is dependent upon how effectively the previous counselors have instilled confidence in the individuals concerned. While it is a time of

greater reliance upon counsel, the individual is now asked to transfer both faith and trust to a strange counselor. The newcomer brings with him largely unknown problems which must be met with the greatest tact and diplomacy on the part of the new counselor.

The person who has just moved to a new area is in the kind of place that he may have seen only in pictures before. He seeks a familiar face or just a familiar expression. He must be given a painstakingly detailed orientation period, yet he cannot be treated like a child. He needs and deserves the dignity afforded to all men, yet he must learn certain rudimentary things that are second nature to most urban children.

He may have been told about flush toilets, but many rural people have never used one, or in some cases, have never seen one. Simple tasks that many take for granted can be new and frightening experiences for the uninitiated.

The counselor must now attempt to reach a common ground of understanding with the new arrival in order to acclimate him to the total urban situation. This covers a broad spectrum ranging from the advantages and disadvantages of urban living to demands made upon workers by industrial employers.

The relocated worker is generally unaware of the demands that industry will make of him. He is used to the relatively bucolic existence of rural areas. He does not recognize the 8-hour day or the necessity for working on designated days. If the sun shines he feels it is a workday, and if it rains he considers it an automatic day off. It is as simple as that. He cannot comprehend the close working relationships that exist; he is not used to being told what to do in every step. He does not understand industry, and industry does not understand him.

All areas of living must be covered by the counselor. How to budget for the higher cost of living in the city and knowledge of the transportation and communication systems of the city must be passed on. It is not unusual to find newcomers who do not know the basic "niceties" of urban living—garbage pickup is often an unheard of thing. Old habits are hard to break, yet they must be broken.

As the newcomer is taught to participate in the system, he will be made aware of what the system can do for him. If he is in need, he should be able to draw upon the system for aid. He is mostly unaware of such things as police, fire, and medical services, and it is often difficult for him to comprehend them.

Then there are the necessary preparations for the future in the job itself. Education and training are things about which he has little or no understanding, nor will he participate in such programs unless they are prerequisites for his job. Since he feels that a job meets all his needs, he has little concern for the future. He has been in want for so long that the needs of the present are paramount and he tends to answer only them.

A motivational process must start with the counselor and culminate with the relocated worker. It is a slow, tedious, wearing-away type of situation that is slow in showing results. It is not an integral part of the mobility program; nonetheless, it is a necessity for the long-term betterment of the man and the program.

Up to this point, discussion has centered primarily on the counseling needs of the individual worker. Next must come consideration of the needs of his family. Before they can join him in his new location he must have a job and a place for them to live. Once he has been assisted in reaching those goals, attention must be turned to assisting him in bringing his family to the city. Once again intensive counseling is needed.

This aid to the family can take many forms, from actual shopping trips to infor-

¹ Copies of pamphlet titled "Mobility" can be obtained by writing North Carolina Manpower Development Corp., Post Office Box 435, Durham, N.C. 27702.

mation on how to use supportive services available in the city from other agencies. Selecting what and where to buy are important items to the family, but not everyone is amenable to suggestions. Buying is a personal thing and each person acts or reacts in a different manner. Some reject any advice. They feel that a few extra dollars can buy the world, and they make every attempt to do so. They soon are disillusioned and many become the target of a stream of bill collectors. That situation calls for a new type of counseling if serious trouble is to be avoided.

The children of the families involved also present counseling demands. Among the 190 relocated families in the mobility project under discussion, 43 had school-age children. The parents were assisted in getting these youngsters enrolled in appropriate schools and advised of the other requirements that must be met in an urban area.

In many rural areas, children frequently take "crop vacations"—time out from school to help tend and harvest the crops. In some isolated areas, absences from school often do not warrant the attention of the truant officer. Regular attendance must be encouraged in the new situation. In the city imposition of penalties for unexcused absences and the ultimate threat of court action are real possibilities.

CARE OF CHILDREN

Many relocated families have little conception of how children should be cared for in an urban environment. In the country, a child is not in much danger of being hit by a car on a busy street. A child in the country is not much of an annoyance to neighbors, for there are few neighbors. In the city there are many busy streets and many other dangers, and children can easily be an annoyance to the many nearby residents. In some instances, those neighbors may be able to turn to the law for recourse to children's activities.

Mention of court action and laws brings up another task for the counselor. Although he must refrain from interfering with any due process of law or with law officers in the conduct of their duty, he does have the responsibility of advising the family as to how and where they can receive legal assistance to protect their rights.

There are countless other tasks which fall into the category of counseling. All are important, but there are far too many to be listed here. Each situation demands particular action on the part of the responsible counselor. There has been a measure of success in the North Carolina experimental mobility project, certainly enough to demonstrate that mobility may be one of the answers to how some disadvantaged Americans can be assured the "right to earn a living."

[From the Durham (N.C.) Morning Herald, Sept. 10, 1968]

COMPUTER MATCHES WORKERS AND JOBS (By Stacie Steele)

CHAPEL HILL.—A uniquely advanced computer match program has been developed by the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. as part of an effort to devise a high-speed system to pinpoint by computer potential workers across the state and match them with jobs available to them.

George Autry, director of the corporation, said objectives of the organization are to "increase productivity and improve per capita income through the fullest possible development of the state's manpower resources."

The computer match project is still in the experimental stages and is being funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

A computer demonstration using live data acquired during a pilot installation in Greensboro will be conducted here Wednesday for Republican presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon.

In the Greensboro installation approximately 300 hardcore unemployed people were matched by computer for job opportunities in the area.

Erwin M. Danziger, director of administrative data processing at the University of North Carolina, is acting as consultant to Manpower Development Corp. Working with him is Leonard Stroebel, manager of systems, software and scientific programming at UNC.

Danziger, who says that the program here is unique because "we have reached a more advanced stage in the use of modern technology, the computer, in attempting to match jobs and the unemployed," stresses that the most important part of the total project is outreach.

"I think we ought to place the greatest emphasis of the program, not on the computer match portion," Danziger said, "but rather on getting the unemployed, making them aware of job opportunities, and getting them to fill out information about themselves on forms which can then be key-punched and put into the computer system."

The most difficult part of the project, Danziger said, "is finding the practically unlocatable people, the underemployed and unemployed, and once having the computer assist in matching these individuals to job requests which are provided by North Carolina industry, helping them to move to a job which may have been offered to him, getting him oriented to a new work situation and keeping him on that job."

Practical difficulties present themselves in attempting to do these things, Danziger said, because of the lack of the preparedness of the unemployed.

"Many of our unemployed in North Carolina are not in a position to accept jobs because they simply do not know in large cities how to use a bus system, what to wear to go to a job or how to use a telephone."

Stroebel, working with Danziger on the project, sees a wide range of uses for the experiment.

"The real potential of this system lies not only in matching people to jobs," Stroebel said, "but in utilizing the wealth of information gathered by the outreach people to do correlation studies on skills and interests of the hard core unemployed people, and perhaps determining some factors for motivating them so that they may become better equipped to handle life, and to contribute somewhat more to the society in which they live."

Autry noted that the computer match program is only one of several related projects which are being conducted simultaneously by his organization.

It is operating a model training center in Greensboro where the chronically unemployed are given a combination of basic educational and motivational training to provide them with a running start toward useful and productive working lives.

That center is to be the model for several others to be established around the state, directly tied to the job needs of industry.

It is operating Project Mobility under the auspices of the Labor Department—a statewide effort to move the unemployed individuals from job scarce areas and find them work and housing in job surplus areas.

It is sorting through the results of more than a dozen operational studies of how the manpower process presently works in North Carolina.

[From North Carolina magazine, November 1968]

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT CORP.: TO FIND THE JOBLESS, TO FIND THE JOBS

The first time that many North Carolinians had heard of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation was the sunny September day that Republican presidential

candidate Richard Nixon came to have a look at the corporation's people-to-jobs computer matching program in Chapel Hill.

MDC is scarcely a year old, but the purpose and scope of its operations have already been circulated about the country; word of the computer experiment had reached Nixon. He came to watch and listen and he was impressed.

The private, nonprofit corporation owes its existence to a tripartite alliance of the North Carolina Fund, the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Association of Manufacturers. The N.C. Fund provided the idea; the OEO provided funding grants and the NAM provided additional finances and advice from its Urban Affairs Division.

Business and governmental leaders of North Carolina occupy the organization's directorships. Its staff is headed by Executive Director George Autry, former chief counsel and staff director of Senator Sam Ervin's Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights. Its programs, proposed and in progress, are many and ambitious. Its goal is to discover the full extent and fundamental causes of the state's manpower problems and the means of solving them.

Behind the creation of MDC was the North Carolina Fund's assertion, made after considerable study of North Carolina's economic structure and society, that conditions of poverty, unemployment and educational lack in many parts of the state were far more serious than anyone had hitherto recognized.

MDC came into being as a result of the Fund's studies. It was incorporated in August of last year with North Carolina National Bank Senior Vice President Luther H. Hodges, Jr., as chairman of the board of directors. A program embracing 15 separate studies and projects was originally envisioned; it was later reduced to ten. They include:

1. The computer match program. Using computer equipment owned by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the program is an experiment to determine whether the aptitudes and basic skills of a person can be accurately matched up to job requirements through the data process method. Factual data was obtained from a group of chronically unemployed people who were recruited for a pilot training program in Greensboro. The data was keypunched in New York and returned to Chapel Hill. Requirements for various types of industrial positions were also reduced to computer language and the matchup process began. The experiment, though not yet complete, already shows considerable promise in some day providing a high-speed method of matching people to jobs. It is also expected to provide information as to why certain people do not match to jobs, and how their skills might be improved to make them a part of the work force. Eventually, MDC hopes to establish computer information centers in various parts of the state.

2. Prevocational training. The first of these programs was begun earlier this year in Greensboro. Subcontracted to a New York agency and directed by Al Boyles, formerly with H. L. Coble Construction Company, the center is training chronically unemployed people in basic literacy and job readiness. The first ten-week session began with 75 trainees; 57 completed the course and most of them improved their literacy at least one grade level while others advanced as many as five grade levels. Nearly half the trainees were placed in jobs soon after graduation; others later found work or embarked on advanced skill training.

The program is purely experimental but MDC officials are delighted at the progress of the trainees and the information that has been gathered from the experience. Other such training centers are planned as MDC's funds and priorities permit, including one at Rocky Mount scheduled to open late this year.

3. Mobility project. MDC took over from the North Carolina Fund a project of moving people to where the jobs are located. Reception centers for the relocated jobless are located in Charlotte, Greensboro and High Point, but housing availability remains a serious obstacle in the mobility process. A staff member of the State Employment Security Commission works full-time in this phase of MDC's operations.

Those are MDC projects already fully operational. Others in the start-up stage include:

1. Development of what are called "out-reach" techniques—finding means of communicating with the poor, motivating them into wanting to become useful members of society and to prepare themselves for success in holding jobs.

2. Supportive services. This involves learning the kind of services that will be needed to help the rural poor and unemployed in their painful transition to urban living and occupation.

3. Basic education and training. How to relate education and training to the poor and jobless and vice versa.

4. Development of jobs: The idea here basically is to learn through comprehensive study just what North Carolina's job potential for the poor really is and how to assemble and report the available jobs.

5. Job development careers. This would involve development of career work in helping the unemployed and the underemployed.

6. Housing. Finding low-income housing for the jobless being uprooted from rural environments; possibly even training workers for building their own dwellings is the concern of this program.

7. Determining North Carolina's industrial training capacity, both public and private, and determining what in the way of additional programs are needed and where.

The Manpower Development Corporation does not envision a permanent existence. Its long-range goal is to develop effective programs for dealing with the manpower problem that will be assumed by the appropriate public and private agencies. Its year-to-year existence depends upon the amount of government and private funds that will be made available to it, but the recognition it has already received would seem to guarantee continued operation for the foreseeable future.

Although the organization does not enjoy universal approbation of all those working in the same general areas, it has the genuine official approval of the State of North Carolina and most of its higher officials. Many of the heads of state agencies which are working on the same problems are members of MDC's board, including Employment Security Commission Chairman Henry E. Kendall and Department of Community Colleges Director I. E. Ready. Among leading businessmen on the board are Burlington Industries Vice President William H. Ruffin of Durham and Duke Power Company President William B. McGuire of Charlotte and many others.

The organization's staff includes, in addition to Autry, Dewitt Sullivan, director of finance and administration; John L. Allen, Jr., director of operations; Lionel H. Aselton, director of industry relations and technical assistance; and Robert C. Smith, director of program development and public relations.

MDC hopes to answer all the questions of manpower development, but in so doing, an important primary part of the job is to learn how to ask the questions. While the problem's broad outlines are easily discernible, its many details are far from clear. The unemployed, the unemployable and the underemployed are not all known. Still in the unanswered category is the question of why they are the way they are. The most complicated and elusive scientific study of all is the study of human beings and their motivations and lack of same.

No one can guarantee that the Manpower Development Corporation will find the answers, or, if it does, that they will be accepted and used by the public and private agencies to which they will be offered. Today's answers may not be applicable to the changing situations of tomorrow.

But the agency is busy seeking to define the questions and go after the answers. It has the blessings of government and of private business. There is a deepening pool of concern over the manpower problem and a quickening eagerness to discover the solutions. What MDC may find will be of direct help not only to North Carolina, but to every area of the country where the problem exists.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Nov. 24, 1968]

HE FRESHED UP ON SCHOOLING, GOT JOB—DIFFERENT POVERTY WAR BREAKING THE CYCLE
(By Dwayne Walls)

GREENSBORO.—Grover Saunders, a gentle man not accustomed to asserting himself, walked through a light snowfall to put in his application and then he never heard anything from it.

So he asserted himself.

"I didn't hear anything and I didn't hear anything," he said, "so I went up there and I told them I hadn't gone up there just to be a-going."

And he told the Manpower Development people something else, too.

"Now, I want to know something," he told them. "Am I a-going to get in or am I not a-going to get in?"

He got in. He began training that very day, and he went to class for 10 weeks.

"I learned a lot of things I didn't learn in school," he said, "and I freshed up on a lot that I did learn."

Grover Saunders had worked briefly as a shipping clerk in a warehouse years ago. But for most of his 44 years he had been a practical nurse, working for low pay in a risky market.

"You had to keep a-scratching," he said "Now and then I would make \$70 a week when I was lucky."

He completed one of the 10-week training courses at Greensboro's Manpower Development Center and got a job as a shipping clerk at \$1.85 an hour.

He got his first raise a few weeks ago and eventually will qualify for a retirement program.

When Grover Saunders made out his application for employment, he left one question blank, the one that asked what kind of wage he expected. "I don't know how much I'm worth," he said.

But now his outlook has changed.

"Why, you know," he said. "They've already got me in training to be head of the shipping department some day."

Grover Saunders' sudden rise to steady employment is a modest success story.

Thousands of other North Carolinians have done as well in climbing out of steady unemployment or grinding under-employment since the war on poverty began five years ago.

But the Saunders journey is noteworthy because he and about 200 other graduates of the Manpower Development Center here are the early products of a new stage in the poverty war.

The Manpower Development Center is the first and fairest child in a houseful of experiments spawned in the past year by the N.C. Manpower Development Corporation (MDC) of Chapel Hill.

This non-profit corporation is seen by some observers as the new kind of poverty program—that is, one dominated by hardnosed businessmen and industrialists instead of idealistic dogooders.

MDC sees itself differently, preferring to describe itself as a collaboration of industry

and government to attack unemployment and labor turnover across the nation.

One MDC official likes to think of it as "a way out of the endless, ceaseless poverty programs of the past."

Whatever its generic description—poverty program or economic development program—MDC clearly is the strongest indication yet that private industry is willing—even determined—to do more than criticize the poverty war.

MDC is the brainchild of the North Carolina Fund. Its major source of funds so far is the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

But the rock-ribbed National Association of Manufacturers has bestowed its blessing and some technical assistance, and MDC is banking heavily on private industry for its success.

The organization was born last fall at a time when the war on poverty was beginning to fall apart or to settle down, depending on who viewed it and where and how it was viewed.

In North Carolina alone half a million people—about one-fourth of the state's labor force—still need jobs or better jobs, even after millions of dollars have been spent to break the cycle of poverty.

That was roughly the time also when the nation's business and industry began awakening fully to a critical shortage of labor.

Employers in North Carolina were scrambling to find help—skilled or unskilled—and thousands of jobs were going unfilled.

That situation still exists. MDC's goal is to develop some way to eliminate both the labor surplus and a job surplus by bringing the two together.

The organization has given itself three years to develop what it calls a "manpower model" on the state level and hopefully to come up with the workings of a national model or at least a national policy.

MDC Director George B. Autry and his staff have completed a three-year plan which attacks the problem broadside.

In North Carolina, as it is elsewhere in the nation, the situation is one of distance.

Unemployment is mostly in rural areas while available jobs are mostly in the cities.

Even when the two exist together in the urban areas there is a gulf between what industry wants and what the labor force can supply.

Sometime within the coming year the corporation will launch several experimental programs intended to put people where the jobs are.

These include an experimental transportation program in the eastern part of the state, possibly a low-cost housing program, and a statewide computer system to identify the jobs and the jobless and match them.

Through the N.C. Mobility project inherited from the N.C. Fund, the corporation also will continue moving whole families out of rural areas into several Piedmont cities.

But the heart of the whole project will be a network of training centers like the one in Greensboro that produced Grover Saunders.

Three additional centers will be established—two in the East and one in the West—and operated initially by the corporation.

But MDC Program Director Bob Smith says the plan is "to work the centers so thoroughly into the fabric of the community that eventually the community will take over from MDC."

MDC also will set up similar training centers for individual industries, and two of the state's largest firms already have contracted for in-plant centers.

The Greensboro center is not a school in the traditional sense of the word, although its trainees do get some basic education and improve their education level an average of about two grades.

"We don't give them a heck of a lot of education," says Al Varn, MDC's training director. "The important thing is to teach them how to use the education they've got. We're there to train people to get a job or a better job, to show them how to make themselves more attractive to an employer."

To do this the center curriculum leans heavily on a course called Human Resources Development which, as one graduate put it, makes the student take a good look at himself.

Trainees are required to deliver impromptu talks to fellow trainees while a video-tape records the performance.

They go through mock job interviews, playing the roles of both applicant and employer, and then criticize their mistakes on a video playback.

The classes include even instructions in personal grooming and medical self-help.

The results have been dramatic in some cases.

Sylvia Dunlap was a high school drop-out who came in the center from the Neighborhood Youth Corp. She now works regularly as a machine operator at \$1.60 an hour.

One graduate that Center Director Al Boyles likes to talk about is Mrs. Alease Galloway.

Mrs. Galloway, the mother of four children, formerly worked as a maid. Even with her husband's regular income the family was barely making it.

Mrs. Galloway had more intelligence than her grade-school education indicated and enough ambition to do something about it. Graduating from the center with a perfect attendance record she took a third-shift textile job and worked straight through rest breaks until the company slowed her down.

She now spends part of her spare time recruiting friends into the training center.

Not all of the center's graduates are whopping successes. A few of the recruits do not even stick long enough to complete the 10 weeks of training, and one of the recent star graduates left a high-paying job to return to welfare rolls, and now seems content to stay there.

The center's follow-up study of the 76 graduates in the second training cycle shows a measure of the program's success.

When they came to the center 55 per cent of the trainees were unemployed and 11 per cent were employed only part time.

Three months after they graduated 65 per cent of the class was found to be employed full time, almost all of them on the first job taken after graduation.

Eight per cent was employed part-time and seven per cent were working part-time while taking additional training.

Nineteen per cent of the graduates were found to be unemployed.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Nov. 30, 1968]

EDITOR'S LETTER: MANPOWER PROJECT LOOKS AT RESULTS, THEY'RE IMPRESSIVE

DEAR READERS: When Bob Smith was associate editor of The News, he used to plow through long government reports larded with gobbledegook with a patience almost painful to watch. But when enough became too much he would phone through the Washington maze until he found the man who wrote the report and say: "I've read your report, and if you've a minute or so, I'd like to know what you are trying to say."

That kind of intellectual precision made Bob a superb editorial writer. It also prompted the North Carolina Manpower Development Corporation, when it was formed little more than a year ago, to ask him to join the corporation as director of program development.

Out of a deep conviction that an anti-poverty program could be made to work and

that MDC had a better-than-average chance to prove it, Bob bid farewell to newspaper work. We talked about the new corporation's joint sponsorship by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the National Association of Manufacturers and the willingness of tough-minded leaders like Luther Hodges Jr. to provide leadership and policy direction. And Bob agreed that "I'll write you when I know something."

He wrote this week and I thought you might be interested in his observations:

"I know, I know," Bob writes. "The last thing you need is something to read. Something that looks complicated and long of wind. Still you might try this one for size."

"SOMETHING EXTRAORDINARY

"We've run three cycles of trainees through our Greensboro center and the first two cycles are far enough off now to make assessment possible. We've bird-dogged graduates, drop-outs, employers—everybody who fits into the puzzle one way or another. The results are here. They are real, not theoretical. There are enough failures to make the modest successes look pretty good . . . You will see (in reports enclosed) our mistakes glaring through, but you will also see that something rather extraordinary has been happening . . . we think a door has been chinked open and a few rays of light let through . . ."

The report tracked 133 persons either totally unemployed or having only part-time jobs below the poverty level, who had received MDC's ten-week program of basic education and motivational training. Of the 133, 122 were located and of these 85 (or 69.7 per cent) were employed full-time. Twenty-three were unemployed.

"These are all people," Bob reports, "with a long and continuous experience of unemployment and underemployment. As you can see almost 70 per cent of them have full-time jobs now, the majority working with the first employer they joined after graduation from the training center . . . Only 20 seem at this point still to be losers . . . I'm personally impressed with the average wage of the full-time workers. It is \$1.85 an hour. That's nicely above the federal minimum. It isn't enough money, Lord knows, but it is a start. Many of these people are getting skills training from their new employers and will move on up the wage ladder."

"A MAID IS NOW A WEAVER

"If you can look at nothing else in the reports, please check the summary which shows what the people were doing when they came into the training center and what they are doing now. It makes all the failing worthwhile . . ."

I saw the reason for Bob's optimism quickly. A domestic earning 75 cents an hour is now making \$1.99 as a weaver. Another person, unemployed since 1962, earns \$1.60 an hour, in a hosiery operation, and an unemployed domestic whose top salary had been 87 cents an hour is now making \$1.32 as a nurse's aide. A part-time laborer has become a production worker at \$2.33 an hour. An unemployed truck driver has become a forklift operator at \$2.15 an hour.

The MDC's reports are thorough, clear and convincing, and they offer reason to hope that the corporation will be able to find funding for other training centers around the state.

Though still experimental, the development of human skills among those impoverished in spirit, ability and means is the most pressing business confronting North Carolina and the nation. And it is difficult to think of a more sensible approach than that of MDC which weds the resources of government with the problem-solving abilities of business.

Sincerely,

PERRY MORGAN.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Jan. 1, 1969]

AT MDC, SUCCESS STORIES: UNLIKELY ALLIANCE HELPS TRAIN UNEMPLOYED

(By Owen Lewis)

The National Association of Manufacturers, the Office of Economic Opportunity and a private contractor running a poverty program?

This unlikely alliance has produced Manpower Development Center on South Edgeworth Street, an outfit for hard-core unemployed and underemployed persons who go through a stiff 10-week course and come out better motivated and better able to cope with the world of private industry.

The center is a part of the Manpower Development Corp., which has headquarters in Chapel Hill, and has instituted a broad range three-year program of experiments dedicated to breaking the cycle of poverty in the state.

The center began operation in March, and has graduated three cycles of trainees who were given courses in basic education and human-resource development—development of motivation and attitude, how to dress, how to look for employment, how to fill out an application, how to prepare for an interview.

"One of the most basic things the center does is to familiarize the trainees with industry. We are not do-gooders. The trainees are expected to find jobs on their own. But if they have major problems, real excuses, we try to help them again. We try to change their attitudes," said Jim Bobbitt, MDC placement developer.

The basic education is programmed instruction, broken down by levels, in such fundamental areas as reading, mathematics and manual dexterity. In the human-resource development field, closed-circuit television is used to let the trainees see themselves as they go through mock sessions of job-seeking.

"Eighty-nine per cent of the employers say that our trainees are better than the average employee off the street," said Bobbitt. Of the last cycle, 81 of 89 of those who entered graduated. "If they stick it out the first week, you can't run them off," Bobbitt said. "This is security for them, and most of the trainees find they have something in common."

Most of the trainees at MDC have more than one of these criteria: poor economically, a school dropout, a member of a minority, under 22, over 45, or handicapped.

Kay Waddell, 22, was unemployed, and had just moved to town, when she heard an announcement of MDC's program on the radio. She applied and was accepted. "The basic math and English refreshed everything I had learned before. Before I had problems expressing myself, but now I feel I can communicate better with other people, understand them better and hold a job."

Miss Waddell, having completed the MDC cycle, is at Guilford Technical Institute on a Manpower Development Training Act program, studying to be a general office clerk.

Blondie Williams, who describes herself as "a middle-aged woman who didn't have as good a chance as the younger ones of getting a job," was a waitress before, and now has a job finishing cabinets at Burlington Distributors. She makes more money, and has regular daytime hours, Mondays through Fridays.

"The training at the center helped me to know how to go about looking for a job. How you act, your personality and your appearance mean a lot. We were taught these things. I think the center is wonderful for the people who didn't get to go to school, or who had to leave school like I did."

Horace Sturdivant, 24, said, "Before I had a job as a shipping and receiving clerk. Now

I have a position with the city in the building inspection department. My pay has improved, and I like the work better.

"My experience at the center was wonderful with the basic education and the human resources development courses. You learn how to get along better with your co-workers and with your employer. You learn what to expect of your employer in time of problems, in time of need."

Not all of the stories are success stories, but most of them are. One who hasn't succeeded yet is Sally Bledsoe. Mrs. Bledsoe said, "I completed the course, but I haven't got a job. The center is helping me try to find one, but it seems like all the jobs are filled." Mrs. Bledsoe is looking for a factory production job, "but it looks doubtful. I guess my height is my biggest problem. I'm not but five-feet, one-inch tall."

But from the first two cycles, more than 65 percent of the trainees have upgraded their job status, many of them spectacularly. The record of the third cycle, not yet complete, is expected to be even more impressive.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) News, Feb. 6, 1969]

LABOR POOL GOING DRY, HODGES SAYS

The chairman of the North Carolina Manpower Development Corp. says businesses should recruit manpower in areas they have previously ignored—the Negro colleges, the poor and men with arrest records.

"Business involvement in poverty and unemployment may be a simple matter of survival," Luther H. Hodges Jr. said today at a Johnson C. Smith University forum.

"Here in North Carolina established industries are discovering that the labor pool is drying up," he said. "They must either tap the manpower resources at the poverty level or lose production for lack of workers."

Hodges, son of the former governor, said business should look critically at its personnel tests "to see if they really do what they're supposed to do."

Hodges, whose agency is one of the first to match persons with jobs via computer, said more than a dozen North Carolina industries have approached MDC for help. The agency, he said, will establish in-plant training programs for industrial managers and the unemployed.

"It's all very well to motivate the chronically unemployed to come to work on time," he said, "but what good will that do if they are discriminated against or looked down upon when they get to work?"

Hodges said also business should experiment with new ways of providing "high support" for disadvantaged employees. "By this I mean most of all an attitude of acceptance by the employing company," he said.

"I mean on-the-job training. I mean going the extra mile to help the individual make the difficult transition from rural to urban life, from the society of the street corner to the community of work. And from the world of failure to the world of success."

Hodges said he is hopeful the agency will be able to establish a number of training centers throughout the state this year.

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, of all the problems facing our inner cities today, none is more crucial than lack of employment opportunity. Although significant progress has been made, the solution to inner city unemployment still looms large ahead of us.

The Federal Government has recognized this problem and responded to it by instituting a variety of manpower

programs, vocational training programs, and others too numerous to mention.

Private industry has also recognized the extent and social significance of inner city unemployment, and has responded to it in various ways. Individuals and giant corporations have wedded their efforts for the purpose of finding new possibilities, exploring new alternatives, and providing new hope to the unemployed residents of our inner cities.

One such union was created in 1957 when James F. Oates, Jr., of Chicago, Ill., combined his creative talents with the substantial resources of the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States. The achievements born of this union bear witness to the ability of the dedicated, to affect significant improvements in the quality of American life.

James F. Oates, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer of Equitable Life, will retire at the end of this year. I would like to share with my colleagues in the Senate, a record of some of his more important community and human achievements. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the following article, which appeared in the March 8, 1969, edition of the Saturday Review.

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

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

It has often been said that the successful magazine is the lengthened shadow of one man. This certainly was true of Harold Ross's *New Yorker*, Henry Luce's *Time*, *Life*, and *Fortune*, and is still true of De Witt Wallace's *Reader's Digest*. It was also true of American business in the post-Civil War period when the corporation was largely the creature of one man and he alone directed his company, often in a dictatorial fashion. But today, with the stock of corporations so widely held, and with the larger ones working in such complex fields, often in as many as a hundred lands, no individual can make all the decisions that demand such a wide variety of skills and an abundance of diverse knowledge. Corporate decisions of major import are now group decisions and of necessity must be so.

In keeping with these slow processes, it seems to take an interminable time before decisions made at the top are implemented throughout a company. This has been particularly evident in the adjustment of the larger corporation to its new social obligations. Yet despite this ponderous procedure of decision-making, the chief executive of a major company can provide leadership and give impetus to the movement of even the largest empires. Where one finds a corporation moving with urgency in seeking new means of meeting the crisis of the inner cities, for example, one is almost certain to find a chief executive riding herd to make sure that the company's policies are being carried out with utmost speed.

One such case highlights the theory. The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States is one of the largest insurance companies in the country. Equitable is in a highly regulated business and must be cautious. All life insurance companies have had a poor history of employment of minorities. Some of them not only refused to hire Negroes or other deprived groups, but often they were even reluctant to sell insurance to blacks. The changes that have come about in all the better-run insurance companies are due not alone to public pressures, but to a realization by management that a tre-

mendous part of their investments is in the cities and unless the cities are healthy the insurance companies will not be. As a result, hiring policies, for example, changed several years ago.

Some have been slow to implement those policies. But not Equitable Life. James F. Oates, Jr., chairman of the board and chief executive officer, has made it his own direct business to see that there is not a letup in the pressure to alter old habits, to hire members of minority groups, to open doors to those previously barred from jobs. Mr. Oates retires from Equitable at the end of this year, and to examine the changes he has wrought, it is worth looking at his record before he came to the company. In 1945, as president of the Chicago YMCA, he decided it was time to end the debates on admission of Negroes to membership. As a result of his pressure, all facilities at the Y were opened to Negroes. There was no falling off in Y membership, and there were no outcries.

In 1946, as president of the Chicago Bar Association, Oates opened another door. Again, there were no Negro members. He brought in Negro lawyers, the first one a judge. In 1948, as head of The Peoples Gas Light and Coke Company, he found that Negroes held only the most menial jobs, and precious few of them. He changed the hiring policies of his company and as a beginning sought out, with the aid of the judge he brought into the Bar Association, twenty well-qualified Negro youngsters. And he did it despite warnings from company executives that white girl employees would leave if black girls used the same washrooms; that it would be the ruination of Peoples Gas if young Negro men were allowed to work in the same offices with white men.

It was with this background that Oates arrived at Equitable in 1957. He found that his new company did not turn away Negroes when they sought jobs, but there was no initiative in hiring minority groups. The result was that there were hardly any Negro, Oriental, American Indian, or Spanish Americans working for Equitable. Oates made it his special province to change that picture.

Oates found that it is not easy to change the thinking of executives. As late as 1960, there were still very few minority group salaried employees at Equitable. Now, nationwide, some 13.5 per cent belong to minority groups. In the New York office, the figure is about 20 per cent and this is certain to rise. Of those being hired now in New York, 60 per cent are Negro and Puerto Rican. Every Equitable office throughout the country is integrated, including the South.

At present more than 200 agents out of a sales force of 7,000 are from a minority group. There are twenty Negro district managers out of some 400. The manager of one of the Philadelphia agencies is a Negro, as are the managers of agencies in Los Angeles and Chicago. And before 1969 is over, there will be more, for the vigorous recruiting campaign is being accelerated.

In addition, Equitable is now in its sixth year of training high school drop-outs, largely Negroes in New York, for jobs. The program is not a complete success, but there have been accomplishments that make the program worth the effort. "On balance," says Oates, "we are more than satisfied that it has been and continues to be a relative success." To Oates, a job "is an essential badge of membership in the larger society and a pay check is a passport to self-respect and self-sufficiency." But jobs alone are not enough. The entire environment of the inner cities must be changed, and that, Oates believes, involves schools, housing, recreational facilities, as it does job opportunities.

But that is not all. Equitable for some time has been one of the leaders among insurance companies in substantial corporate philanthropy, including aid to higher education. In

1954, Equitable's contribution program totaled \$375,000. Last year it was \$775,000, and it will be roughly the same in 1969. In addition, \$200,000 more has been budgeted for urban programs. Equitable's Division of Community Services encourages company employees and agents to become active in civic causes.

The Equitable effort is part of the life insurance industry's pledge to invest \$1 billion in urban core areas throughout the country to improve housing conditions and finance enterprises that will create jobs. And while the Federal Housing Administration guarantees the good use of these funds, the companies could invest them in other areas and get a better return of from 1 per cent to 1.5 per cent more. Oates was one of the leaders who proposed this industry wide program, which will in all likelihood be extended as soon as the original \$1 billion is invested.

And if one more example is needed to show that a busy chief executive can still find time for what are usually called external responsibilities, there is Oates's activity as general chairman of Princeton University's capital campaign, which from 1959 to 1962 raised \$53,000,000.

L. L. L. GOLDEN.

JERRIS LEONARD AND CIVIL RIGHTS: AN AUSPICIOUS BEGINNING

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the new administration has been in office a little over 2 months now. Most of the Presidential appointees have just begun to acquaint themselves with their responsibilities, proceeding cautiously and gingerly in their new posts. But in the area of civil rights enforcement I am pleased to see that there has been no hiatus, no waiting. The forceful policy of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations is being carried forward in this administration by the new civil rights chief in the Justice Department, Jerris Leonard.

When he took office last January, Jerry Leonard inherited a docket of some 400 civil rights cases from his predecessor, Stephen Pollack. He has carried them forward, enforcing the civil rights laws enacted during the last decade. Vigorous and impartial enforcement is essential if these laws are to be given real meaning and substance.

This past Tuesday, Jerry Leonard completed oral argument in the case of Daniel against Paul, now pending in the Supreme Court. The case is on appeal from a ruling by the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals, and involves the question whether discrimination by a private club violates the public accommodations section of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. Although the United States is not directly involved as a party, the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department intervened to insure that the Civil Rights Act would be properly applied by the Court. Jerry Leonard briefed and argued the case—a case which may result in a far-reaching interpretation of the civil rights laws.

But Leonard's functions have by no means been limited to carrying out existing cases, or intervening in disputes between private litigants. He has recently filed a motion in a Texas Federal district court challenging the Houston school sys-

tem's method of complying with the school desegregation guidelines. Last May, the Supreme Court had ruled that the free choice plans adopted by Houston and other communities in the South are not an effective means of desegregating the schools; Leonard's motion seeks to implement that decision.

Finally, Jerry Leonard has been active in the area of open housing. In a recent speech to the Wisconsin Department of Industry, Labor, and Human Relations, he indicated that the Justice Department intends to enforce vigorously the congressional mandate on open housing. Local housing and urban development agencies will be encouraged to bring legal action against persons who discriminate against Negroes in real estate dealings. Chicago is to be one of the targets of his drive.

These achievements in so brief a period of time are impressive. They augur well for civil rights.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 1969

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 584.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the joint resolution by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) making a supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on proceeding to the consideration of the joint resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations without amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, we now have under consideration House Joint Resolution 584, making supplemental appropriations to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. House Document 91-76, transmitted to the Congress on February 20, 1969, proposed

supplemental appropriations of \$1 billion for this purpose for fiscal year 1969, and a corresponding reduction of \$1 billion from the fiscal year 1970 budget. The House of Representatives has approved the full budget estimate. House Joint Resolution 584 was reported from the House Appropriations Committee on March 24, 1969, and passed the House of Representatives on March 25, 1969. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported the resolution without amendment on March 26.

Mr. President, when the Congress processed the regular agricultural appropriations bill for fiscal year 1969 last year, the budget request for this item was \$3,648,506,000. The House reduced this amount by \$460,393,500, and the Department did not appeal the House reduction. The Senate concurred in the House action inasmuch as the Department stated at that time that it felt this amount was sufficient to meet the financing requirements for all of the various CCC programs—which are mandatory and uncontrollable—and still have remaining an operating margin of approximately \$1 billion.

Since that time, however, there have been large and unexpected demands upon the Corporation's borrowing authority totaling \$1,686 million.

These unanticipated increases have been caused by extremely large increases in crop production—particularly feed grains, wheat, and soybeans—and decreases in exports. These increased supplies of commodities, coupled with lower prices and decreased exports, have resulted in higher quantities of commodities going under loan, and also loan repayments.

The dock strike, which has not been settled in the gulf ports from New Orleans westward, has further aggravated the situation by slackening the demand for agricultural commodities.

These factors have caused producers who have commodities under loan with the CCC to postpone repaying these loans and reclaiming the commodities until a future date when the prices will be firmer.

All of these developments have combined to cause this total program increase of \$1,686 million above what was estimated in the fiscal year 1969 budget. Of this amount, \$973 million occurred prior to the submission of the 1970 budget and \$713 million occurred since that time. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a table which shows when these increases occurred.

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

TABLE 1

Commodity	1969 Budget to 1970 budget	Since 1970 budget	Total
Feed grains.....	\$76	\$405	\$481
Wheat.....	246	141	387
Cotton.....	135	80	215
Soybeans.....	238	137	375
All other.....	278	-50	228
Total.....	973	713	1,686

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, last fall it became necessary to exempt the CCC from the effects of Public Law 90-364, the Revenue and Expenditure Control Act of 1968. This action, while exempting the CCC from the overall ceiling established under that act, did not increase the Corporation's borrowing authority.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a table which also appears in the printed hearings on page 7. This table details all of the changes which have occurred since the fiscal year 1969 budget was formulated.

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

TABLE 2.—Commodity Credit Corporation—Analysis of Changes in Borrowing Authority Available

[Millions of dollars; fiscal year 1969]
Estimated borrowing authority available June 30, 1969, included in 1969 budget..... \$1,963.4

PRICE SUPPORT AND RELATED EXPENDITURES	
Increases from 1969 budget to 1970 budget:	
Feed grains (increased production)	\$76.1
Wheat (more production and less exports)	246.5
Cotton (lower exports and domestic use)	134.6
Soybeans (more production and less use)	237.9
Storage facility loans (more space needed)	58.0
Rice (more production and less exports)	43.1
Tobacco (shift from "free" stocks to CCC)	75.1
Oils, edible (less exports)	20.0
Interest and all other	112.4
Total increases	1,003.7
Decreases from 1969 budget to 1970 budget:	
Peanuts (less production)	-13.3
Dairy products (less production)	-3.2
All other (dry beans, tung oil, long-staple cotton, etc.)	-14.1
Total decreases	-30.6
Net increases from 1969 budget, reducing availability of funds	
	-973.1
Increases since 1970 budget:	
Feed grains (less exports and \$168 million more advance payment)	404.7
Wheat (less exports)	141.1
Cotton (more production and less total use)	80.0
Soybeans (trade holding off purchases in anticipation of lower prices)	137.5
Storage facility loans (more space needed)	40.0
Tobacco (shift from "free" stocks to CCC)	34.8
Rice (export payments)	5.0
Interest (higher rates)	38.9
Total increases since 1970 budget	882.0

TABLE 2.—Commodity Credit Corporation—Analysis of Changes in Borrowing Authority Available—Continued

[Millions of dollars; fiscal year 1969]	
Decreases since 1970 budget:	
Dairy products (less production and sales to section 32)	-163.9
Cottonseed meal (more use)	-5.3
Total increases since 1970 budget	-169.2
1969 appropriation (included in 1969 budget \$918.1 million) (enacted \$300 million)	618.1
Net increases since 1970 budget, decreasing availability of funds	
	-\$712.8
Total net increases since 1969 budget	
	-1,685.9
Net available	
	277.5
1969 appropriation for realized losses:	
Included in 1969 budget \$3,648.5 million; enacted \$3,188.1 million	-460.4
Net deficit in borrowing authority after price support and related	
	-182.9

PUBLIC LAW 480 AND OTHER	
Public Law 480:	
1969 appropriation (included in 1969 budget \$918.1 million) (enacted \$300 million)	618.1
Decrease in expenditures (from \$1,444.4 to \$1,036.7 million) ..	407.7
Difference, financed by borrowing authority	
	-210.4
Advance to Farmers Home Administration (Public Law 90-328)—Not in 1969 budget	
	-30.0
Other net changes in special activities (mostly less short-term export credit sales)	
	+42.3
Total, Public Law 480 and other	
	-198.1
Revised estimate of borrowing authority available June 30, 1969 (deficit)	
	-381.0

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to summarize the major factors which have caused this increase of \$1,696 million:

First. The production of feed grains, wheat, and soybeans has increased substantially above the levels anticipated in both the 1969 budget and the 1970 budget. As an example, feed grains have increased 1.1 million tons, while exports are down 3.1 million tons, resulting in an additional investment of \$481 million by the CCC.

Second. Moreover, wheat is 60 million bushels over the expectation, while exports are expected to be down 190 million bushels, resulting in an increased investment of \$387 million.

Third. Additionally, soybeans are 30 million bushels over the amount estimated earlier, while domestic use and exports are expected to be down 59 million bushels, which has resulted in an

additional investment of \$375 million by the CCC.

Fourth. Other programs account for increased funds; mainly, tobacco, which is up \$110 million; rice, \$48 million more; oils up \$20 million.

Then, too, repayments have been much lower than anticipated when the 1969 budget was prepared. Repayments last year, through January 31, 1968, totaled \$477 million, or 47 percent of the year's total of \$1,021 million. However, this year, based on preliminary data, the \$465 million collected through January 31, 1969, amounts to only 37 percent of the projected total of \$1,246 million.

In the case of cotton, production is down 2.1 million bales from that which was earlier predicted. However, both domestic and foreign demands have decreased and no price increase is expected for cotton. This has resulted in placing an additional 2.3 million bales of cotton under loan at an additional cost of \$215 million.

These large crop productions are also causing farmers to take greater advantage of the storage facilities loan program. This accounts for an additional \$98 million in CCC loans.

Also, additional interest charges have amounted to \$62 million.

When the 1969 budget was formulated, it was proposed that the advance payments to the participants in the feed grains program be reduced from 50 to 25 percent. However, the Department, after considering this proposal, concluded that the participants had not been given adequate notice of this proposed action, and decided to continue the 50-percent rate as in the past several years. This adds \$168 million to CCC expenditures for fiscal year 1969. This increase will, of course, show a proportionate decrease in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. President, I have tried to detail some of the major items comprising this total increase of \$1,686 million which was not anticipated when the fiscal year 1969 budget was formulated.

As I stated on March 24, during the hearings on this item, I am pleased to note that the Department is requesting, in its 1970 budget, restoration of all prior year losses except for \$250 million, which applies to fiscal year 1968. Had this course been followed in the past—as has been recommended by the Senate Committee on Appropriations—the Department would not now be asking for this supplemental appropriation of \$1 billion. Previous years' hearings have brought out that both the agency and the Department officials have requested full restoration of the prior year losses of the Corporation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the budget request, the appropriation, and the remaining unrecovered losses from fiscal year 1961 to the present.

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

TABLE 3.—COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION NET REALIZED LOSSES AND APPROPRIATIONS TO RESTORE SUCH LOSSES, FISCAL YEARS 1961-68

Year incurred	Losses	Restora- tion	Act or estimate	Unrestored after appropriation	
				Year	Cumula- tive
1961:					
Regular	\$2,067.0	\$2,067.0			
Inventory revaluation	1,268.5	211.5	1963 Appropriation Act, \$2,278.5	\$1,057.0	\$1,057.0
1962	2,798.4	2,699.4	1964 Appropriation Act, \$2,699.4	100.0	1,157.0
	2,654.9	1,574.0	1965 Appropriation Act, \$1,574.0		1,137.9
1963		100.0			1,057.0
		1,000.0	1965 supplemental, \$1,100	1,080.9	2,237.9
		80.9			1,057.0
1964	3,226.9	2,719.1	1966 Appropriation Act, \$2,800	507.8	1,564.8
		507.8			1,057.0
1965	3,048.0	3,048.0	1967 Appropriation Act, \$3,555.8		1,057.0
1966	2,984.9	1,399.7	1968 Appropriation Act, \$1,400	1,585.2	2,642.2
		1,585.2			1,057.0
1967	3,813.6	1,602.9	1969 Appropriation Act, \$3,188.1	2,210.7	3,267.7
1968	3,198.2			3,198.2	6,465.9
		1,000.0	1969 supplemental request, \$1,000		5,465.9
		5,215.9	1970 budget amendment, \$5,215.9		250.0
1969 through Dec. 31, 1968	*2,567.2				

¹ \$275,000 was transferred to ARS for cotton research.

² Consists of:

1961		\$1,057.0
1967		2,210.7
1968		2,948.2
Subtotal		6,215.9
1969 supplemental		-1,000.0
1970 Budget		5,215.9

* Law authorizes appropriations for actual amounts recorded in the accounts only as of June 30, of each fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there is one other item I wish to mention; the borrowing capacity of the Commodity Credit Corporation has reached such a precariously low level that \$219 million has been advanced to the Corporation from section 32 funds. I was assured, however, in the hearings by officials of the Department that sufficient amounts would be repaid to this fund to enable it to carry forward \$300 million into fiscal year 1970, as authorized by law. The Senate report also includes language to this effect. Section 32 funds are used to remove surpluses of perishable agricultural commodities from the market when necessary. It is the only source of relief to which the producers of these non-price-supported commodities may turn when they have large surpluses. Therefore, it is imperative that sufficient funds be kept in the account for these surplus removal operations.

As I pointed out earlier in my statement, expenditures for the CCC are mandatory and uncontrollable. They administer and fund the various programs which have been authorized by law. A list of all of the programs administered by the CCC can be found on page 15 of the hearings.

Mr. President, let me turn for a moment to enumerate some of the effects on farmers and others if CCC should have to cease operations; and in this connection I have prepared mimeographed memorandums, which have been distributed in the Chamber, a copy of which is on the desk of each Senator. This memorandum indicates the effect of our not providing this supplemental appropriation.

Public Law 480 shipments would have to stop, thus aggravating the adverse effect on international trade already felt as a result of the dock strike, and com-

mitments to foreign governments could not be met. This would be detrimental to our international image and good will to the extent that importers would make purchases elsewhere, and those sales would likely be lost permanently because importing countries would look to our competition to meet their needs.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would have to stop making price support loans to farmers.

Advance payments would have to be stopped for feed grain producers who may still enroll in this year's program in the 11 States where the sign-up was extended for 2 weeks. The 11 States are: Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Minnesota, Iowa, Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska.

The corporation would not be able to pay bills that normally come due between now and July 1. Examples are wool payments normally due farmers and ranchers in early April; payments to warehousemen and others for storing CCC-owned grain or grain under extended loans; payments to railroads for freight costs due.

Additionally, the CCC could not make firm storage facility loans and drying equipment loans, an exceedingly popular and necessary program for farmers who must improve their marketing practices.

With the current tight money situation, farmers and others who are due payments or loans from CCC would be forced to borrow elsewhere at increased interest rates to replace this source of funds.

In other words, Mr. President, the consequence of failure to pass the appropriation requested by the administration would be serious, not only for agriculture but also for our entire economy.

Mr. President, I have tried to briefly summarize the urgent need and necessity for approving this supplemental re-

quest of \$1 billion, none of which, by the way, will be used for administrative costs.

I shall now be happy to respond to questions from Senators, and I yield first to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS).

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, as I understand it, this appropriation of \$1 billion is to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for previously incurred losses?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. That is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. These are losses which, in earlier years, several years back, should have been recognized as such by Congress but were not recognized as losses for the purpose of reimbursement in appropriation form?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct in stating that. These losses go back to 1961, in the amount of \$1,057,000,000; to 1967, in the amount of \$2,002,000,000; and to 1968, in the amount of \$3,002,000,000 and they have not been reimbursed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is correct; to a total extent of about \$6.5 billion?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. \$6.5 billion is the total for those 3 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes. The Senator from Florida on numerous occasions, and I have supported him, in earlier years has tried to get Congress to recognize these losses as they were being incurred over the years in order that the taxpayers, the American people, could realize and have called forcibly to their attention the true extent of the cost of this agricultural program.

As a result of that belated recognition of the losses and under this new book-keeping system, which I mentioned yesterday, the Government can in effect report a surplus when we are actually running at a deficit of several billion a year.

To further emphasize the point, I ask this question: Is it not a fact that under this new system of reporting, while this bill calls for \$1 billion, an amendment could be offered raising that amount to \$2 billion, \$3 billion, \$4 billion, \$5 billion, or \$6 billion, and if Congress were to adopt it it would never change by one iota the final figures as to the surplus or deficit reported at the end of this year?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to yield to the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) on this point.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the Senator will find I am correct in saying that whether we appropriate \$1 billion, \$2 billion, \$5 billion, or the entire \$6.5 billion, it would not change the final figure one iota. What we are doing is recognizing this year and seeking to restore losses incurred between 1961 and 1968. Furthermore; these are losses which were not recorded at the time.

The point I am making is that the actual cost of these programs will never show up to the taxpayers.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, before I yield to the Senator from Florida, I do want to make two points.

First, I should like to emphasize what I said earlier, that the Senate Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), and others, have endeavored in prior years to have these reimbursements requested and appropriated for on a current basis. Second, the fact that they were not made on a current basis was not the fault of the Congress, nor of the Department of Agriculture but was the fault of the Bureau of the Budget of the previous administration. The Bureau of the Budget, in those years, as I understand it, insisted upon a reduction of the requests of the former Secretary of Agriculture for complete reimbursement of these losses, to the CCC.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The fault lies in the previous actions of the Bureau of the Budget; and I think the Senator is exactly right when he says that this procedure was just a juggling of the books. If they had acted in accordance with the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee, we would not be confronted with this problem today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I made a statement to that effect earlier, and I wish to reemphasize it. I am not criticizing the Senate Appropriations Committee, because its chairman, the Senator from Florida, has consistently pointed out this false method of accounting. I have supported him in that contention.

But the net effect was that in prior years the Congress and the administration would claim that it was reducing the appropriation of the Department of Agriculture by a billion dollars, which made it look good to the taxpayers; when in reality it was not reducing expenditures at all. Now we are asked to belatedly restore these funds, and under this new accounting system it will still not show up as a loss.

It is comparable to a situation where a private taxpayer, reporting to the Government, can very properly report on a cash basis the income from his year-to-year operation, or he can report it and pay his income taxes to the Government on an accrual basis. Either method is acceptable and proper for reporting his income to the Federal Government.

But if a taxpayer wants to change from the accrual reporting system to the cash reporting system or from the cash system to the accrual system he has to make a request to the Bureau of Internal Revenue, obtain its permission, and then be subject to an audit to make sure that he eliminates the so-called notch so that the Government would not lose any revenue as the result of this changeover.

What I am pointing out here is that the Government, in changing over from the old administrative budget to this new unified budget, is dropping about \$6.5 billion that will never be reported to the American taxpayers as a cost of the agricultural program. I think we are giving them an unrealistic appraisal of the

cost of administering the agricultural program.

I think there is something wrong with any operating system wherein the appropriating of \$1 billion, \$2 billion, or \$5 billion does not change the answer at the end of the year. I think it requires an explanation on the part of the administration that this notch exists and that we are not actually saving money for the American taxpayers as we claim. These represent previously incurred losses which can only be made up by direct payments from the taxpayers.

I say again, the Government is practicing a system of bookkeeping which it would not approve for any private individual to use in reporting his income to the Federal Government.

I support the committee today, and I am not criticizing it because we do have to restore this loss. We are going to have to restore all of the \$6.5 billion eventually because at some point we are going to have to reckon these losses that have been sustained.

I only wish Congress had followed the advice of the Senator from Florida and the committee in earlier years, but now that we are making this changeover we should make this clear to the American taxpayers. It should be emphasized so that they may really understand the delicate financial picture with which we are confronted.

Under this new system we raised the debt ceiling \$12 billion yesterday for what purpose? To finance some imaginary surpluses. That is ridiculous.

Who ever heard of a proposal of going to the bank to negotiate a larger line of credit in order to borrow money with which to finance a surplus? We do not have a surplus. We are operating the Government at a deficit today and at a projected deficit for the next 18 months that will average \$500 million a month.

That should be admitted and brought home to the American taxpayers.

The only way that we can bring the deficit under control and check the inflationary spiral is by making bona fide reductions in expenditures. I think the sooner we realize that, the better off we will be. We cannot check the inflationary spiral by any fancy manipulation of the books to make them look good.

I again emphasize that my remarks are not meant in any way as criticism of the committee.

The Senator from Florida has been pointing this out for years, but for years the Congress and the administration has not followed the recommendations of the committee. This manipulation gave the previous administration a chance to spend \$6.5 billion and to cover up the expenditure so that the American taxpayers would not know what was going on.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for yielding. I also thank the Senator from Delaware for his insistence throughout the years that these matters should be handled honestly so as to give accurate and current information to the

people of this Nation from year to year regarding the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

If the Senator from Delaware will listen to me for a moment, I want to recite what I understand the facts to be.

First, in previous years the notes of the Commodity Credit Corporation to the Treasury of the United States representing what was advanced by the Treasury to the Commodity Credit Corporation from year to year and what was expended in carrying out the functions of the CCC were canceled at the end of each year without any real recognition of the fact that a certain amount of money had been spent.

I have no complaint with the operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation, because those operating it were merely carrying out the mandates of Congress and the laws passed by Congress. I have no complaint to make of the Department of Agriculture, because from year to year, both under the previous administration and under the present administration, the Department of Agriculture has been requesting full restoration of prior year losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The Senator from Delaware some years ago asked Congress to pass—and it did pass and it had the strong support of the Senator from Florida and many other Senators—legislation requiring reimbursement of these losses by appropriations. This procedure shows affirmatively what had been spent by the CCC in its operations and what is needed for reimbursement to restore their total borrowing capacity to \$14.5 billion, which is their authorized amount.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget has always felt that if it just asked for enough restoration to carry out what in its opinion would be required to carry out the next year's operation, everything would be all right.

The Senator from Florida has stoutly insisted for 5 years prior to last year—or perhaps it was 6 years prior to last year—that the mandate of the legislation offered by the Senator from Delaware and passed by Congress should be carried out and that there should be restoration yearly through the appropriations process of all prior year losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. Unfortunately, that has not been done.

Year after year the Senate has stood by the Senator from Florida in his attempt to have this done. However, with the Bureau of the Budget—and, unfortunately, the Bureau of the Budget was backed up by the administration during that time—insisting that all they needed was a partial restoration, that was all we have been able to get.

So, last year for the first time, the Senator from Florida decided to abandon that effort. These facts have been stated ably by the Senator from West Virginia. I predicted at that time on the floor—and the RECORD will show it—that the Commodity Credit Corporation was going to come to a day of reckoning by reason of the following of that very improper practice.

That day has come. We are now at the point where, in order to get through this year's operations, the Commodity Credit Corporation has to have restored to it \$1 billion.

As a matter of fact, the CCC has not only exhausted its own resources, but it has also borrowed \$219 million, as stated so ably and properly by the Senator from West Virginia, from section 32 funds.

Section 32 funds are derived from 30 percent of the tariff receipts. Their primary purpose is to assure that producers of perishable commodities, who comprise much more than half of the agricultural producers in the Nation who do not have price supports, will be protected. These perishables include beef, pork, poultry, fruit, vegetables, and other crops—none of which have price supports.

When there is a surplus today—which destroys the value of the full production—the Commodity Credit Corporation through the use of section 32 funds can remove that surplus from the market and use it for the school lunch program, the direct distribution program, and other institutional programs, in connection with feeding our poor people. This creates a situation under which the rest of that commodity can be sold at least for some small profit.

Officials of the Department testified during the supplemental hearings that if this supplemental request is granted sufficient amounts will be repaid to section 32 to enable the section 32 permanent appropriation to carry forward \$300 million into fiscal year 1970, as provided by law. The Senate report states that the committee expects this action to be carried out. Since this is the only relief afforded these producers of perishable commodities, it is vitally important that necessary funds be carried forward to provide an adequate amount for these surplus removal operations.

The Senator from West Virginia has fully covered this matter in his statement.

I pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for so sympathetically handling the problem. I also pay tribute to the distinguished Senator from Delaware for stating his understanding of the problem and his understanding of the facts—that this crisis exists because we have not followed the law and made full reimbursement from year to year of the loss of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Those losses are sure to occur because of the storage costs and other cost associated with acquiring these commodities.

There has to be paid the transportation, including a large part of the ocean transportation under our Public Law 480 operations, the cost of the food-for-peace program and many other items which I do not need to mention because they have been so well covered by the Senator from West Virginia.

I am glad that this crisis has developed because it has shown the utter folly of continuing to operate as we have operated now for so many years.

As a result of this crisis, there has finally been brought to bear the proof of the soundness of the position taken by the Senator from Delaware heretofore and by the entire Committee on Appropriations of the Senate year after year. I have had the privilege of leading the debate on the floor when we have taken this position for a good many years.

Finally comes the proof of the pudding. Finally there has come a payday when we have to pay for these improper and incorrect practices which have been followed in contravention of existing law. We are arriving at the point of partially meeting that payday now. We will have to meet it in much greater measure when the annual appropriations bill comes up.

Mr. President, I strongly support the position of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), chairman of the Deficiencies and Supplemental Subcommittee, regarding the urgency of this request and the necessity for passing House Joint Resolution 584, which will restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation in the amount of \$1 billion.

On March 18, 1969, when the Secretary of Agriculture was before the Agriculture Subcommittee of Appropriations, of which I am chairman, the Secretary and other officials testified as to the reasons and the necessity for early passage of this supplemental request. On March 24, 1969, Senator BYRD held full and complete hearings on this subject with officials of the Department. These printed hearings are available on the desk of each Senator.

I shall not detail the factors which have caused these extraordinary large borrowing demands upon the Corporation since the Senator from West Virginia has already covered these in his statement.

At the present time these unreimbursed losses for previous years are as follows: for fiscal year 1961, \$1,057 million; for fiscal year 1967, \$2,210.7 million; and, for fiscal year 1968, \$3,198.2 million—totaling \$6,465.9 million. The fiscal year 1970 budget proposed \$6,215,934,000 for restoration of these losses. This was to restore all prior year losses except for \$250 million of those losses which occurred in fiscal year 1968. House Document 91-76, in which the supplemental estimate of \$1 billion was transmitted to the Congress on February 20, 1969, also proposed a \$1 billion reduction in the fiscal year 1970 estimate. Officials of the Department stated on page 30 of the hearings that if this supplemental was granted they would apply these funds toward the earliest unreimbursed losses; namely, the \$1,057 million which goes back to fiscal year 1961. This will leave a balance of only \$57 million remaining of the deficit for that fiscal year. The Senate report states that the supplemental funds will be so applied.

Mr. President, I again state that I fully support this resolution.

I thank the Senators for their cooperation, and I again thank the Senator from West Virginia for his understanding of the need for protecting section 32 funds.

I support this bill, and I am glad that at last the emergency which now exists has brought out how unsound, unsafe—and I think not completely forthright—have been the methods that have prevailed for too many years, beginning with 1961.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Florida for his remarks. He is correct.

I pay tribute to the Senator from Florida, the Senator from West Virginia, and their committee for having tried to correct this in earlier years.

They are now placed in a position in which they have to recognize this belatedly, but in recognizing it and in correcting this mistake. I did not want it to go by unnoticed. We will ultimately be reimbursing \$6.5 billion of losses that have previously been incurred, and the taxpayers have never been told.

We are operating under a type of book-keeping system today in which the Government can report surpluses when it actually is operating under a deficit. There is something wrong with that system. We should change it and tell the American people where their money is going.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator for his comments. He has made a great contribution to this subject.

The day of reckoning is at hand. We are making a reimbursement in this bill of \$1 billion, and when the fiscal year 1970 bill comes before the Senate, we will make further reimbursements in the amount of approximately \$5.2 billion. This will leave only about \$250 million of the 1968 losses that are unreimbursed.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COOK. Would the Senator refer to the memorandum that was placed on each Senator's desk?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOK. Item 6 reads:

The decision to continue the advance payments at 50 percent has also increased the expenditures of the Corporation by \$168 million.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. May I explain that?

Mr. COOK. May I ask the Senator if it is not true that in the executive budget that was presented to us, the advance payments were arbitrarily cut to 25 percent, and this really does not constitute an increased expenditure, but, really, last year the expenditure was somewhere in the vicinity of \$330 million, and this is merely raising it to the 50 percent figure?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator is correct in that no advance notice was given to farmers that these advance payments, which for a period of approximately 8 years, have been at the rate of 50 percent, would be reduced. The first intimation of that reduction came when the President's budget was submitted on January 15, at which time it was indicated that the advance payments would no longer amount to 50 percent, but would be reduced to 25 percent.

Mr. COOK. But is this not in essence

also part of the \$168 million that could be considered as part of the surplus of this fiscal year's budget?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I indicated how this came about. The difference in the 25 percent and the 50 percent is \$168 million. So we are paying it now because the department felt that it had a moral obligation to the farmers to give them notice in ample time before such reductions should be made, and, consequently, it is going to continue—at this point, at least—the making of 50 percent of the payments at the time the agreements are entered into. The \$168 million will have to be paid now, but it will be deducted from the 1970 budget.

Mr. COOK. It will come off totally in the 1970 budget, will it not?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, the additional amount we are paying in this fiscal year will be taken off the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. COOK. As a matter of fact, in the next fiscal year no funds are available in the budget for advance payments.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Are you referring to the 1970 budget?

Mr. COOK. Yes. In other words, it was cut to 25 percent this year, and it was cut to zero for next year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. The Department has not reached any decision on payments for next year's program yet.

Mr. COOK. I am talking about the executive budget. I believe the Senator will find that it was cut from 50 percent to 25 percent in this fiscal year and that in the next fiscal year it was cut from 25 percent to zero.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We are dealing here with advance payments for the current year's program.

Mr. COOK. And in the 1970 budget, it is cut from 25 percent to zero.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We have not reached that point yet.

In the 1970 budget, it is cut from 50 percent to 25 percent under the Johnson budget. The Department intends, however, to leave it at 50 percent, which means we will have to come up with an additional \$168 million.

Mr. COOK. This is not an increase. This is merely keeping it at the same level as the previous year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. It is an increase over what would have been allocated had the Department gone along with the Johnson administration's proposal that these advance payments be cut from 50 percent to 25 percent. The Department is not going to do that, and that means we will have to spend \$168 million more now, and this amount will be deducted from the fiscal year 1970 budget.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think there may be some misunderstanding.

As a matter of fact, these advance payments do not increase obligations at all. It means we are merely prepaying our obligations to the participants in

this program. This bill does not change the picture of what will happen under the 1965 authorization act, which we extended last year, to the end of 1970.

I just want to make it clear that under that act, CCC is authorized to make these payments. Whether they are advanced as 50 percent in the beginning or 25 percent in the beginning. CCC's duties are mandatorily put upon them by the 1965 act, as extended, and there will be no difference in the final expenditure of CCC funds.

I say to my distinguished friend that the operation of CCC always calls for reimbursement of their losses. We will reach the time later when, whatever they pay out and whenever they pay it out, in the course of this year, we will have to reimburse any losses they sustain.

I do not believe any change in the program is accomplished by this, except that instead of paying off only 25 percent in advance, as was proposed by the Johnson budget for this year, CCC will be able to do—if this bill is passed—what it has done for years and what, in my opinion, it should continue to do until Congress itself has the chance to review the 1965 act, as extended.

We will have to review this act either this year or next, because it expires at the end of next year.

I see the Senator from South Dakota on his feet. He has been a staunch supporter of the 1965 act and of its extension. The Senator from Florida has not been a supporter of that act, but he believes it should be honestly administered after it is enacted and that the funds must be provided for its honest administration. The Senator from Florida will continue to take that position, and he sees no fault at all in the present Department of Agriculture or the present CCC in wishing to continue what has been the practice since the 1965 act was passed. We will have to either extend that act or supplant it, and I hope we will supplant it, by different legislation, but that will be something for the entire Congress to pass upon.

I see no reason why the practice as initiated when the act was passed should not be continued into this year.

Mr. COOK. Yes, sir. The only point I wanted to make was that this shifted \$168 million out of the budget for this fiscal year into the next fiscal year.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. We will deduct the \$168 million while we are currently paying for the fiscal year 1970 budget.

Mr. HOLLAND. Shifting it out of the operation of the CCC from the fall of this calendar year, which would be within fiscal year 1970, to the first part of this year, which would be within fiscal 1969. But there is no change in the total amount. There is no change in the mandate of this Congress. We are not asked to change the legislation. We are asked simply to allow CCC and the Department of Agriculture to continue without interruption the program that has been carried on under the 1965 act into this year, just as it has been in earlier years.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I think this colloquy has clarified the problem which bothered some Senators. Perhaps if the Senator had added in item 6 on this sheet two more words the situation would have been made more clear for those who have not followed the act carefully. I think item No. 6 should read:

6. The decision to continue the advance payments at 50 percent has also increased "the immediate" expenditures of the corporation by \$168 million.

It would not be total expenditures.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I accept that suggestion.

Mr. MUNDT. It is a reason why we have to have this before us; and one of many reasons for emergency action now.

Mr. President, I wish to take this occasion to salute our new chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals. This is his first bill in that capacity. He has handled it with his customary efficiency. As one interested in the constructive service CCC has rendered through the years, I wish to congratulate him for expediting the hearings and action on the floor of the Senate because time is rapidly running out. We have until tomorrow to meet this obligation. I hope the Senate will ratify the action of our subcommittee, on which I serve as the ranking Republican member.

I believe the colloquy which we have had and the explanations which have taken place are factual and proper because the public should be fully informed of the operation of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able Senator from South Dakota for his comments. I also express appreciation to the Senator from Kentucky for raising the question with regard to the ambiguity which appears in item 6 on the memorandum which I had prepared.

Mr. President, I wish to insert the words "the immediate" between the words "increased" and "expenditures" so as to clarify the meaning of this item. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MEMORANDUM BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA, MARCH 27, 1969

There is an urgent need for this supplemental of \$1 billion for restoration of losses of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The expenditures for the CCC are mandatory and largely uncontrollable. *The borrowing capital of the Corporation will be exhausted by March 28.* Since the fiscal year 1969 bill was enacted, and even since the 1970 budget was formulated and presented, there have been large unprecedented borrowing demands on the Corporation and net program increases of \$1,686 million. Briefly, the major factors causing these increases are:

1. *Large unanticipated increases in crop production, particularly wheat, feed grains, and soybeans, and decreases in exports.*

2. *The nationwide dock strike, which has*

not yet been settled on the Gulf Coast, further adds uncertainty to the commodity market and has slackened the demand for agricultural commodities.

3. Repayments on loans are far behind those of last year. The uncertainty in the commodity markets is causing producers to leave their commodities under loan until prices are firmer.

4. Farmers have taken further advantage of storage facility loans due to increased crop production.

5. There are additional interest charges on CCC borrowings.

6. The decision to continue the advance payments at 50 percent has also increased the immediate expenditures of the Corporation by \$168 million.

EFFECTS OF NOT PROVIDING SUPPLEMENTAL

1. CCC will be forced to suspend operations.

2. All price support loans to producers will be halted.

3. Advance payments for feed grains program will be suspended.

4. Public Law 480 shipments will be suspended and this would:

(a) have a further weakening effect on the market, and

(b) force foreign buyers to seek new sources for their commodities.

5. Wool payments will be suspended.

6. Warehouse storage, transportation, freight, and other necessary costs of the Corporation could not be paid.

7. Farmers will be forced to borrow funds in the open market at the prevailing higher interest rates.

Mr. PEARSON and Mr. YARBOROUGH addressed the Chair.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I yield first to the Senator from Kansas, and then I shall yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the very laudatory comments made by the Senator from South Dakota to the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership and most able presentation of this supplemental appropriation which means so much to Kansas.

I wish to emphasize one point, and I am sure the Senator has covered this matter in his prepared statement. Unfortunately, I came to the Chamber a little late today. I wish to emphasize the real reasons for taking up this matter today. I thank the Senator for inserting the memorandum in the RECORD because not only is it useful to Senators but I think it will prove very useful for the public understanding of this particular measure.

I recall that in committee hearings the Senator from Florida quite properly indicated he hoped the additional interest charge on CCC would apply to the oldest loans, going back to about 1961.

At that time I had some question about interest rates that would be applied. I understand this is borrowing from the Government itself and as the Senator has pointed out it is merely taking money from one pocket and putting it in another pocket. The qualms I had at that time no longer prevail. I wanted to make that statement a part of the RECORD.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator. Do I understand he wishes the \$1 billion to be applied to the earliest losses; namely, 1961.

Mr. PEARSON. I think that was the suggestion of the Senator from Florida in committee hearings.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes, I believe that was his suggestion.

Mr. PEARSON. That is part of the report rather than the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Officials of the Department stated in the hearings that the \$1 billion would be applied against the earliest losses, namely those going back to 1961. I questioned these officials regarding interest charges and they stated that interest does not run against losses incurred in prior years but only against current losses.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank the Senator. Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for his handling of this matter as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals of the Committee on Appropriations, and for his handling of the matter on the floor of the Senate. I congratulate him on the clarity of the memorandum he prepared containing the six points that have been referred to. A seventh point should be added setting forth the inestimable benefit to the Senate and the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the communication from the President to the Speaker of the House of Representatives requesting this item and the accompanying statement by Robert Mayo, Director of the Budget, as to reason for it.

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

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE "Commodity Credit Corporation

"Budget appendix page	Heading	Request pending	Proposed amendment	Revised request
150	Reimbursement for net realized losses.....	\$6,215,934,000	-\$1,000,000,000	\$5,215,934,000"

The additional amount proposed for the fiscal year 1969 is needed to enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to carry out its mandatory price-support and related program operations. Large unanticipated increases in crop production, particularly in feed grains, wheat, and soybeans, and decreases in exports have resulted in substantially greater present demands for Commodity Credit Corporation loan funds. Without the additional funds, the Corporation will be unable to make the price-support loans necessary for the orderly marketing of farm commodities.

Since the total of the amounts appropriated to date and requested in the 1970 budget will provide sufficient funds, the amount requested for 1970 is being reduced by the amount of the 1969 supplemental request. The combined effect for the 2 fiscal years will be the same as contemplated in the 1970 budget document.

I recommend that the foregoing be transmitted to the Congress.

Respectfully yours,
ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 20, 1969.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I transmit for the consideration of the Congress proposed changes in appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal years 1969 and 1970. These changes would involve a supplemental appropriation of \$1,000,000,000 for fiscal year 1969 and a reduction of the same amount in the request for appropriation for the Department for fiscal year 1970.

The reasons for proposing these changes at this time are discussed in detail in the attached letter from the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. I concur with his recommendations.

Respectfully yours,

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., February 20, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

SIR: I have the honor to submit for your consideration a proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1969 in the amount of \$1,000,000,000, and an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 involving a decrease of a like amount for the Department of Agriculture.

The proposed supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1969 is as follows:

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE "Commodity Credit Corporation

"Reimbursement for Net Realized Losses

"For an additional amount for 'Reimbursement for net realized losses', to partially reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained but not previously reimbursed, pursuant to the Act of August 17, 1961 (15 U.S.C. 713a-11, 713a-12), \$1,000,000,000."

The amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1970 is as follows:

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I call particular attention to the following paragraph:

Since the total of the amounts appropriated to date and requested in the 1970 budget will provide sufficient funds, the amount requested for 1970 is being reduced by the amount of the 1969 supplemental request. The combined effect for the 2 fiscal years will be the same as contemplated in the 1970 budget document.

While the position of the administration is that without this supplemental appropriation these payments will stop—they are the executive and they can stop them—I point out that it seems to me to take \$1 billion off of next year's budget, add it to the deficit of the outgoing administration, and thus leave this administration \$1 billion better off budgetarily. I thank the Senator for yielding. I am for the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. President, with respect to the expression of concern by the Senator from Florida with respect to the repayment of section 32 funds, I indicated earlier it was at his insistence that the committee wrote into its report words which would exert great pressure and influence upon the Department of Agriculture to proceed in that direction. I think it would be well to include in the RECORD also at this point excerpts from the colloquy which occurred during committee hearings. The excerpts are brief and they should be in the RECORD as legislative history.

During the hearings conducted by the Senator from Florida (Mr. HOLLAND) on Department of Agriculture and related agency appropriations for fiscal year 1970, Mr. Charles L. Grant, who is Director of Finance for the Department of Agriculture, had this to say:

TRANSFER OF SECTION 32 FUNDS TO CCC

Mr. GRANT. To alleviate the situation, Mr. Chairman, we have taken steps to transfer \$219 million of section 32 funds to the CCC primarily for the purchase of dairy products. This is an interim measure and we anticipate that before the year is over at least \$108 million of that will be returned to section 32 in order that we can carry over the full \$300 million of section 32 funds at the end of this fiscal year.

Then in the hearings which I conducted as chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, Mr. Clarence D. Palmby, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, had this to say in regard to the question of repayment to section 32 for the funds which have been advanced in this crisis:

Mr. PALMBY. It is our intention to repay or to make complete the section 32 fund account to the extent the funds are not expended for the purchase of dairy products.

Then Mr. Grant went on to say:

We would take steps to repay section 32 in the amount that has not been used for dairy products, to be sure to carry over at the end of the year \$300 million. Section 32 funds would be available for section 32 purposes next year.

When he was asked whether the repayment would amount to \$111 million plus \$108 million, he answered in this way:

It will probably be 108 million or more. It will be at least \$108 million. \$108 million is the amount necessary to protect the \$300 million carry-over.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I want to make it clear that those primarily interested in section 32 funds—and I admit that I am one of them—have no right as to the use of such funds above \$300 million at the end of the fiscal year, except to have the carry-over of \$300 million, because section 32 legislation itself provides that any excess above \$300 million at the end of the fiscal year in section 32 shall be transferred to the general fund of the Treasury. Of course, we would expect that to be done this year, as it is any year. All we want to be sure of is that, notwithstanding the heavy draft which they have made upon section 32 funds for this emergency use by the CCC, we want \$300 million to be

carried over into the next fiscal year. We are perfectly willing to help out in the general problems of CCC, to the degree that we can, and still carry over the \$300 million.

We thank the Senator for having stated the matter in the report of the committee, as he has. It has been brought out now effectively on the floor, and I am sure that that objective will be honored by the CCC and by the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I promised to yield to the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) much earlier. Then I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for the purpose of submitting an amendment?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas for that purpose.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

On page 1, after line 11, insert the following:

"EMERGENCY CREDIT REVOLVING FUND

"For an additional amount for the 'Emergency Credit Revolving Fund', \$30,000,000.

"OPERATING LOANS

"For an additional amount from funds available in the 'Direct Loan Account' of the Farmers Home Administration, for operating loans, \$100,000,000."

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to provide the Farmers Home Administration \$100 million for regular operating loans and \$30 million for emergency loans. These funds are urgently needed.

Emergency loans are made to established farmers and ranchers in areas designated for this purpose by the Secretary of Agriculture upon his finding that a natural disaster has caused a general need for agricultural credit which cannot be met by local sources. There are 1,108 designated counties in 38 States in which farmers are eligible for emergency loans.

These loans are not made from annually appropriated funds. Instead, they are made out of the emergency credit revolving fund in amounts apportioned for this purpose annually by the Bureau of the Budget. Loans are made out of this fund and collections go back into it for making additional loans. Apportionments for this fiscal year total \$104 million and this amount has already been loaned.

After apportioned funds were exhausted, it was necessary for the agency to return without loan checks, the approved loan applications of about 3,000 farmers totaling \$17 million—100 of these farmers are in my State of Arkansas.

Let me say that during this past year, Arkansas has experienced very bad weather, about the worst rains and local flooding, especially in the northern and eastern parts, that I can remember. The large rivers, such as the Arkansas River, were not affected in the way that the local areas were. It was disastrous.

Counties in the following States have been designated for emergency loans:

Designated Emergency Loan Areas, March 25, 1969

	Number of counties
Alabama	60
Arkansas	36
California	15
Colorado	9
Delaware	3
Georgia	80
Idaho	8
Illinois	60
Indiana	79
Iowa	43
Kansas	36
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	20
Maine	1
Maryland	9
Michigan	16
Minnesota	9
Mississippi	31
Missouri	9
Montana	1
Nebraska	85
Nevada	4
New Jersey	13
New York	30
North Carolina	60
North Dakota	10
Ohio	67
Oklahoma	24
Oregon	6
South Carolina	46
South Dakota	18
Tennessee	32
Texas	101
Utah	2
Virginia	63
Washington	8
Wisconsin	2
Wyoming	4

Counties in 38 States..... 1,108

Mr. President, let me say also that the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has sent me word and asked that I express for him his concurrence in this matter, that he is unable to be in the Chamber because of his committee meeting now going on, but that the relief which will be brought by adoption of my amendment would mean a great deal to his State and he wishes to be associated with me in this matter.

Mr. President, the apportioned funds for emergency loans are exhausted and \$17 million is needed for loans already approved. It is estimated that at least \$13 million will be needed for approvable emergency loans over the next 3 months. Consequently, my amendment would increase the fund by \$30 million.

Mr. President, earlier this week officials of the Department of Agriculture testified before the Appropriations Committee concerning the need for additional operating loan funds. I will quote pertinent portions of this testimony, which excerpts, Mr. President, give a very good description of the operation of the amendment and its justification:

Operating loans are used to purchase needed livestock, machinery, feed, seed, fertilizer and other farm and home needs. These are crucial needs which farm families cannot postpone to some future time when credit may be more readily available. These needs must be met in the appropriate season every year in order to continue farming.

Without necessary credit inputs, needy and underfinanced farm families cannot obtain the production and income essential to support their families, meet other expenses, pay their rent, taxes and the installments falling due on their debts.

In our opinion, operating credit should not be severely rationed to needy and underfinanced farm families. The availability or lack of operating credit is far too often the final deciding factor in determining whether farm families continue to live and work in rural areas where they desire to remain, or whether they become economic and welfare casualties in the slums.

In addition to providing the inputs essential for the continuance of families in farming, operating loans provide other significant benefits in rural areas. Purchases made with such loan funds and the increased income of borrower families contribute significantly to rural business and employment opportunities in rural areas.

Without adequate operating credit, established operators of small farms and young farm families who desire to take over the operations of retiring farmers are unable to compete with large-scale commercial operators. Some of the large operators desire to purchase additional family farms which become available into their holdings. This results in further reduction in the (1) number of family farms, (2) number of people remaining in rural areas, and (3) need for rural businesses to serve them. This in turn is reflected in deterioration in small towns, local schools, churches, other rural facilities and community organizations.

Operating loan borrowers repay their loans. Between November 1, 1946, when the Farmers Home Administration Act became operative and June 30, 1968, needy and underfinanced farm families received over \$4.0 billion in operating loans. Principal repayments totaled over \$3.2 billion which represents approximately 96 percent of the amount which had fallen due on these loans. The outstanding balance of approximately \$728 million represented for the most part, loans which were not yet due. In addition to principal repayments, operating loan borrowers had repaid \$333 million in interest which is more than six times the amount of principal charged off.

Families receiving operating loans repay those loans on the average in approximately 6 years and graduate to other credit sources. They are self-supporting, pay taxes and are not a continuing burden upon the taxpayer.

This repayable investment by the Government is in vivid contrast to the high continuing monetary and moral costs incurred when needy and underfinanced farm families are not helped in rural areas, are forced off the land, and congregate in slum sections of the cities.

The following excerpt from the 1969 Agricultural Finance Outlook published by the Economic Research Service and released on February 3, 1969, reflects an increasing need for operating loans:

"Reporters agreed that certain groups of operators were having increasing difficulty obtaining adequate loans. Many young or beginning farmers with low capital reserves or equities, operators of small farm units, and farmers who were marginal in one or more respects were being caught in tight financial situations. With demand for relatively low-risk loans continuing strong, many lenders are not interested in putting a lot of money in what they consider to be comparatively high-risk loans."

For a number of years the amount of funds available to new applicants for operating loans has been exhausted well in advance of the end of each fiscal year. In each of the last two fiscal years allocations for initial operating loans were exhausted in a substantial number of states in February. This has been true even though maximum efforts have been made each year to participate with, and supplement, other credit sources in order to reach as many needy farm families as possible with the limited funds available.

Mr. President, the fund for operating loans is now exhausted. I have obtained estimates that over \$100 million will be required to satisfy legitimate needs between now and June 30, 1969. These estimates are as follows:

Applications for initial loans on hand (Dec. 31, 1968)-----	7, 107
New applications to be received, estimated Dec. 31, 1968, to June 30, 1969-----	15, 000
Total -----	22, 107
Based on previous experience 70% of these applications would be expected to result in loans if funds are available -----	15, 475
The average initial operating loan is now-----	\$8, 100
Total initial operating loan needs for the remainder of 1969 fiscal year -----	\$125, 347, 500
Estimated amount required for subsequent loans, remainder of fiscal year 1969, to keep present borrowers in business -----	\$93, 000, 000
Total requirements-----	\$218, 347, 500
Amount OL funds remaining on hand (Dec. 31, 1968) -----	\$118, 294, 695
Total need Dec. 31, 1968 to June 30, 1969 -----	\$100, 052, 805

Mr. President, the people who need these loans are farm families who desire to remain in farming and have the ability to succeed if properly financed. They are generally unskilled in occupations other than farming and will be unable to successfully move into industrial employment. Without credit assistance from FHA, most of them may be forced from their farms.

The record shows that borrowers have paid about 96 percent of the principal maturities on their operating loans. In addition, they have paid interest which is more than six times the amount of writeoffs and judgments on such loans.

This need for loan funds is urgent in every State of the Union, and \$100 million should be made available as soon as possible.

Mr. President, I have received many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls from Arkansas farmers urging that these funds be made available. I will not burden the RECORD by inserting these communications, but I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD copies of letters which I have written to the Senate Appropriations Committee and to the Bureau of the Budget.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 24, 1969.
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As you may know, rainfall of disastrous proportions has made many counties in Arkansas eligible for emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration. This eligibility is meaningless, however, because the revolving fund for FHA emergency loans is exhausted and approved loans cannot be disbursed. Moreover, regular operating loans also are being denied for the same reason.

I am advised that over 100 emergency loans, aggregating over \$1 million, are being withheld from Arkansas farmers at the present time. Nationwide, I understand that there may be more than 3,000 such loans totaling about \$17 million. I am obtaining more detailed information from the Farmers Home Administration and when it is received, I will furnish it to the Committee.

During your hearings on appropriations for the FHA, I hope you will explore this situation with agency officials and take whatever action may be necessary to provide as soon as possible more adequate funds for both emergency and operating loans.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1969.
HON. ROBERT P. MAYO,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MAYO: Enclosed for your information is a copy of my letter to Senator Holland, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations. This letter concerns the urgent need for additional funds to permit disbursement of approved emergency and operating loans by the Farmers Home Administration. I understand that as much as \$25 million for operating loans and \$6 million for emergency loans could be released to the agency to meet these urgent needs. I hope that you may act promptly to provide these funds, and I would appreciate a report upon the matter at your convenience.

With best wishes, I am,
Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment has a most worthy purpose, especially when I read in the press that an increase of several million dollars in funds has already been agreed to for Apollo 10, and how much the missiles cost. To me, it is absurd and utterly indefensible that the farmers of this country, who need this money and who will repay the loans, cannot get this kind of financial assistance at the present time, even when the loans are already approved. I repeat, it is utterly indefensible for this country not to give some priority to this kind of need for our farmers.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Sena-

tor has yielded to me because I have some information which I should like to place in the RECORD and which I hope will persuade my distinguished friends to withdraw the amendment.

I am as much interested in meeting emergency loans now as any Senator in this Chamber. I am also as much interested as any Senator in this Chamber, including my good friend from North Dakota, whom I see in his seat, who is always interested in the subject of meeting the operating loan needs of the Farmers Home Administration. I have some information on these two subjects which I should like to communicate at this time, if I may.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, indeed.

Mr. HOLLAND. In the first place, the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) supplied to the subcommittee now engaged in hearings on the annual bill a communication, several days ago, which was placed in the RECORD, which showed the facts which he has stated here upon the record today as to the need in his own State—and it exists in some other States—for emergency loans.

He also stated in that letter the need for an increase in the operating loan funds.

Following that time, the Senator from Florida, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations which handles these matters, communicated this need of the State of Arkansas, and other States, for emergency loans and communicated the general exhaustion of operating loan funds in several States to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Department of Agriculture.

The Department has replied and I ask unanimous consent that the first four paragraphs of their reply be incorporated in my remarks at this point.

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

EMERGENCY LOANS

1. Status of emergency credit revolving fund:

Through March 20, 1969, the Bureau of the Budget had apportioned \$104 million from the Emergency Credit Revolving Fund for use in fiscal year 1969. Virtually all of these funds have been spent. Also as of March 20, 1969, the Fund had \$5,495,308 which could be apportioned for use in this fiscal year. An additional \$7.5 million in receipts to the Fund is anticipated during the remainder of the year. These could also be made available for emergency loans, if apportioned by the Bureau of the Budget.

2. Number emergency loans which cannot be funded:

After apportioned funds were exhausted it was necessary for the Farmers Home Administration Finance Office to return approximately 3,000 approved emergency loan applications for which checks could not be issued. Counties are no longer accepting applications for emergency loans.

3. Where are the designated emergency loan areas?

Attached is a schedule by states showing 1,108 designated emergency loan counties in 38 states.

4. Efforts to increase the emergency credit revolving fund:

The Bureau of the Budget originally approved the apportionment of \$64 million for Emergency Credit Revolving Fund for fiscal

year 1969. On January 21, the Department requested that an additional \$36 million be apportioned for use in this Fund. The Bureau of the Budget did not act on this request. On February 3, the Department requested the release of \$15 million (from \$64 million to \$79 million). This was approved on February 6. On February 12, the Department requested an increase of \$12 million. No action was taken on this request. On February 24, the Department requested an increase of \$41 million (from \$79 million to \$120 million). At that time it was expected that receipts would be sufficient to carry out an emergency program at the \$120 million level. On March 4, the Bureau of the Budget released \$25 million of the \$41 million requested.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the first thing I would like to deal with is the emergency loans. The information transmitted to me by the Department of Agriculture states that, as of March 20, 1969, the fund now has \$5,495,308 in funds which can be apportioned for use in this fiscal year for the emergency program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. How much was it?

Mr. HOLLAND. \$5,495,308. At the same time they stated that, by the end of this fiscal year, unless there is a complete failure of the practices heretofore followed, there will be an additional \$7.5 million, or more, of collections from emergency loans heretofore made.

The Senator knows—in fact, I think he has already stated—that this fund is a revolving fund, which will thereby, by the receipt of this \$7.5 million or more, come to approximately \$13 million which will be available during the remainder of this year.

The Department stated that it has not made a request because of this fact, and because it believes \$13 million will cover its needs. Attention is called to the fact, however, that we will hold hearings on the large second supplemental appropriation bill, very shortly.

I want to assure the Senator that, having been through these emergencies when I was Governor, and later, I have very great sympathy for the filling immediately of emergency needs. I do not believe the handling of those emergency needs in the Department was understated in that statement furnished to me, and according to that information, there will be \$13 million, or perhaps more, in funds for use during the remainder of this fiscal year.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Has it been apportioned? I was told it was not apportioned and not available by the Budget Bureau. Is that correct?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Department has not yet requested it, but it will do so at once. We have told them it is needed and they must request it at once.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why do they turn down an approved loan? Several men have called me on the phone and said they were turned down and had been told the agency had no money.

Mr. HOLLAND. I must say we must have some charity toward a new administration and the head of the new administration's agency handling the fund. I have no reason at all, after having discussed it, to believe that there will be any further delay in requesting this fund.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am pleased to hear that.

Mr. HOLLAND. I think they both will be handled at once. The Senator from Florida has already requested the apportionment of the \$25 million for the operating funds which was withheld out of the total appropriation of \$275 million which we made last year. The budget at that time was only \$250 million. Our committee stepped it up to \$300 million. I think the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) was one of those most interested in that increase. In conference it had to be stepped down to \$275 million. Of that amount the Bureau of the Budget withheld \$25 million under Public Law 90-364, the act which we passed—calling for budgetary reductions and reductions in expenditures.

I was sorry that \$25 million was withheld from the \$275 million. I have already requested that it be reinstated.

I want to make it clear that this request is not in any way political. The members of my subcommittee who are members of the Republican Party, which is now in power so far as the executive is concerned, but not so far as the legislative is concerned, are joining in this effort with just as much zeal in this respect as are members of the Democratic Party, which happens to be in the majority in the legislative body but not in control of the executive.

I think this will be accomplished very shortly. If it is not, I want to say to my distinguished friend that I shall be in favor of putting new funds in the second supplemental appropriation bill; but I much prefer to have the appropriation of the Congress already made and outstanding to be made immediately available. I am doing everything I can toward that end.

I invite my distinguished friend and his able colleague, and others who are adversely affected locally right now by the fact that the emergency loan funds are impaired or exhausted temporarily, to join me and to join other members of our subcommittee who are requesting immediate action on this matter. I think immediate action will be taken.

I would hope that my distinguished friend would either withdraw or withhold his amendment, because these funds for the CCC are so badly needed. These funds affect his State vastly more than they affect mine, because it has to do with the operation of the CCC in the field of staples, of which we produce very few in my State. I would hope he would withhold his amendment, because we need this measure to go in effect at once. Not only are the assets of the CCC exhausted, but they have had to reach over into section 32 and borrow \$219 million. As I understand it, they are practically exhausted. If we do not pass the measure, various operations so ably described in the memorandum of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), which has been placed in the RECORD, will all have to stop. They are operations which will adversely affect not only the agriculture of this country, but our relations with other, poor countries whom we are helping under the Food for Freedom Act. I

know of my friend's interest in that worthy objective throughout the years.

So I hope he will not press his amendment. It will just hold up this bill in conference. We are coming to the Easter vacation. I do not know whether we could dispose of this measure before that time, and I do not want to see stopped the very important operations of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. Now I yield to my senior colleague.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the word "emergency," with respect to these emergency funds, has great significance. It describes the situation which is confronting many farmers in Arkansas, today. Also speaking of being charitable toward this administration, I certainly want to be, and have been; but the delay in the releasing of these funds is not charitable toward the farmers of this country who are suffering. If these funds can be released and made available, that should be done now—not next week or 2 weeks from now. This is the 27th of March. It is the planting season. The farmers cannot proceed with their plans for making a crop this year without these funds and without knowing whether they can get them or not. At this moment the farmers are completely at a standstill.

Perhaps the amendment would delay the releasing of the funds. I do not know. But the administration must act on whatever power it has and give the farmers some relief. If the administration does so, it will indicate an intent to meet the responsibility of the Government in this area and relieve the distressed condition which now prevails. Much of it is not due to the farmer. Much of it has been aggravated by the longshoremen's strike which the Government has tolerated and to which it has taken no positive action to terminate. The farmers in my State have suffered by reason of conditions over which they have no control.

As my distinguished colleague points out, these loans have been approved, and upon approval of them, the farmers have the right to make their plans accordingly, and to anticipate that the funds will be available to make their crop this year.

I thank my distinguished colleague, and I commend him for offering the amendment. I realize there is a problem; but how can we make the administration understand that an emergency is an emergency, and get them to act accordingly?

I can see no reason for delay. The administration has already procrastinated entirely too long. These funds should have been released and as much of them as possible put into the hands of our farmers long before now.

I again thank my distinguished colleague and commend him for offering the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further comment? Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I may have stated, and if I did not I wish to state it now, because I want to be completely fair to the De-

partment of Agriculture. The Department has already requested the release of the \$25 million, and in fact has requested it three different times; this slowdown or holdup is in the Bureau of the Budget.

My own feeling is that the Bureau of the Budget has not yet really understood what its responsibility is in the handling of all of the fund requests pending in this Government. I am bringing to their attention as urgently as I can the fact that this \$25 million should be released. I am asking the Department to make the same request as to the emergency fund, and I know that it is going to be made.

What I am asking here is that my fellow Senators bring their influence, much greater than mine, to bear upon the Bureau of the Budget in this matter, because I do not think that anyone is so inhuman as to wish to hold up the availability of emergency funds for people who have been drowned out, and that is what has happened in the great State so ably represented by my two friends from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thank the Senator. I have already written a letter, and expect to follow that up. We may be able to persuade the Bureau of the Budget. I did not realize exactly what the situation was that the Senator mentioned.

I yield now to the Senator from Texas, who has been standing on his feet for a good while.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for yielding to me, because I wish to be associated with his remarks on this matter.

I approve whatever course he takes, whether he withdraws or wishes to push his amendment, because he has had the benefit of long study.

This is, I suggest, an emergency situation. Out of the 254 counties in my State, 101 have been declared eligible for emergency loans, mainly because of weather conditions. The disparate nature of the weather in the different parts of my State, stretching from the cold area of the northwest to the subtropical area of the southwest, makes it an area of conflicting air currents, which sometimes cause great damage.

Many approved loans are unfunded. We have called down to the Department of Agriculture today, and the Acting Assistant Administrator for Operating Loans says there is no money for this purpose available this fiscal year. That is what they told us today: No money available for this purpose this fiscal year. That means the 30th of June. That means ruination for these farmers.

I am glad that the senior Senator from Arkansas has come into the Chamber, because I have just reported here that we called the Department of Agriculture today, and the Acting Assistant Administrator for these operating loans told us that there is no money available for this purpose for this fiscal year. There are many approved loans in my State; 101 counties of the 254 have been declared eligible counties.

The modest amendment of the Sena-

tor from Arkansas is for \$130 million. We spend about \$3 billion a month on the war in South Vietnam, with 17 million people there. There are about that many farmers in the United States; I think we ought to be willing to spend \$130 million on those who are potentially in a disaster status.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. We are not even spending it, just lending it to them, and they have a very good record of repayment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator mentioned that. This is not giving away anything; this is a loan program, there has been a profit of \$330 million on these FHA loans—six times the losses on that kind of loan.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is about 95 percent repayment.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. We are only asking the Government to loan some money to the farmers in areas that have been declared disaster areas. I think the freezing of this money is wholly inexcusable—this modest amount of money, with its importance to the whole farm economy of America.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one brief insertion?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator, how does he explain this? The Senator from Texas says this morning the Department of Agriculture said there are no funds available this fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. They have not been approved for that use by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why did they not tell the Senator from Texas the expenditure has not been approved, but the money is available, instead of just leaving the impression there is not any?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Of course, Mr. President, I did not know all the technical considerations. They just told us there was no more money for this fiscal year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator misunderstood them, because I have already placed in the RECORD their statement to me, that as of March 20 they had between \$5 and \$6 million available, and that other receipts were coming in—in the amount of \$7.5 million or more before the end of the year.

May I, at this time, place in the RECORD a list—

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I did not misunderstand what they told me. They may have told the Senator something else.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have placed in the RECORD the written statement furnished by them to me, which I know they would not make in writing unless that was the fact.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the complete list of counties, by States, where emergencies exist, as furnished to me by the Department of Agriculture. It shows there are 101 such counties in Texas.

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

Designated emergency loan areas, Mar. 25, 1969

Alabama	60
Arkansas	36
California	15
Colorado	9
Delaware	3
Georgia	80
Idaho	8
Illinois	60
Indiana	79
Iowa	43
Kansas	36
Kentucky	8
Louisiana	20
Maine	1
Maryland	9
Michigan	16
Minnesota	9
Mississippi	31
Missouri	9
Montana	1
Nebraska	85
Nevada	4
New Jersey	13
New York	30
North Carolina	60
North Dakota	10
Ohio	67
Oklahoma	24
Oregon	6
South Carolina	46
South Dakota	18
Tennessee	32
Texas	101
Utah	2
Virginia	63
Washington	8
Wisconsin	2
Wyoming	4

Counties in 38 States..... 1,108

Mr. FULBRIGHT. May I ask the Senator from Florida, with these repayments in the emergency fund, is it the Department's view, even though they are repaid, that they are frozen and not available until the Budget Bureau takes further action?

Mr. HOLLAND. Unfortunately, the law which we all voted for makes that provision. The Bureau of the Budget has to approve the expenditure of funds that come in.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But it is discretionary with them; they do not have to freeze it?

Mr. HOLLAND. It is discretionary with them, and that is why I want my distinguished friends and others to bear down upon the Bureau of the Budget, so they can make it immediately available. I am sure this is the quickest way to get relief; I would not suggest it if I did not think it would get results.

I do not think the Senator would be justified in bringing about a possible impasse, on the pending bill in conference, or the possible absence of a conference until after Easter. Let us try this out, and use our very best efforts. I do not believe the Director of the Budget is an inhuman man. This is the first test we have to discover just how far he will go in meeting human needs of this kind. I am satisfied that he will act, and act favorably, and I want to give him that opportunity.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me one moment, to clarify a point?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I think the statement the distinguished Senator from

Florida just made verifies the accuracy of what the Department of Agriculture told me this morning, that this money was not available for this fiscal year, because the Senator has now said it would take action by the Bureau of the Budget to unfreeze this money.

That is all I have been contending. I think that the prior intimation that my information was wrong is now shown by the statement of the Senator from Florida to be false. These loans have been frozen; they have been approved, but they are unfunded. Hundreds of unfunded loans are approved right now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of counties in Texas which are eligible for FHA emergency loans.

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

COUNTIES IN TEXAS ELIGIBLE FOR FHA EMERGENCY LOANS

Aransas	Haskell
Armstrong	Hays
Austin	Hidalgo
Bastrop	Howard
Baylor	Hunt
Brazoria	Hutchinson
Brazos	Jackson
Brooks	Jefferson
Burleson	Jim Wells
Caldwell	Karnes
Calhoun	Kaufman
Cameron	Kleberg
Carson	Knox
Castro	Lamar
Chambers	Lamb
Childress	Lavaca
Cochran	Lee
Collin	Liberty
Collingsworth	Lipscomb
Colorado	Live Oak
Comanche	Lubbock
Coryell	Lynn
Crosby	McLennan
Dallam	Madison
Dawson	Matagorda
Deaf Smith	Mitchell
Delta	Montgomery
Dickens	Moore
Donley	Motley
Duval	Nacogdoches
Ellis	Navarro
Falls	Nueces
Fannin	Ochiltree
Fayette	Oldham
Floyd	Orange
Foard	Parmer
Fort Bend	Red River
Gaines	Refugio
Galveston	San Patricio
Garza	Sherman
Goliad	Swisher
Gonzales	Terry
Gray	Throckmorton
Grimes	Victoria
Hale	Waller
Hall	Washington
Hansford	Wharton
Hardeman	Wilbarger
Hardin	Willacy
Harris	Wilson
Hartley	

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I commend the Senator from Arkansas for the fight he is making for funds for farmers under the emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration. These

loans can only be made, in the first place, to farmers who cannot obtain credit elsewhere. There is a greater need for funds for this program now than at any other time in the past 10 or 15 years. Operating costs are high—the highest ever—and people are leaving the farms at a rate of 500,000 a year.

This is the equivalent of establishing five new cities of 100,000 population each. The best way and the surest way to keep the farmers on the farm, where they want to be, is to make them loans of 30 percent so that they can stay there and continue to operate their farms.

The record reflects a remarkable record of repayment. It is approximately 96 percent.

I do share the feelings of my friend, the Senator from Florida, however, that we should put this provision in a later supplemental bill and in the meantime we should work with the Bureau of the Budget to release the funds for this purpose which they are holding up now. A supplemental bill for the Commodity Credit Corporation is being considered now. This amendment would delay this important measure.

This restoration of Commodity Credit Corporation funds is needed for the food-for-peace program and to permit loans to be made to farmers under commodity programs, or these loans and payments should be made and are very necessary.

I would hope that my friend, the Senator from Arkansas, would withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I support the amendment introduced by the Senator from Arkansas to provide \$30 million in additional funds for the emergency credit revolving fund of the Farmers Home Administration.

For years the emergency loan program of the Farmers Home Administration has been hampered by the inadequacy of its loan fund. The situation has grown worse and it now is, in fact, desperate.

The very name of the program—"emergency loan"—underscores its importance. A farmer is not eligible for a loan under this program unless, because of crop failure or disaster, he is in dire and immediate need of assistance. The program is designed to save farmers who are in real and great need. Yet, there are farmers in Alabama and throughout America for whom emergency loans have been approved, but the Farmers Home Administration tells them there is no money to lend. This situation makes a mockery of the program. It is indefensible and intolerable.

The needed \$30 million should be voted for this program. Unless we act now, more of our farmers will be forced out of farming.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for operating loans, under the Farmers Home Administration, the authorization for fiscal year 1969 is in the amount of \$275 million. This amount was authorized in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, signed into law August 8, 1968.

The budget estimate for fiscal year 1969 was in the amount of \$250 million

and the House bill last summer recommended this amount. However, in the Senate Committee on Appropriations the sum was increased to \$300 million, and the compromise in conference authorized the sum of \$275 million.

The committee has been advised that under the mandate to the administration ordered last summer by the Congress, \$25 million of this sum of \$275 million has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget and is not available for the purpose for which Congress authorized this sum.

These loans are made to farmers and ranchers for costs incident to reorganizing a farming system for more profitable operations and for a variety of essential farm expenses.

For many years, the Congress has provided sums in excess of the amount made available for the current fiscal year. In 1968, \$300 million was available. In 1967, \$350 million was made available. In 1966, 1965, and 1964, \$300 million was made available.

In view of the case which has been made for this additional sum, I would hope that the administration would release the \$25 million which has been placed in reserve. I can see nothing to be gained by placing additional funds in this emergency resolution since the administration already has funds if it will only release them.

With reference to the emergency credit revolving funds, the budget contains an estimate of \$31,918,000 for fiscal year 1970. This sum is to be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for a \$30 million loan from that Corporation to the revolving fund, which was authorized by Congress last year, plus the interest charges on the loan. There is no request pending before the Congress for additional funds for revolving fund for fiscal year 1969. Through March 20, 1969, the Bureau of the Budget has apportioned \$104 million from the emergency credit revolving fund for use in fiscal year 1969. The Department of Agriculture has advised the committee that virtually all of these funds have been expended. As of March 20, the fund had a balance of \$5,495,308, which could be apportioned for use in this fiscal year plus receipts of some estimated \$7½ million.

Again, I would express the hope that the administration would release this approximate \$13 million so that it can be utilized for these worthy emergency cases—and, to repeat, I can see nothing to be gained by placing additional funds in this emergency resolution since there are funds available now if the administration will only release them.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the efforts of the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT). I feel that the emergency loan program and the operating loans program administered by the Farmers Home Administration are vital, and that it is important that these programs be adequately funded to meet the needs of farmers. Indications are that emergency loans are going to be in great demand this spring due to the increased

snowfall in the northern States, and the operating loan program is already short of funds and is unable to meet the present demands. It is my understanding that the Bureau of the Budget is withholding some \$38 million which could be expended in these two programs if funds were released by the Bureau of the Budget. I feel that in view of the fact that these funds have been frozen, the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas should be adopted. In my own State of Oklahoma, farmers must have operating loans and emergency loans through the Farmers Home Administration in order to meet year-to-year operating expenses, as well as to overcome economic pressures of natural disasters such as rain, floods, tornadoes, and the like. I therefore hope that the amendment will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I thank the Senators from North Dakota, Florida, Texas, Alabama, Oklahoma, and Mississippi for joining in this matter.

I believe that in view of what has been said, especially by the Senator from Florida—who is the best authority I know really on this subject—that it might be wiser to follow the course he suggests.

I am reluctant to withdraw the amendment. However, I shall pursue the matter with the Bureau of the Budget. As the Senator said, this would be a quicker method than if we were to go to conference on the bill because of the inclusion of the amendment.

With that understanding and that explanation which I am very pleased to have this morning, I will not formally offer and press the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I will continue my efforts and will see to it that the other Senators do the same to get the two funds released.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I express appreciation to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas for not pressing the amendment.

The Senator has made a fine case, and I hope that the administration will release the \$25 million which has been placed in reserve by the Bureau of the Budget. As I stated earlier, I see nothing to be gained by placing the additional funds in the emergency resolution. The administration has the funds already, if they will release them.

The bill will not have to go to conference if there is no amendment.

I join the Senator from Florida and the other Senators in urging that the Bureau of the Budget release those funds.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I support the administration's request for a supplemental appropriation for the Commodity Credit Corporation. The appropriation is necessary simply because the price support programs are mandatory. CCC expenditures are fixed charges, and funds are so low, they will be depleted by the middle of April.

I applaud Secretary Hardin's decision to maintain advance payments to farmers at the customary 50-percent level which prevailed for the past 8 years. That

decision accounts, in part, for the need for a supplemental request at this time.

During consideration of this bill, we should recognize the importance to the farmer of the attitude of the new administration toward agriculture.

President Johnson's budget, submitted in January, proposed to slash advance payments to farmers to 25 percent instead of the 50 percent which was customary and which had been expected. There had been no advance notice of this decision, not even during the announcement of the 1969 feed grains program in December.

President Nixon and Secretary Hardin quickly concluded the obvious: the farmer had not been given sufficient notice and the Government had a moral obligation to continue the rate without abrupt change. Therefore, Secretary Hardin restored the 50-percent advance payment.

It must be recognized, Mr. President, that this supplemental appropriation will not increase expenditures. By advancing 1969 crop payments in this fiscal year, the 1970 budget will be reduced by a similar amount. This was a necessary and wise step.

I commend President Nixon and Secretary Hardin for taking a commonsense look at the problems of the farmer. It indicates that this administration truly is concerned with assisting our agricultural industry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 584) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move to lay the motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORITY FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT, PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE, OR ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN DULY ENROLLED BILLS OR JOINT RESOLUTION DURING THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President, President pro tempore, or Acting President pro tempore be authorized to sign any duly enrolled bill or joint resolution during the adjournment of the Senate until March 31, 1969.

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

S. 1715—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF KONG WING SIK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to introduce on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. Mon-

TOYA) a bill for the relief of Kong Wing Sik.

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

The bill (S. 1715) for the relief of Kong Wing Sik, introduced by Mr. BYRD of West Virginia (for Mr. MONTYA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1717—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCREASE THE PERSONAL EXEMPTION FROM \$600 TO \$1,200

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for proper reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal exemption from \$600 to \$1,200. The present \$600 exemption was provided by the Revenue Act of 1948. In the 21 years that have passed since its adoption, the cost of living has increased 48.1 percent—based on the level of consumer price indexes in 1948, average, and in January 1969—so that the \$600 would have to be raised to \$889 merely to equal the purchasing power of the \$600 exemption 21 years ago.

Our standard of living has changed substantially over this period of time, also. Life in the 1960's is quite different from that in the 1940's. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has just published a study which attempts to answer the question: How much does it cost to live for an urban family of four in the spring of 1967 for three standards of living? The resulting three budgets share the basic assumption that maintenance of health and social well-being, the nurture of children, and participation in community activities are desirable and necessary social goals.

For the moderate budget, the U.S. urban average family cost was \$9,076 in spring of 1967. The cost for the lower budget was \$5,915, and the higher budget amounted to \$13,050. The personal exemptions for a family of four today total \$2,400 which does not even approach the total of the lower budget. Certainly exemptions totaling \$4,800, which my bill will provide, would be far more equitable.

A study by the Social Security Administration in 1966 showed the "poverty line" for a nonfarm family of four was \$3,335. Anyone who falls below the poverty line will have less than a minimum diet for health or will have to choose between necessities. Under present tax law a family of four with an adjusted gross income of \$3,335 has to pay \$46 in Federal income taxes. My proposal would exempt a family of four from Federal income taxation until their adjusted gross income exceeded \$4,800.

The most frequently heard argument against increasing the personal exemption is the revenue that would be lost to the Government. But we can regain this revenue by enacting measures of tax reform to close at least some of the loopholes through which billions of dollars escape the Treasury each year. In addition, the tax savings to individuals resulting from an increase in the personal exemption to \$1,200 will come back to

the Government in the form of higher taxes because of higher profits of those in the food processing industries who will sell more goods if the poor have money to buy it. Personal expenditures represent over 60 percent of the gross national product. These additional funds in the hands of consumers will increase the incomes and the profits of grocery stores, appliance dealers, clothing manufacturers, and others, which will result in a correspondingly larger tax base for the Federal Government, and increased revenues.

We cannot continue to ignore the plight of the low- and middle-income taxpayer. In addition to the burden of Federal income taxes and inflation that I have outlined above, he is also being subjected to rapidly increasing State and local taxes and the recently effected increase in social security taxes.

We must remove the glaring inequity of the present personal exemption from our tax structure. Since February 18, the House Ways and Means Committee has been conducting extensive tax reform hearings. It is to be hoped that resulting legislation will assure greater equity and fairness in the tax system so that some wealthy tax-dodging individuals and special-interest groups will no longer be able to avoid their fair share of taxation. But we cannot wait for this time-consuming process to be concluded. We must give the low- and middle-income taxpayer relief now. And immediate increase in the personal exemption to \$1,200, in my opinion, is the best way to accomplish this objective.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point 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. 1717) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$1,200 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness) introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "\$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,200":

- (1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);
 - (2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);
 - (3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and
 - (4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).
- (b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "\$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "\$2,400":

- (1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to per-

sons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

SEC. 2. (a) Section 3(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than \$5,000, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964) is amended—

- (1) by inserting after "After December 31, 1964" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1967, 1968, and 1969";
- (2) by striking out "beginning after December 31, 1964," and inserting in lieu thereof "beginning on or after January 1, 1967, and before January 1, 1970,"; and
- (3) by striking out "After December 31, 1964" each place it appears in the tables and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1967, 1968, and 1969".

(b) Section 3 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) TAXABLE YEARS BEGINNING AFTER DECEMBER 31, 1969.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1969, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than \$5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall correspond in form to the tables in subsection (b) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 if the taxable income were computed by taking either the 10-percent standard deduction or the minimum standard deduction."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code (relating to number of exemptions) is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables in sections 3(a) and 3(b) and the tables prescribed under section 3(c)".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code (relating to husband or wife filing separate return) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return the tax imposed by section 3 shall be—

"(A) for taxable years beginning in 1964, the lesser of the tax shown in table IV or table V of section 3(a),

"(B) for taxable years beginning in 1965, the lesser of the tax shown in table IV or table V of section 3(b), and

"(C) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969, the lesser of the taxes shown in the corresponding tables prescribed under section 3(c).

"(3) Neither table V of section 3(a) nor table V of section 3(b), nor the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), shall apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in table V of section 3(a), table V of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) in lieu of the tax shown in table IV of section 3(a), table IV of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), as the case may be. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code (cross references) is amended by striking out "and table V in section 3(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof "table V in section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended by inserting after "nor table V in section 3(b)" the following: ", nor the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 4302(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

<i>"Percentage method withholding table</i>	
<i>"Payroll period</i>	<i>Amount of one withholding exemption</i>
Weekly -----	\$27.00
Biweekly -----	55.80
Semimonthly -----	58.80
Monthly -----	116.00
Quarterly -----	350.00
Semiannual -----	700.00
Annual -----	1,400.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period) -----	3.80"

(b) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) At the election of the employer and with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee after December 31, 1969, a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a).

"(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before January 1, 1970, a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a):"

(c) Section 3402(m)(1) (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended by striking out "\$700" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$1,400".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first two sections of this Act shall apply only with respect to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969. The amendments made by section 3 of this Act shall apply only with respect to remuneration paid on and after January 1, 1970.

AUTHORITY FOR THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE TO FILE REPORTS DURING THE EASTER RECESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce be authorized to file during the Easter recess reports on various bills that have been pending and on which action will culminate during the Easter recess.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ELLENDER ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 170 to have printed as a Senate document, a report entitled "Review of the United States Foreign Policy and Operation."

I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate meets on Monday next, I be recognized at the conclusion of morning business for a period of 1 hour so that I may make my report to the Senate.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOMEBUILDERS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, largely as a result of the civil disorders in the cities, the Congress and administration last year set as a new national housing goal the construction or rehabilitation of 26 million homes in the next 10 years. This is an average of 2.6 million a year, and it compares with the 1.6 million or so we have been building and rehabilitating annually.

It was a great regret to many of us to hear the new Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Mr. Romney, describe this goal as "unrealistic." I enthusiastically supported the Housing Act of 1968 and its intent to increase greatly the construction of low-income housing. I think what happened in our cities, and what will happen in the future if we do not correct widespread slum conditions, is a lot more "unrealistic" than this Housing Act objective.

We all know we cannot build all the homes we did in 1968 plus 63 percent more each year unless we assure the availability of materials, labor, and other elements that go into their construction. Doing this should be a primary activity of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. Apparently it will have to be taken up by Congress, and I welcome the hearings that will be held this month in the House and Senate Banking and Currency Committees on one of the bottlenecks: lumber and plywood supplies and prices.

A few days ago, the President of the National Association of Homebuilders addressed the annual meeting of the Western Wood Products Association on this very subject. He is Mr. Eugene Gullledge of Greensboro, N.C. His remarks outline the picture very clearly. They

also remind us that Congress is joint manager, along with the Department of Agriculture, of over half the Nation's supply of wood for housing.

His speech should be read by all Members of Congress. Those of us on the Appropriations Committees have a special responsibility to make sure the investment is made in the national forests to produce the wood the Nation needs.

I also call this speech to the attention of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Urban Affairs Council in the White House. The country is waiting to see what leadership these agencies will offer for the realization of a decent home for the 6 million households that do not have one.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Gullledge's speech of March 6, in San Francisco, Calif., be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TEXT OF SPEECH GIVEN BY EUGENE A. GULLEDGE, OF GREENSBORO, N.C., PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF HOMEBUILDERS, MARCH 6, ANNUAL MEETING OF THE WESTERN WOOD PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF.

It is a great pleasure to me to be with you, my fellow members of the home building industry. If we didn't have lumber, I can assure you in this country we wouldn't have any homes. The National Association of Home Builders intends to do its part to see to it that there is available enough timber in this country to build the homes of this nation. Our objectives are parallel with yours in all respects in this quest. We have, as an organization, the responsibility of trying to make certain that the people of this nation of ours are properly housed.

In 1949 the Congress enacted a Housing Act. In the preamble to that it established the concept that every American family should be housed in a decent home in a decent environment. That was a concept. There was no implementation of that concept, however, in legislation until the 1968 Housing Act which translated that concept to some tangible goals. Those tangible goals have caused a lot of concern in the minds of a lot of people.

Statistically speaking, this nation produced its greatest number of living units in 1950 when we reached a production of approximately 1,950,000 living units. At that time, less than 10 per cent of that production was multi-family and 90 per cent was single family. At that time, we used approximately 4.9 per cent of our Gross National Product in producing those living units.

Our country has grown since then. Our demand for housing has grown. It is anticipated that by the end of this century, another 31 years, our population will have grown from 200 million to about 335 million people, a 67.5% increase. In order to satisfy the housing demands of those people and all the other demands which housing requires, the housing and construction industry in effect will have to rebuild America.

We have the responsibility to do it—to rebuild America—to duplicate again every existing thing we've got—all the homes and all the churches, and all the shopping centers and all the hotels, and all the sewage treatment facilities and all the schools, and all the water plants. Not only do we face a near-doubling of our population, but continuing obsolescence is taking away thousands of housing units from the market. The attrition rate is two-thirds of a million units a year—

some 665,000 living units a year disappear by reason of hurricanes, flood and fire, and by reason of bulldozer and the termite, and a change in use. We then have a challenge given to this industry to rebuild America. We are going to have to do it *not* by technological breakthroughs, so hoped-for and so highly touted by people who are *not* knowledgeable in the field. We are going to do it by methods which the industry has the capability of using right now today.

HOUSING TASTES CHANGE LITTLE

We are going to house the traditional American family in the traditional American house in the year 2000 as well as we are doing it in the year 1969. There's a very simple reason why. People are quite willing to come to a "modern" hotel. They are quite willing to live in a "modern" apartment. They couldn't care less whether it is made of stone, or whether it is made of fiberglass, or whether it is made of plastic or wood. But when it comes round to building their house in which they are going to raise their families and in which they are going to put their money—*without fail*, and I emphasize *without fail*, every market survey going shows that people want a house quite similar to the house in which they grew up. As a consequence, you and I were raised in traditional homes and we, today, in the main want traditional homes for ourselves. Our children are being raised in traditional homes and they are going to be the people who will be buying the homes and living in those homes at the end of this century.

There have been numerous efforts made by interested entrepreneurs, homebuilders if you will, to try to create a new concept of living, a new way in which people can live, a new type of house. Unfortunately, this has been done by too many people who could not learn from the other fellow's mistakes. Industry and individuals literally have dropped millions of dollars in the failure of these efforts.

All surveys which are aimed at trying to find out what people want to live in, what they'll pay their money for—and there's a vast difference—inevitably come to the conclusion that they want a house pretty much like the one Mom and Dad had, assuming it was a decent house. So I say to you, as we rebuild America, we are going to be doing it with traditional materials. To you, of course, that means wood and to us, as home builders, it means wood. To the nation, we hope it means wood.

Let's be realistic about it. We in the industry have been going through a rather traumatic experience since 1966. At that time we were suffering from what is known as "tight money". The money was not there. Because it wasn't there, a lot of homes weren't built and the rate of production of housing in this country in October of 1966 got down to 848,000 units, about half the normal rate which we had expected. As a result, we had a terrible housing shortage.

In trying to recover from that housing shortage, we produced in 1967 some 1.3 million units. In 1968 we produced 1.54 million units. In 1968 a Housing Bill was enacted that said the national objective and goal shall be to build 2.6 million units per year for each of the next 10 years. And that's what will be needed in order to get our people to the point where most of them are living in decent homes. Because that goal is so much higher than we have been doing, (and we should produce about 1.55 million units this year) a lot of sensible people say it is impossible to achieve.

LUMBER BOTTLENECK IN ACHIEVING HOUSING GOALS

A lot of people say that under generally normal conditions we could have been producing 1,750,000 housing units this year. But because of the scarcity of lumber and plywood and its price, and because of the scarcity of money and its price, plans are

being scaled down. The American public will be denied the opportunity of having some 200,000 units of housing produced that should have been produced. This throws us that much farther behind in national objectives.

Now, if in this period of *not*, 1968 and 1969, when we are producing 1.5 million units in round figures we are having lumber scarcities, how are we going to get the lumber and plywood to build another 1 million units more?

SOCIAL NECESSITY FOR MORE HOUSING

It is not enough to say to the home builder, "You've got all the housing produced that you can possibly produce so don't worry if you can't produce enough". If we fail to produce enough, there are people out there who will not have a decent home because we didn't produce it, and they'll get mighty disturbed.

Otto Kerner, a former Governor of Illinois, was appointed by President Johnson in 1967 to head the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. It became known as the Kerner Riot Commission. Among the three principal reasons which the Kerner Commission determined were the causes of riots in 1967 was the inadequate supply of housing. It has been estimated by the experts that there are somewhere between 6 to 7 million substandard occupied living units in this country today. More are being created every day.

People living in substandard homes do not have the opportunity of feeling that they, in many cases, are participating in the economic progress of this country. Social progress is held back, and this country simply cannot afford to have a sizable segment of its population so dissatisfied with the neighborhoods in which they live that they are willing to burn them down.

That is what has been happening. They're so disgusted with the situation in which they find themselves they are simply willing to burn it down. We've got to do something about that. This nation cannot afford the riots; it cannot afford the civil disorders and all that spring from it.

We must find solutions to these problems, and it will not be sufficient for you and me to have a comfortable level of business. We cannot be fat cats, we cannot be satisfied people. We've got to be people who are concerned, who are involved, and who are committed to the idea of producing enough housing for the people of this nation so that that national goal will be realized—that every American family will have the opportunity of being housed in a decent home in a decent environment. We've got to become really seriously concerned about how we solve it.

The home builders were greatly concerned last year, as they are this year, with lumber from the standpoint of supply and price. It is a legitimate concern. You cannot expect them not to be disturbed over the price situation. Many of you who may be distributors, as well as the producers, are getting it from both ends. Customers are complaining, boiling, and crying. Of course, the mills are, too, and you are probably in a position where you can satisfy nobody, and everybody is wanting to blame everybody else—and that's the name of the game, too. Nobody really wants to say, "It's our fault." I can tell you this, it is not sufficient for anybody to blame anybody.

COMMON EFFORT REQUIRED

Home builders are not satisfied with trying to pin the donkey's tail on any part of the industry. Home builders, and I'm sure you, too, are interested in solving the problem. How do we make certain that the housing needs of this nation may be met in order that the nation may be spared the trials which accompanied the riots and disorders in the past?

Let me assure you that if we fail, we are

going to reap a far greater harvest of terror and destruction than we have ever had in the past. It's a challenging proposition, it's a sobering thing which makes us get in and dig and commit ourselves through our Association activities, yours and mine, to start finding some solution to these things. That's our overall concern.

You'll recall astronaut Anders who went around the moon with two companions last Christmas season. He said, "Whatever the mind of man can conceive, man can achieve." It is purely a question of dedication.

When President Kennedy was approached in 1960 with the concept that in this decade we would put a man on the moon, he became convinced that we could. He convinced the Congress that we could. Subsequent Congresses appropriated the funds. I don't believe there is a person in this room today who doesn't think that we will have a man on the moon before the end of this decade. Yet, how many people thought we really could in 1960. Very few. The goal will be achieved because there is dedication to achieving that goal. Simply that!

You and I as citizens first and all of this country, and as businessmen, can make certain that there is enough dedication on the part of public officials at all levels of government—City Hall, State Legislatures, and Federal Legislative circles—that we achieve our objective. But we've got to show them how.

Representatives of the forest products industry and the home building industry met with HUD Secretary Romney on Monday, February 24. We spent 2½ hours with the Secretary. We discussed fully with him the problems of lumber supply and price, indicated to him the areas in which we thought the Administration could be effective, areas in which we thought the bureaus could be effective, and areas in which we thought legislative actions were needed. There was no differences of opinion between the home builders and the forest products people on those points. As far as I can tell, there will be no variance between the opinions of home builders and the opinions of the forest products people on achieving those points. But we home builders happen to be a little more restless than are the lumber people. We are the ones who are not being helped, if you will, (I am trying to choose the words carefully and I see some smiles)—we are the ones who are not being helped by the current price situation. As a consequence we would like to see something done about it, and we are going to do our "doggonedest" to see that something is done about it.

We're not going to try to tell you or your industry what sort of profits you ought to have or what the price of lumber really ought to be. Some smarter people than we are, have got to figure that out. But I think that we have a vast experience in dealing with the Congress and dealing with the Administration to try to help interpret to them the consequence and the results of certain actions and what they mean.

We had a meeting with President Johnson in July, 1967. I was present in his office, along with my fellow officers of NAHB. We were dealing at that time with the Congress on a very, very important matter to us. The President told us then, in effect: "Remember one thing, gentlemen, the duty of every member of Congress on the Hill is to serve his people. So, he is first looking at everything in the light of how it is going to affect the people back home. The people back home are going to pass judgment on him." That was very sage, basic advice.

Therefore, we, meaning the home builders and you jointly, will have to make certain that the Congress understands that we do have a legitimate interest—that's for sure—because we are in this business to house those who are going to be the voters for those Congressmen.

NEED TO INCREASE FEDERAL TIMBER SUPPLY

Now, at the beginning I addressed you as "Fellow Members of the Housing Industry" because we are in this business to house those to present the case to the Congress and to the Administration for achieving a number of objectives. We are going to have to persuade the Congress that the amount of timber which is harvested from Federal timberlands should be increased sufficiently to be able to meet the demand for timber in this country. There appears to be currently something on the order of a 10 per cent shortage between the amount of timber being produced and the amount of timber needed. This demand will increase and the objective is to reduce the shortage, hopefully to nil—a balance between supply and demand.

In order to increase the supply of timber, you can only get timber from two places. You can either grow it or import it—one of the two. Our imports show little hope of being dramatically improved. Our growing then becomes our principal way of increasing our supply of timber. The timber which we use for residential construction is roughly balanced about half between what comes off Federal lands and half of what comes off of so-called private lands. The figures are not exact but close enough for the point. The acreage involved on private lands is considerably less than the average involved on the public lands.

Therefore, it is a matter of fact, not opinion, that the public lands are being rather mismanaged in comparison with the private lands. Private holders of forests are doing a good job of professional management. Public managers of public lands, by comparison, are doing worse.

We have got to convince the Congress that the supply of lumber can be most effectively increased in this country by increasing the amount of managerial skill and talent they are willing to allow the Forest Service to use in managing that business enterprise.

FINANCIAL INVESTMENT REQUIRED

Some Forest Service policies will need a close examination. Frankly, I think we need a method of funding the Forest Services business endeavors in order that they, too, might be working on long-range plans. We need a different concept, if you will, really of what a perpetual yield amounts to, what an allowable cut amounts to, and what all the other terms that are germane to the subject amount to in order that we might reach a level of sophistication of forest management in our public lands that is commensurate with the management of our private lands. It can be done—it must be done because it is only through these sources that we can expect to be able to increase effectively the supply of lumber. It is the intention of the National Association of Home Builders to assist in each and every way to achieve these objectives.

We see no way in which the American people will be housed, according to the established goals of the Congress, except through the continued and ever-increasing use of wood products. The timber supply for these products, to a large degree, is in the hands of the Federal government. It is administered under policies which currently preclude those policies from giving a yield from those lands commensurate with what private management does. As a consequence, you will find no departure between our objectives and yours in that respect.

PUBLICLY OWNED RESOURCES BELONG TO ALL THE PEOPLE

There are, however, a few public policy questions to which the lumber industry and the forest products industry must address themselves. I want to tell you some of the areas in which you are going to have to furnish satisfactory answers. You are going to have to recognize first of all that the American public owns those lands. I am not

going to talk about the Sierra Club, and I am not going to talk about recreation. I am not going to talk about the conservationists for conservation's sake. I am going to talk about the fact that the American public wants to make sure that it gets the best value for the dollar received and expended etc. In seeing that our trees—mine and yours—that are sold to lumber producers which produce lumber and forest products—are used wisely.

PRICE RISE FUELS INFLATION

Let me emphasize one thing—the gravest, I repeat—the gravest threat to America today is not Vietnam, the threat of riots in the cities, or unrest on the campuses. It is not the so-called decaying moral attitude of people in college—it is none of those; the gravest threat to America today is the threat of inflation—the psychology which says that if we don't build it today or buy it today it'll cost us more tomorrow; so we had better buy it today. It is the concept that no matter what price I pay for it today, it will be less than I'll have to pay tomorrow.

That threat of inflation becomes the greatest danger to you and me—to all of the nation. It becomes evident, therefore, that those are the factors which are working to produce the most harm in this nation today. It is because of this that you and I have got to address ourselves to the whole problem—what is it that can create within the lumber and forest products industry a situation where a 10 per cent shortage of supply can result in such a drastic increase in price?

I'm not arguing with you whether the price you are selling at is right or wrong. I'm saying that the rapid increase in price is in, and of its own very nature, regardless of merit, inflationary. It has vastly fueled the demand for commensurate increases in the prices of other materials. The brick people want more money for their product, the cement people want more money for their product, and the asphalt shingle people want more money for their product. Labor wants more money for its product, and the labor negotiators are quite aware what's happened to the price of forest products. Whenever you go into negotiations on renewal of your labor contracts don't you think that those people aren't aware of what has happened to the industry prices and the industry profits.

Regardless of your position that they are fair and right, the inflationary aspect of it is what is the most dangerous thing. So you and I—we've got a problem. How are we going to use effectively the national forests which belong to the people and channel the harvest through a private enterprise distribution system without allowing that system to become a principal factor in stimulating inflation? In turn, such a system works against the best interest of the people who own that product. It is an involved statement but this is our problem.

Frankly, neither home builders nor the lumber interests have been successful in addressing ourselves to an appropriate solution but we must work on it. If my good friend, Masud Mehran of Livermore and Diablo, California, will forgive me for telling a story twice, I'd like to close with this: We have a tremendous job ahead of us. It is not short range only; it is not long range only. I'm concerned with how I'm going to get the lumber to build my houses this year, as well as in 1975.

A retired French Marshal was walking through his garden with his gardener and discussing what they could be doing to improve it. The Marshal suggested he'd like to see such and such a tree planted over in a corner, and the gardener replied, "Sir, the tree that you mentioned will take fully 100 years to mature and do the job you want it to do."

The Marshal replied, "In that case, let's plant it this afternoon."

You and I have a big job to do—let's get started this afternoon.

THE PRESIDENT'S STUDY OF THE OIL IMPORT PROGRAM

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, yesterday, President Nixon announced the establishment of a so-called task force to review the Nation's oil import policies. The need for critical review of this program is obvious in light of the inequities of the program and the growing public demand for substantial reform. No region of the country bears the hardship and high price of the oil import program more than New England and there are no more vigorous proponents of reform than the representatives of that region. It is interesting to note, however, that the President's decision to review this program comes at a time when there is pending before the Federal Government a proposal for an oil refinery at Machiasport, Maine, which would give New England, for the first time, its fair share of imports under the present mandatory oil import program. The proposal for a Maine refinery is vigorously opposed by the oil companies who are advocates of the oil import quota system. The direct result of the President's announcement of a study is the indefinite delay of the refinery project. For the moment, the only interests served by the review are those in conflict with the consumer interests of New England.

I am seriously concerned that the only interests served in the long run by President Nixon's study will be those in conflict with the consumer interests of the Nation. My concern stems from the nature of President Nixon's announcement.

The "appointment" of this study group is a repetition of the process which bequeathed the oil import program to the Nation in the first place. In 1957 a Special Committee To Investigate Crude Oil Imports was appointed by President Eisenhower. This Committee was composed of the same Cabinet-level posts which have been named by President Nixon. The 1957 group held no public hearings, took no public testimony, issued no public report justifying their recommendations. Their study resulted in the present mandatory oil import program which has cost the American economy and the consumer over \$40 billion in 10 years.

In light of this result it is no surprise that the President of the American Petroleum Institute in a letter to Arthur Burns on February 5, 1969, stated:

It would be highly desirable to establish another Cabinet-level committee to conduct a study.

The original Cabinet-level group arrived at its recommendations by negotiating with the industry. No consumer groups were consulted. No representatives of consumer interests were included.

What is required at this time is a fresh look at the oil import program.

The Cabinet officers and the Director of Emergency Planning named by Mr. Nixon to a so-called task force already have the specific responsibility for constant surveillance of this program as well as the responsibility to recommend action to the President. This is their responsibility under section 6(a) of Presidential Proclamation No. 3279, as

amended. This responsibility has existed in the Office of Emergency Planning, the Departments of State, Defense, Treasury, the Interior, Commerce, and Labor for a decade, yet no recommendations for change have been forthcoming. In fact, the Oil Import Administration of the Department of the Interior is a strong defender of the present system.

I do not question the capability and integrity of our new Cabinet officials, but they are busy men and the oil import program is a minor part of their responsibilities and it is complex. It is simple commonsense to assume that Secretary Rogers, Secretary Laird, Secretary Kennedy, Secretary Hickel, Secretary Stans, and Secretary Shultz cannot personally devote a great amount of time to this review. It is simple commonsense to assume that unnamed individuals within their departments will carry out this study, perhaps some of the same people who have seen no need for action in a decade.

The concerns of the departments represented in Mr. Nixon's study group legitimately relate to the oil import program and should be represented on a panel charged with reviewing the program. But they are not the only concerns and they certainly have not been vigorously voiced in the past as part of the constant surveillance these departments were supposed to have maintained.

The push for reform has come from Congress and the public. It comes belatedly from the oil industry only because of the threat they see posed to the program by projects such as Machiasport. The industry should not be permitted to huddle behind closed doors with Government to decide the public fate.

What is essential to the public interest at this time is an effective and objective review of the oil import program undertaken, not by anonymous staff members, but by a publicly identifiable group which will have the time to study this program, to take public testimony and include representatives of consumer interests. The questions being raised about the oil import program are not minor. They go to the wisdom of the program's very existence. A program which costs the American consumer \$4 billion a year should be publicly debated and scrutinized, not shunted off for an in-house review. We are at a point in the life of American Government where an educated citizenry is laying claim to its right to know, its right to be included in the decisions which touch its life and its pocketbook. If we are willing to publicly debate the national need for an anti-ballistic-missile system, we should be willing to provide a public forum for debate of the oil import program which has already proved more costly than that military proposal.

Under the law, the President has complete authority for deciding upon an oil import control program. There will be no opportunity for his decisions to be considered and voted upon by Congress. The very least the President can provide is the opportunity for all views about this program to be considered before he reaches his decision. I hope the President

will reconsider the composition of his study group, provide for open hearings and public reports, and by doing so take the public into his confidence.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY,
MARCH 31, 1969

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 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, March 31, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 27, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas P. Turley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Tennessee for the term of 4 years vice Thomas L. Robinson.

Brian P. Gettings, of Virginia, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Virginia for the term of 4 years vice Claude V. Spratley, Jr.

Bill Carnes Murray, of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the northern district of Georgia for the term of 4 years vice Elmer J. Hardegree.

Harold M. Grindle, of Iowa, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Iowa for the term of 4 years vice Charles B. Bendlage, Jr.

Royal K. Buttars, of Utah, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Utah for the term of 4 years vice Ellis Maylett.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 27, 1969:

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK OF THE UNITED STATES

Walter C. Sauer, of the District of Columbia, to be First Vice President of the Export-Import Bank of the United States.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

John A. Nevius to be a member of the Board of Directors of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1969, pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, as amended.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

Nils A. Boe, of South Dakota, to be an Assistant Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in the grade of Lieutenant general:

Maj. Gen. Oren Eugene Hurlbut, XXXXXX

IN THE NAVY

The following-named Reserve officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Don C. Bowman, Jr. Edwin J.
Robert P. Owens Zimmermann, Jr.
William H. Longley

MEDICAL CORPS

George H. Reifenstein

SUPPLY CORPS

George F. Baughman
Heinz H. Loeffler

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Arthur H. Padula

DENTAL CORPS

Harry G. Ewart

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

Harvey P. Lanham	John P. Weinel
Lawrence G. Bernard	Sheldon H. Kinney
Lester E. Hubbell	Herman J. Trum III
Eugene G. Fairfax	William R. McKinney
Means Johnston, Jr.	Julian T. Burke, Jr.
Alexander S. Goodfellow, Jr.	George S. Morrison
Horace H. Epes, Jr.	Roderick O. Middleton
Thomas R. Weschler	Herbert H. Anderson
Malcolm W. Cagle	Damon W. Cooper
Pierre N. Charbonnet, Jr.	Frank B. Stone
Gene R. La Rocque	Harold E. Shear
Percival W. Jackson	William D. Houser
Victor A. Dybdal	Raymond E. Peet
George R. Muse	Mark W. Woods
Roger W. Paine, Jr.	Paul L. Lacy, Jr.
James A. Dare	James L. Holloway III
Harry L. Harty, Jr.	Daniel K. Weitzenfeld
James L. Abbott, Jr.	Norbert Frankenberg
Francis J. Fitzpatrick	Albert J. Clancy, Jr.
Emmett P. Bonner	Thomas B. Owen

MEDICAL CORPS

Felix P. Ballenger

SUPPLY CORPS

Paul F. Cosgrove, Jr. Roland Rieve
Grover C. Heffner Stuart H. Smith
Elliott Bloxom

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Paul E. Seuffer
Spencer R. Smith
James V. Bartlett

DENTAL CORPS

Myron G. Turner

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Eugene T. Rossides, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.
Paul W. Eggers, of Texas, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.
Randolph W. Thrower, of Georgia, to be Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Nathaniel Samuels, of New York, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of State.
Charles A. Meyer, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of State.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
John A. Hannah, of Michigan, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

UNITED NATIONS REPRESENTATIVES

William B. Buffum, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the deputy representative of the United States of America to the United Nations with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Christopher H. Phillips, of New York, to be deputy representative of the United States of America in the Security Council of the United Nations.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The nominations beginning Bennett W. Alford, to be colonel, and ending James A. Zahn, to be chief warrant officer (W-2), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 6, 1969.