From these figures, he noted that chances of committing burglary, robbery, and murder in Cook county and escaping jail are better than 50 to 1. "I submit that this is a shocking indictment of our whole system of criminal investigation and prosecution," he said.

Kirkpatrick, also citing soaring national crime rates, said he thought his listeners would find in these and other available statistics far fewer demands for judges and justice than in the few highly publicized cases which gave rise to the present tensions between the press and the bench and the bar.

He suggested that "some of the time, money, and talents" the legal profession has devoted to "restraining the press" be devoted to the proposed new project.

He added, "The need seems so compelling to me that I think the press would join you."

Kirkpatrick also defended at length opposition of the press to restrictions which have been imposed on news coverage of criminal proceedings with intent to assure fair trials.

He said some of these restrictions "have created ideal conditions for corruption, incompetence, and indifference among policemen, prosecutors, and judges."

"They put a muzzle on the watchdog which serves as the proxy observer for all citizens in the courts," he said. "This is a greater hazard to justice than so-called prejudicial publicity."

He said the goal of management of the nation's legal system should be both a free press and a fair trial, rather than one or the other.

Kirkpatrick said there has been steady deemphasis by newspapers of crime news because studies have shown crime news is far down in reader preference.

"We don't cover crime for sensation and scandal but because it is a serious social problem," he said.

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR. OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 3, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, recently Senator BYRD, the senior Senator from Virginia, made some very pointed and timely comments in reference to the proposed expansion of Washington National Airport.

The remarks of Senator BYRD were commented on editorially by the Staunton (Va.) Leader. Because I think it is of considerable interest to all Members, therefore, I would like to include the editorial of Friday, March 21, of the Staunton, (Va.). Leader as follows:

DON'T EXPAND NATIONAL

Senator Harry F. Byrd Jr., D-Va., is undoubtedly right in his opposition to expansion of National Airport, which carries most of the air traffic in and out of Washington. It lies on the Virginia side of the Potomac and offers somewhat faster access to the capital than Dulles International Airport once the passenger is on the ground.

Dulles is also in Virginia. As Sen. Byrd said in a Senate speech, it "was built specifically to provide for the day when National became overcrowded, and it is clear that day has arrived."

It arrived some time ago, as many Senators and others realized, as the Upper Valley who fly out of Shenandoah Valley Airport to Washington have been saying. Some Senators and others have won some support last year. But as Sen. Byrd told his colleagues, architects can provide workable plans for expanding terminal facilities but "are powerless to create more air space, and that air space is alarmingly full."

That is, as any airline passenger with National as his destination, departure or transfer port could tell the government.

Why the big airlines have persisted in using National rather than Dulles has been a puzzle for some time. The Dulles facilities are thoroughly modern, the skies are not crowded, and neither are the runways or loading bays. Good highways and fast public transport have been provided. But refusal to make the same effort for National has resulted in the handling there last year of 10 million passengers, although the rated capacity is four million. Congress should not appropriate funds for expansion of National Airport, especially when huge public funds went into construction of Dulles to accommodate the increased traffic foreshadowed. The Dulles terminal is in the crowded skies over National—a fact which, coupled with a turn-down by Congress, the expense and public dissatisfaction, should make the airlines transfer their traffic patterns and transfer a heavy volume of their business to Dulles.

SENATE—Monday, April 14, 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 beauty of the world—its green forests, its noble mountains, its lovely lakes and sparkling streams, its wide plains to be cultivated and its unending wealth of soil—its lovely waysides in the morning, its golden fields of gold in the evening—its bountiful nature to remind us of our origin in Thee. Create in us a character and spirit in harmony with the world about us that we may serve Thee in newness of life.

Bless this land, which Thou hast given us, with honorable industry, sound learning, pure manners, and true justice that we may be a united people who walk and work and witness to the glory of Thy higher kingdom.

For it is in Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 10, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 10, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 14, 1969.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 3, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.
S. 566. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue.
S.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DOMESTIC PROGRAMS AND POLICIES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-90)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Congress of the United States:

As the Members of Congress know, I have had under consideration the question of whether to send to the Congress this year a message on the state of the Nation has resulted in the handling there last year of 10 million passengers, although the rated capacity is four million. Congress should not appropriate funds for expansion of National Airport, especially when huge public funds went into construction of Dulles to accommodate the increased traffic foreshadowed. This terminal is in the crowded skies over National—a fact which, coupled with a turn-down by Congress, the expense and public dissatisfaction, should make the airlines transfer their traffic patterns and transfer a heavy volume of their business to Dulles.

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 beauty of the world—its green forests, its noble mountains, its lovely lakes and sparkling streams, its wide plains to be cultivated and its unending wealth of soil—its lovely waysides in the morning, its golden fields of gold in the evening—its bountiful nature to remind us of our origin in Thee. Create in us a character and spirit in harmony with the world about us that we may serve Thee in newness of life.

Bless this land, which Thou hast given us, with honorable industry, sound learning, pure manners, and true justice that we may be a united people who walk and work and witness to the glory of Thy higher kingdom.

For it is in Thy holy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 3, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 3, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 10, 1969, received a message in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 10, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 14, 1969.)

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on April 3, 1969, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 165. An act for the relief of Basil Rowland Duncan.
S. 566. An act for the relief of Nguyen Van Hue.
S.J. Res. 97. Joint resolution to extend the time for the making of a final report by the Commission To Study Mortgage Interest Rates.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.
For example, one area of deep concern to this Administration is the most dependent constituency of all: the child under five. I have announced a commitment to the first five years of life as one of the basic pledges of this Administration. Head Start was an promising idea for bettering the environment and nutrition of young children; there also are many others. We have already begun enlarging the scope of our commitment in this vital area, including the establishment of an Office of Child Development within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The budget was submitted to an internal review and a Cabinet committee to smooth the coordination of our regional offices was reorganized so that for the first time, related agencies will have common regional headquarters and common regional boundaries. An Office of Urban Affairs was created, so that the problems of our urban areas, including the most hard-hit areas, will be caught in a constant fiscal crisis.

The crime-control package soon to be submitted to Congress will make clear the Federal Government's commitment, nationwide, to assisting local authorities in combating crime in the District of Columbia, recognizing that the Federal city should be made a model of law observance and law enforcement. The crime-control package so soon to be submitted to Congress will make clear the Federal Government's commitment, nationwide, to assisting local authorities in protecting the lives, rights and property of their citizens.

An equal pressing priority is the entire complex of needs that we commonly group under the heading, "the problems of the cities"—but which in fact reach beyond the cities and include the distresses of rural America as well.

Our policy review has strengthened my conviction that in approaching these problems, America needs a new direction, not a turning away from past goals but a clear and determined turn toward new means of achieving those goals.

One example is hunger and malnutrition. The failure of past efforts to combat the problem has demonstrated that tinkering with the present welfare system is not enough. We need a complete re-appraisal and re-direction of programs which have aggravated the troubles they were meant to cure, perpetuating a dismal cycle of dependency from one generation to the next. Therefore, I will be submitting to Congress a program providing for the reform of the welfare system.

In specific operational areas, we moved postmasterships from politics toward merit. We started an overhaul of the Office of Economic Opportunity and its programs, and streamlined the administration of the various manpower programs.

We have been asked to say more clearly that we are determined to correct the most fundamental issues confronting our country. Hasty action or a seeking after partisan advantage either by the Congress or Executive Branch can only be self-defeating and aggravate the veryills we seek to remedy.
April 14, 1969
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nothing had been done, and cited this as evidence of the growing impotence of government. The crucial point here is that whereas in the past the executive branch of the government was sometimes a signal for inaction by design, now "leave it to Washing­ton" has become too often a signal for in­action by default. We have to design sys­tems that go beyond "commitment," and guarantee performance.

If there is one thing we know, it is that the Federal Government cannot solve all the nation's problems by itself; yet there is, nonetheless, an over-shift of jurisdic­tion and responsibility to the Federal Government. We must kindle a new partnership between government and people, and among the various levels of government.

Too often, Federal funds have been wasted or used unwisely—for example, by pouring them into direct grants, when more money could have been made available at less cost by the use of incentives to attract private funds.

The programs I will submit have been drawn with these principles in mind. Among their aims are:

-To supplement Federal funds with private funds, through the use of "seed money" devices such as tax credits and loan guarantees;

-To include all the nation's voluntary sector more fully, using the energies of those millions of Americans who are able and eager to help in combati­ing the nation's ills;

-To do the Federal and state and local in­stitutions, so that they both merit and gain in a greater measure of confidence on the part of their own citizens;

-To streamline the administration of Federal programs, not only for ef­ficiency and economy, but to improve the certainty of delivery and to cut away the clouds of confusion that now surround not only their opera­tions, but often their purposes;

-To make maximum use of the new knowledge constantly being gained as a result of our increased commitment to the first five years of life.

These programs will not carry extra­gant promises. The American people have seen too many promises, too many false hopes raised, too much substitution of the easy slogan for the hard performance.

Neither will they carry large pric­etags for the coming fiscal year. We must recognize, however, that in the long run progress will not come cheaply; and even though the urgency of controlling infla­tion dictates budget cuts in the short run, we must be prepared to increase sub­stantially our dollar investment in Amer­ica's future as soon as the resources be­come available.

The Administration will gladly trade the false excitement of fanfare for the abiding satisfaction of achievement. Consolidation, coordination and ef­ficiency are not ends in themselves; they are the means of taking America's government responsive to the legit­imate demands for new departures.

Quietly, thoughtfully, but urgently, the people of the United States have moved in these first few months to re­direct the course of the nation. I am con­fident of the direction, and convinced that the time to take it has come.

RICHARD NIXON.

The White House, April 14, 1969.

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be jointly referred to the Committees on Finance, Judiciary, Labor and Public Welfare, Post Office and Civil Service, District of Columbia, and Banking and Currency, for consideration of the Ejec­tive President. Without ob­jection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

AGREEMENTS WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY DIVERSIONS FROM THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PRODUCTION PURPOSES—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. Pres­i­dent, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunc­tion of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 91st Congress, first ses­sion, the texts of two notes constitut­ing an agreement between the Govern­ment of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, provid­ing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power pro­duction purposes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunc­tion of secrecy be removed from Executive C, 91st Congress, first ses­sion, the texts of two notes constitut­ing an agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, provid­ing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power pro­duction purposes. Without ob­jection, it is so ordered.

An agreement with Canada providing for the construction of a temporary cof­ferdam above the American Falls at Niagara was concluded by an exchange of notes on the same date. Copies of those notes are transmitted herewith for the information of the Senate. This cofferdam agreement is deemed to be a "special agreement" of the kind expressly authorized by the Boundary Waters Treaty of January 11, 1909 with Canada. It is stipulated in this agreement that it enters into force immediately upon the exchange of notes.

I also transmit for the information of the Senate a report by the Secretary of State explaining more fully the back­ground and purposes of the two agree­ments.

I urge that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the agreement authorizing additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes. RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 14, 1969.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Repre­sentatives by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 338) electing the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. SCHWENDEL, to be a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR DOLE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, sometime shortly after the transaction of routine morning business has been concluded, the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole) be recognized for not to ex­ceed 1 hour.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

REPORT ON BIOSCIENCE PROGRAM
A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of proposed action by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to conduct the bioscience program at a level in excess of that authorized in the National Aeronautics and Space Authorization Act, 1962 (82 Stat. 360), together with the facts and circumstances related to that action (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECT FOR THE ARMY RESERVE
A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of an additional facilities project proposed to be undertaken for the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT ON PROPOSED ACQUISITIONS OF EMERGENCY SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT
A letter from the Acting Director of Civil Defense, pursuant to law, reporting on property acquired under emergency supply procurement authorization of $100,000 and over, covering the period of July 1 through September 30, 1968; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
A letter from the Deputy Chief of Naval Material (Procurement and Production), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of research and development procurement authorizations of $50,000 and over, covering the period of July 1 through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON EXPORT EXPANSION FACILITY PROGRAM
A letter from the Secretary of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Export-Import Bank of the United States export expansion facility program during quarter ending March 31, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT ON U.S. EXPORTS TO YUGOSLAVIA
A letter from the Secretary of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the activities of the Export-Import Bank of the United States on sales or leases of commodities to Yugoslavia (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REVENUES AND COSTS FOR VARIOUS CLASSES OF MAIL
A letter from the Postmaster General transmitting, pursuant to law, a report setting forth the cost of carrying and handling the several classes of mail matter and of performing the special services for the fiscal year 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

REPORT ON BUILDING PROJECT SURVEY
A letter from the Administrator of the General Services Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the building project survey under the Public Buildings Act of 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT ON QUADRENNUAL ADMINISTRATION OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
A letter from the Librarian of Congress transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Library of Congress, including the Copyright Office, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and a copy of the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS
None, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the house of representatives, of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Finance:

ENROLLED HOUSE RESOLUTION 1093
"A resolution memorializing Congress to amend the laws of the land regarding veterans; and directing distribution

Whereas, those Americans who have served their country by duty in the Armed Forces of the United States are among our most esteemed citizens; and
By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. MUNDY, Mr. TOWER, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. Dole, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. CASE, and Mr. PACKWOOD): S. 1770. A bill to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. (See the remarks of Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:
S. 1791. A bill to further secure personal privacy and protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for personal information, to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mr. ENVIN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:
S. 1792. A bill for the relief of Lai Tung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MITCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):
S. 1793. A bill to provide for the disposition of property of the Sioux Tribe of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIZOHOFF (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BErLE, Mr. BOSS, Mr. BURKETT, Mr. GARVEY of West Virginia, Mr. DODD, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. INOTYE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. McCY, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. PINCHERLLE, Mr. SABRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. TYDINGS):
S. 1794. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amount of deduction for personal exemption to $1,200; to the Committee on Finance. (See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIZOHOFF (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BErLE, Mr. BOSS, Mr. BURKETT, Mr. GARVEY of West Virginia, Mr. DODD, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GRAVEL, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. INOTYE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. McCY, Mr. MCDONALD, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. PINCHERLLE, Mr. SABRE, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. TYDINGS):
S. 1795. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Finance. (See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIDDET (by request):
S. 1796. A bill to provide for the protection of the Indian tribes of the Triibes of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. (See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:
S. 1801. A bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions of the Board under the Oath of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. HAYFIELD when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONTOYA:
S. 1802. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 in order to require that the public interest of the areas to be served be the sole consideration in the allocation of certain facilities pursuant to such act; to the Committee on Commerce. (See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

S. 1788—INTRODUCTION OF THE STUDENT ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969
Mr. MONTDALE, Mr. President, I introduce, for myself and Senators BAYH, CRANSTON, DODD, HARRIS, HART, HARTKE, HOLLINGS, HUGHES, INOTYE, McCARTHY, NELSON, PACKWOOD, RANDOLPH, SCOTT, THURMOND, and Williams of Nebraska, and Yong Min of Ohio, the Student Assistance Act of 1969. This legislation has several purposes: First, it will remove the financial obstacles to college attendance by providing direct grants to students, based solely on need, and by greatly expanding Federal grants available to students from needy and lower-middle-income families. Second, it will increase the flexibility of student loan resources by chartering a private, nonprofit bank to assure availability of loan funds. Third, it will greatly expand Federal aid available for graduate and professional education by permitting graduate and professional students to obtain grants based upon need, loans from the bank chartered by this bill, and fellowships for the third and fourth years of graduate study for those who qualify on the basis of ability and need. Fourth, it will augment existing efforts at student "outreach" to identify and encourage high school students who otherwise might not seek further education, by providing direct grants to institutions serving those who qualify on the basis of ability and need. Fifth, it will greatly expand Federal assistance to high school students by providing direct grants to institutions attended by students who receive assistance under this act. Sixth, it will provide for new and expanded efforts for providing college outreach programs during the early years of high school.

None of those who join in support of this proposal are wedded to its specific form. Our purpose is to find the best possible legislation for dealing with the problems of providing as-
sistance to college students and institutions of higher education.

Mr. President, the case for a substantial increase in Federal support of colleges and college students is a compelling one.

The Need for New Federal Assistance

Increased Costs: The primary need for this bill is the vastly increased cost of attending college. Officials from the Office of Education have testified that the estimated average cost of attending a public university this school year is $1,740. For a private university the estimated average cost this year is $2,640.

Allowing for the expected yearly increases during the next 3 years, the average cost of a 4-year college education for a freshman who entered a public university last fall is $7,260. If he entered a private university, the total cost is estimated at $10,990.

These costs are high. Hard-working parents with moderate incomes find that the cost of educating their children is becoming increasingly burdensome. It is especially true if they have more than one child in college, as many of them do. For the poor, these costs are completely out of reach.

Costs of attending college are rising much faster than prices for other goods and services. In the American economy, the Consumer Price Index increased 44.6 percent between 1948 and 1966. During the same period costs for attending a public college for 1 year increased 72.3 percent, and for private universities, the cost increased 91.3 percent. The percentage increase in the cost of college has been almost double that of the increase in the Consumer Price Index.

I ask that the following table be inserted in the Record at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1—Increase in the Cost of Attending Public and Private Colleges for 1 Year Compared with the Increase in Consumer Price Index, 1948-66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Cost 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Price Index (1967=100)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public colleges (current dollars per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private colleges (current dollars per year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage increase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, these costs have increased because the cost of providing higher education has increased. There is some evidence, however, that public institutions—now educating 70 percent of all college students—are passing these increased costs on to students faster than the cost of providing this service increases.

According to Students and Buildings, a Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication, between 1955 and 1965 the average revenue of public colleges from federal research funds increased 34 percent. The average student charges increased 38 percent. This means that the public subsidy of higher education has been decreasing relative to the cost of providing the service. At private institutions during this 10-year period, average revenue, exclusive of research funds, increased 83 percent while average student charges increased 70 percent.

Another way to measure the increased burden posed by the cost of higher education is to look at the cost of higher education as compared with the gross national product. According to the Office of Education, in 1957 expenditures by institutions of higher education comprised 1.2 percent of the gross national product. In 1967, the most recent year for which information is available, the comparable figure was 2.4 percent.

I ask that the following table be inserted in the Record at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2—Expenditures by Institutions of Higher Education Related to Gross National Product: United States, 1959-60 to 1975-76</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calendar year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I have already indicated that the cost to students is generally rising somewhat more rapidly than the cost of providing education in public higher education institutions. This fact, coupled with the figures above, means that students and their parents are spending an increasing proportion of their income for college education.

The geographic mobility of the educated: Higher education is a national resource. It is used nationally. It is trained nationally. Those who increasingly begin to pay for it nationally.

First, many college students do not receive their education in the State of their residence. I ask inclusion of the following table in the Record at this point.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3—Residents Enrolled as Students in Home State and Out of State: Undergraduate, Graduate, and Professional, 1963</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In home State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent who live in out of State</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in 1963, the last year for which geographic information is available, there were 4,365,864 students working for a bachelor's or higher degree. Of these, 850,715 were receiving their education in a State other than the one of their residence. This means that approximately 20 percent of all college students in 1961 were enrolled in institutions of higher education located outside of their State of residence.

There is no information which accurately shows how many graduates choose to reside in the State in which they receive their degree. There is no doubt, however, that many of these graduates choose to live and work in other States. The geographic mobility of the educated: Higher education is to look at the cost of higher education as compared with the gross national product. According to the Office of Education, in 1957 expenditures by institutions of higher education comprised 1.2 percent of the gross national product—GNP. In 1967, the most recent year for which information is available, the comparable figure was 2.4 percent.

I ask that the following table be inserted in the Record at this point.

| The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered. |

The geographic mobility of the educated: Higher education is a national resource. It is used nationally. It is trained nationally. Those who increasingly begin to pay for it nationally. For all these reasons, States are becoming more and more reluctant to pay the proportion of higher education. Rightly or wrongly, they tend to see the provision of such education as beyond their responsibility. Graduates who receive their education and then go elsewhere and view as a net loss to the State's economy. Students from other States are often viewed as unnecessary burdens upon State resources.

States have also traditionally relied upon taxes which respond somewhat more slowly to economic growth than the national tax structure. This, coupled with a growing reluctance to accept the responsibility for providing education to students from other States, means that many States provide an especially costly graduate education to many students whose families live and pay taxes in other States. These same students are then the ones most likely to move outside the State when they graduate.

For all these reasons, States are becoming more and more reluctant to pay the proportion of higher education. Rightly or wrongly, they tend to see the provision of such education as beyond their responsibility. Graduates who receive their education and then go elsewhere and view as a net loss to the State's economy. Students from other States are often viewed as unnecessary burdens upon State resources.

States have also traditionally relied upon taxes which respond somewhat more slowly to economic growth than the national tax structure. This, coupled with a growing reluctance to accept the responsibility for providing education to students from other States, means that many States provide an especially costly graduate education to many students whose families live and pay taxes in other States. These same students are then the ones most likely to move outside the State when they graduate.
tend college. This is true even when children have the same ability. The tables from several studies indicate this to be the case. I ask permission to include the following tables in the Record at this point:

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

### TABLE 4.—PROBABILITY OF A HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATE ENTERING COLLEGE IN THE YEAR FOLLOWING GRADUATION BY FAMILY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS QUARTILE, STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT QUARTILE, AND SEX: HIGH SCHOOL CLASS OF 1961 (NATIONAL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement quartile</th>
<th>Socioeconomic quartile</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>3d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Talent.

### TABLE 5.—PERCENTAGE WHO GRADUATED FROM COLLEGE, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE, SEPARATELY FOR MALES AND FEMALES (TOTAL COHORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic status levels</th>
<th>Intelligence levels (males)</th>
<th>Intelligence levels (females)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Same as table 9.

### TABLE 7.—PROBABILITY OF FRESHMEN WHO ENTER COLLEGE (FULL-TIME) IN THE YEAR OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION, RECEIVING A BACHELOR’S DEGREE AFTER 4 YEARS, BY ABILITY AND SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SES</th>
<th>Ability</th>
<th>(High)</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (High)</td>
<td></td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Low)</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Project Talent.

### TABLE 8.—PERCENTAGE WITH COLLEGE PLANS, BY SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS AND INTELLIGENCE, SEPARATELY FOR MALES AND FEMALES (TOTAL COHORT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socioeconomic status levels</th>
<th>Intelligence levels (males)</th>
<th>Intelligence levels (females)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper middle</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Same as table 9.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all of these tables except the last three are figures taken from a nationwide sample. The last three are from a large sample of Wisconsin high school graduates for a given school year.

The message is clear: Children of rich parents are much more likely than equally able children of poor parents to attend and finish college. As shown in table 4, which relates figures for a national sample of high school graduates, a male child of poor parents has only from one-quarter to two-thirds the chance of enrolling in college as a child with the same achievement level and rich parents. Clark Kerr, who recently headed the Carnegie Foundation’s inquiry into the needs of higher education, has said:

Today a young man or woman whose family’s income is in the top half of the national income range has three times the chance to get a college education as one whose family is in the bottom half.

The reason that children from poor families attend college at significantly lower rates than those from rich families is in part motivational. They may not receive encouragement from their families. They often attend inferior elementary and secondary schools. Their peer group does not lend them to think about attending college since most of their friends do not plan further education after high school.

But much of the difference in attendance rates is due solely to money. Children of low-income parents have often suffered deprivations. Making future plans often seems futile. And to some students a $10 bill is a great deal of money. Raising the $7,100 necessary to attend school for
a year may pose what seems to be, and usually is, an insurmountable task.

This is why there are hundreds of thousands of bright high school graduates in this country who do not go to college. It is a tremendous waste in human resources. No nation—no matter how rich or well-developed—can long afford to waste its human resources. This Nation, with its greatest wealth, cannot condone this waste. This Nation, with its belief in opportunity for all, cannot continue this glaring inconsistency of bright, able, high school graduates denied the opportunity to continue their education because of lack of finances. All who can benefit from postsecondary education should have the opportunity to do so. We must end this inequality now.

The impact of low family income upon low rates of college attendance manifests itself concretely in the low rates of college attendance of some segments of our population.

Minority groups—Indians, Negroes, Mexican Americans, and Puerto Ricans—have notably low rates of college attendance. Sometimes this is because some minorities live in isolated sections without ready access to institutions of higher education. But the most important determinant is low family income.

Significantly fewer rural children attend college than do their urban and suburban counterparts. One study of Wisconsin high school graduates found that students who lived in medium-sized and large cities were more than twice as likely to plan to attend college as were students living on farms. Again, part of the reason is that children of farm families are often isolated from institutions of higher education where they can readily obtain a college education. But the overriding factor is again income. Farmers as a group tend to make less income than do city dwellers.

Finally, some States have significantly lower rates of college attendance than others. In 1965, for example, 46.5 percent of the college age population was enrolled for degree credit. In the 12 States served by the Southern Regional Education Board the comparable figure was 34.9 percent. This was not because the States served by this board were not making a valiant effort to educate their citizens. But the South has a less developed economic base. Family income in the South is lower than family income elsewhere. Because of this, the impact of income on college attendance is likely to be more readily noticeable in the South than in the Nation.

Growth in higher education opportunity structure: We know that a good many of the hundreds of thousands of bright high school graduates do not go to college. They do not do so because of cost. As these costs become higher, more and more students, as measured in absolute numbers, will be denied the opportunity of a college education. I think that many people fail to recognize the dimensions of the opportunity structure in higher education. We are hulled into a false sense of progress. We see burgeoning enrollment figures—they have more than doubled in the last decade. What we fail to see is that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college has not grown appreciably during the last decade. I ask that the following table be included in the record at this point.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 11.—NUMBER OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES COMPARED WITH NUMBER OF 1ST-TIME COLLEGE DEGREE ENROLLMENT, 1955, 1965</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of high school graduates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of high school graduates attending college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of high school graduates attending college</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is difficult to determine with certainty the percentage of high school graduates who attend college. The figures noted above compare the number enrolled in college for the first time for degree credit with the number of high school graduates in a given year. This measure gives some idea about the progress being made in providing educational opportunities to the young people of this Nation.

The rate of progress is not encouraging. The 5.5-percent increase of 10 years means that the percentage of high school graduates who attend college has increased at an average of only 0.5 percent per year.

I think that these deficiencies in our opportunity structure must be repaired. The losses of human talent and the effects on the quality of life are beyond calculation. The economic loss is almost incomprehensible.

In recent years this country has become increasingly aware of the problems of the poor. We have not always liked what we have seen. But there is now a greater awareness that problems exist. There is a greater honesty in admitting that all is not as we have sometimes pretended it to be.

We have also come to recognize that there is a large group of Americans who have not been able to participate in the opportunity structure of our society. This is not because they don't try. They are fortunate enough to find jobs. But their jobs are often low-paying ones. Their savings are eaten up by increased medical costs, increased taxes, and increased costs in providing the necessities of life. Family emergencies sometimes set them back. This large group, though, live their lives quietly. They are war weary. Their struggle is incessant.

Because these “working poor” live their lives in incessant struggle so quietly, they are sometimes called the “forgotten Americans.” It is time that they be recognized. It is time that they be given the chance to face and overcome the cycle of poverty. Their low levels of training lead to low-paying jobs—or to no job at all. There is no money to pay for education. And this is passed from one generation to another and another and another.

We must break this cycle now. We have the resources to do it. What we have never done is use them in a really massive way to attack them through higher education.

We are beginning to ask: How do we end poverty? What better first step than permitting 650,000 to 1,300,000 young people to obtain a college education? This country could make no better investment in economic development than in higher education. The increased earnings made possible by a college education will provide an additional tax revenue to pay the entire cost of this program. And the benefits of the program are transgenerational. Once the cycle is broken, future generations will have access to the opportunity to pay for the education of their children.

According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication “Expanding Opportunities for Higher Education,” the difference in earnings between a college graduate and a high school graduate is $136,187.

According to the Internal Revenue Service about 67 percent of taxpayers pay 15 percent or more of their income in Federal personal income taxes. At this rate the minimum tax return on the additional $135,000 made possible by a college education would be $20,428. In all likelihood the return would be even greater since the additional income would probably put these taxpayers into higher tax brackets. But even these conservative estimates of the cost of the program will more than pay for itself through the increased tax revenues made possible by it.

Another way of presenting the impact of this program on tax revenue is to look at the GI bill. It is one of the most successful education programs ever undertaken by the Federal Government. The educational benefits available through this law made possible for millions to return from war duty and complete their education; 7,600,000 World War II veterans and 2,391,000 Korean conflict veterans participated in the first two GI bills. Among these, according to the last count of the Veterans’ Administration, were 11 U.S. Senators and 118 U.S. Representatives. I am one of the delegation of 11 U.S. Senators who qualify for this assistance. The total cost of these programs was $19 billion. The benefits of the first two GI bills ended in 1945 after approximately 20 years of operation. At that time, the Veterans’ Administration concluded:

An analysis of incomes of veterans and nonveterans in the same age groups, made in September 1955 by the Veterans’ Administration and the Department of Commerce, showed
that incomes of veterans who received G.I. bill help in education averaged from $1000 to $1500 a year more than of those who did not. On this basis we estimate trained and educated veterans paid additional income taxes in excess of $1 billion a year. This represents income taxes recovered a period of 20 years; the estimate of $1 billion annually in added taxes totals a $20 billion return in taxes alone on the $10 billion cost of the education bills.

One billion dollars in added tax revenue per year. And this is continuing. By the time the generations who participated in the first two GI bill programs complete their work life the added tax revenue will more than double that of each tax dollar originally spent for the program. The benefits of the GI bill can also be measured in other ways. In human terms, the education provided by this program has permitted many to achieve their full potential who otherwise would not have been able to. Many people fail to find potential because they do not have confidence in what they are doing. They are often capable of doing more demanding work but lack the skill to do so. They are often frustrated in their present jobs but lack the inner security and perhaps the self-confidence to make the move to new ones. Education has permitted many to move upward and outward to higher levels of skill and salary. It has given a flexibility to millions who have been able to move out of dead-end jobs and into positions which they find challenging and relevant to their interests.

Other benefits—some really incalculable—have also been generated by the GI bill. This education provided teachers, engineers, doctors, skilled technicians, and so on. It permitted raising the skill levels of millions in this country. And it did so just a time when the skilled manpower needs of this Nation were increasing by quantitative leaps. This permitted the technological development of this country and the manufacturing process which facilitated the growth of the economic structure of this Nation. Industry was able to develop faster than it would have otherwise. And this, too, resulted in increased tax revenues for the governments of this country.

When new tax revenues are generated it means that new spending power has been created. This new spending power has a multiplier effect which reverberates throughout the economy. Its impact is far reaching. It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have spent more on homes, automobiles, appliances, and clothing than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.

It means that millions have been able to enjoy a higher standard of living and a more comfortable life than they would have otherwise.
A $500 subsidy offered to all high school graduates in the lowest half of the income distribution would increase first-year enrollment of this group by over 25% in 2 years.

Mr. President, there is no question but that lower income groups are much more responsive to cost of attending college in making their decisions to further their education after high school graduation. This bill will help to make it possible for all to attend college, if they want to and have the ability to do so, regardless of their financial circumstances.

I would like to point out that making direct grants to students is not a new concept in providing Federal assistance to higher education in this country. Several present programs already do this. They include: Benefits are paid to college age dependents of deceased and disabled parents covered by programs of the Veterans' Administration, social security, and railroad retirement. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has a grant program for persons of Indian descent. The GI bill provides assistance to veterans, and the National Science Foundation makes direct grants to graduate students. I ask inclusion in the Record at this point of the following table which indicates the number of students receiving aid during the most recent month for which figures are available.

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

| TABLE 12.—FEDERAL PROGRAMS PAYING AID DIRECTLY TO POST-SECONDARY STUDENTS |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                | Average         | Number          | Benefit          |
| Social Security | $684            | 341,009         | %                |
| Railroad Retirement | 1,100 | 8,009           | %                |
| GI bill          | 1,009           | 346,861         | %                |
| Veterans' Administration | 1,099 |                      |                  |
| 1
| 2
| Department of Health, Education, and Welfare fellowship program | 5,800  | 27,423 | 341,000 |
| NSF graduate fellowship program | 5,128  | 2,555  | $200    |
| 3
| 4

Note: Except for the NSF program, all of these programs pay aid to students studying in the field of the student's choice.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this bill takes the basic concept behind these programs and applies it to a larger number of students who do not meet the eligibility requirements of present direct-aid programs. What this bill does that present direct-aid programs do not do, however, is to include an institutional cost-of-education allowance to each grant. This allowance, discussed below, will be paid directly to the institution in which a student chooses to obtain his education.

Aid to postbaccalaureate degree students: Graduate and professional degree students will also be eligible for the student opportunity grant program based on need. In addition, this bill will create a Federal fellowship program which will provide fellowships to graduate students for one year of work on the Ph. D. or equivalent degree.

The rationale for extending eligibility for the student opportunity grants to graduate and professional degree students is the same for making this aid available to postsecondary vocational and undergraduate students: to remove the financial barrier to higher education.

The cost of attending graduate or professional school is often higher than that of attending undergraduate school. The cost to the student and his family support for graduate school. Table 7 shows that students from high-income families are more likely than student of equal ability from low-income families to receive graduate school tuition support. This bill will seek to remove this inequality.

The new fellowships are provided for several reasons.

First, graduate enrollments are increasing at a faster pace than undergraduate enrollments. According to the "Digest of Educational Statistics 1968," graduate enrollments increased by 70.3 percent between the fall of 1963 and 1965. During the same period of time, undergraduate enrollments increased 54.3 percent. This is putting an increasing strain upon present sources of graduate support, many of which are supported by State governments, private endowments, and foundations. We must assured that the flow of this highly trained talent will continue.

Second, if the present direct-aid program is tied to the field of study or the career opportunity grant program, the last 2 years of work on the Ph.D., it is a particularly mobile geographically. States are becoming reluctant to undertake this responsibility and to support it at adequate levels. I think this bill will have to think much more initiative in this area, and this bill provides a good basis for a new thrust in support for graduate education.

Federal student loan bank: This bill makes possible the power to sell securities and lend money to students. The securities and other large pools of money may be available to the bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Third, loans made by this bank should be somewhat cheaper than present loans. The Federal government will be able to tap larger pools of money than does the present guaranteed loan program. Pension funds, insurance investment funds, and other large pools of money may be available to the bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Institutional assistance: This bill provides direct, noncategorical assistance to postsecondary and higher education institutions in the following ways:

First, it provides a cost of education allowance for schools that offer a student opportunity grant. The school will receive $100 per student aided, plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each first-year student, 30 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each second-year student, 40 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each third-year student, and 50 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each fourth-year student.

Second, loans made by the bank will be able to tap larger pools of money than does the present guaranteed loan program. Pension funds, insurance investment funds, and other large pools of money may be available to the bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Institutional assistance: This bill provides direct, noncategorical assistance to postsecondary and higher education institutions in the following ways:

First, it provides a cost of education allowance for schools that offer a student opportunity grant. The school will receive $100 per student aided, plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each first-year student, 30 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each second-year student, 40 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each third-year student, and 50 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each fourth-year student.

Second, loans made by the bank will be able to tap larger pools of money that does the present guaranteed loan program. Pension funds, insurance investment funds, and other large pools of money may be available to the bank. The managers of these funds, however, are unwilling to make this money available on a loan-by-loan basis to students at the present time. This will provide a structure whereby these funds may be channeled to students.

Institutional assistance: This bill provides direct, noncategorical assistance to postsecondary and higher education institutions in the following ways:

First, it provides a cost of education allowance for schools that offer a student opportunity grant. The school will receive $100 per student aided, plus an amount equal to 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each first-year student, 30 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each second-year student, 40 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each third-year student, and 50 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each fourth-year student.
allowance will be equal to an amount of 150 percent of the basic fellowship grant.

The cost of education allowances are as follows:

First, the effect of the other provisions of this bill will be to increase college costs, whether it be public or private. Increasing the number who attend college by new programs of student financial aid would raise the cost to those who would attend without student aid. These subsidies would have to be spread over a larger number of students. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare publication "Students and Buildings" explains:

For the current college population, tuition and fees average about $500 per year, and the cost of instruction averages about $1,500. Thus, one can easily speculate that if the total number of students increased by about 40 percent—roughly what would be involved if all potential students attended full time and doubled—the costs have to be raised to about $780 per year or about 50 percent. This assumes that the average student, working at roughly $1,500, and that additional instructional expenses would have to be met through increases in tuition.

We must include a cost-of-education allowance to cover the additional cost of educating the persons who receive these Federal benefits.

Second, the cost to colleges of providing education is increasing each year. They need additional funds which each college can use in its area of greatest need. This is a decision which can best be determined by the individual institution. The categorical grants which presently exist do not allow for the flexibility which is necessary. The categorical grants do not allow the university to engage in activities which do not coincide with their greatest needs.

The provision of this bill will be spent where local education institutions best believe it should be spent. And they are most capable of making that decision.

Student outreach program: The present student outreach programs, Upward Bound and Talent Search, have identified and helped to motivate thousands of students during the last few years. Without the efforts of these programs, thousands of students who are now in postsecondary education programs would not be there.

Nevertheless, I believe that additional efforts are needed. The number of able students who are not yet in postsecondary education programs indicates a large field that has yet to be tapped. In addition, the massive Federal effort envisioned by this bill must make its full impact felt by providing new efforts to identify and motivate students to attend college. I think that this can be done by striking out in several new directions.

First, we can involve high school teachers and students in these efforts more than we do so now. We can do this by providing Federal training courses for high school teachers and counselors and for members of student councils. These courses can provide new ways that these groups can work with high school students up-to-date on postsecondary financial aid, study programs, and career possibilities. Many students need motivation from their education. Developing educational plans. We must make certain that they have adequate information on which to base these plans.

Second, we must provide aid to the colleges for their recruitment efforts. Many sensitive educators have long remarked that if the colleges of this country would emphasize academic recruitment of students from low-income families as much as they emphasize the recruitment of athletes, the opportunity disparities between rich and poor students would be much less today. But it is virtually impossible to do this and know how to do in recruitment efforts. This bill will provide Federal assistance for this purpose to colleges which develop especially effective efforts at recruiting poor students.

Third, when students and their parents are making postsecondary educational plans they need ready access information about financial aid, career, and college possibilities. This bill will establish higher education opportunity centers throughout the country for this purpose. Most can use existing Federal facilities—such as the special Council on Educational Opportunity Grants. Half-time, three-quarter-time, and full-time students will be eligible for these grants for a period of up to four years (or its part-time equivalent) study for post secondary vocational or undergraduate study. If a student is enrolled in a program, which normally includes not more than four academic years for the baccalaureate degree he may receive a grant for a longer period of time, although this will not exceed five academic years or its part-time equivalent.

Graduate and professional students will also be eligible for these grants for a period of time not to exceed four academic years, or its equivalent in part-time enrollment, beyond the baccalaureate degree.
These grants will be awarded solely on the basis of need according to a formula which is discussed below. The student will generally be expected to pay room, board, books, and other expenses as may be reasonably assumed to be related to the student’s educational experience. The minimum amount for each student will be a sum equal to: 25 percent of the excess over $200 awarded to each student of the National Average Cost of Education. These criteria will include: effective family income (as defined below), the number of dependents attending college, the size of the student’s family, and the number of dependents attending or likely to attend institutions of higher education in the student’s family. The increase in percentage of the amount received by a student for each additional year of college attendance is determined by the Commissioner of Education in accordance with the guidelines approved by the Commissioner of Education.

3. Expected Student Savings is the amount that, under this program, the student is expected to save from summer, vacation, or part-time employment which can be applied toward the cost of his postsecondary education.

The Commissioner of Education can also prescribe special rules determining family income which are determined to be self-supporting. When a student is determined to be self-supporting, the student will receive, in addition to his scholarship grant, an amount of $300 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,500, to establish for each year a low earnings provision for each dependent. This allowance will be $300 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,500, and the actual cost of providing the services connected with the student’s educational experience. Institutions attended by students receiving grants will receive for each dependent, not to exceed $200 per dependent. This amount will be $200 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,000, for each dependent. In all cases, the amount available for financial aid will be $300 per dependent.

Provided for part-time study is included to increase the flexibility of this program as it responds to the needs of students. There are some students whose family circumstances may preclude their attendance in an institution of higher education. This student will receive, in addition to his scholarship grant, an amount of $300 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,500, to be used in part-time employment which can be applied toward the cost of his postsecondary education. These fellowships will be based solely on ability and need. They will not be awarded on the basis of the student’s field of study.

HIGHER EDUCATION LOAN PROGRAM

The bill also authorizes a Higher Education Loan Bank as a private, non-profit corporation to provide small loans to postsecondary vocational, undergraduate, graduate, and professional students. These loans will be for a period of up to five years for undergraduate work and for up to five years of graduate or professional study, or for an equivalent period in the case of loans for vocational education. They must be enrolled in at least one-half of a normal full-time course of study in order to receive the loan. The borrower will be required to pay an amount which will not exceed the cost of attending school at the institution he attends, less any other federal aid he is receiving.

These loans will be guaranteed against default, death, and disability by the Federal Loan Bank. Interest payments and repayments of the principal will be deferred until a student has completed his schooling and for a period of time up to three years after he completes, or is enrolled for, such studies as the Peace Corps, VISTA, or the Armed Services. There will be no “forgiveness” features similar to those found in the Higher Education Loan Program. The Bank, however, will be eligible to establish for each student a low earnings provision for each dependent, not to exceed $200 per dependent, not to exceed a total of $1,000, to be used in part-time employment. In whole or in part, of annual repayment in any year in which the borrower’s income fails to reach a minimum level or in which the borrower is unemployed for any period of time, the Bank will be entitled to defer the repayment of the remaining balance of the loan.

The bill also establishes Higher Educational Opportunity Scholarship Centers which will make information available, including appropriate application forms, and furnish guidance and counseling services with respect to all federal higher education programs designed to provide opportunities for education beyond high school, and with respect to attending vocational schools, other than those which are Federal programs. A Council on College Opportunities is also established by the bill. This Council shall: 1) develop a new and effective way of increasing and coordinating all federal programs designed to identify, motivate, and provide financial aid for college attendance; and 2) determine the current potential of college attendance by who usually do not go to college.
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S. 1789—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I introduce, for reference to the proper committee, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the individual income tax personal exemption from $600 to $1,200.

There can be little question that the present personal exemption for each dependent is totally inadequate for four times. The $600 figure was established in the Revenue Act of 1948—more than 20 years ago—and has not been revised since that time. During these same two decades, however, the cost of living has risen 48.1 percent, based on the level of consumer prices indexes in 1948 and in January 1969. Obviously, the present figure is only a fraction of what is needed.

An exemption of $800 per person provides a total exemption of only $2,400 for a family of four. However, a recent study by the Department of Labor shows that in order to maintain a moderate standard of living today, a family of four needs about $9,191. Certainly, then, the personal exemption for this family should comprise a greater percentage of their total financial need than the present $2,400.

Congress is presently considering ways of achieving equity in the tax structure in order not to remove the glaring inequities from the tax system. And, in my view, the enactment of the proposal which I introduce today would be an important step in our overall effort to revise the American tax structure and to relieve what many consider to be an undue burden upon these groups.

I believe it is vitally important that we act now to remove the glaring inequities from the tax system. And, in my view, the enactment of the proposal which I introduce today would be an important step in our overall effort to revise the American tax structure and to relieve what many consider to be an undue burden upon these groups.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 1789) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the individual income tax personal exemption from $600 to $1,200, introduced by Mr. BUCK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1789

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is 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 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(3) Section 6013(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(f) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(g) Section 6013(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates).

S. 1970—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL
PROVIDING FOR A GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend the authority...
for the Great Plains conservation program.

The objective of the Great Plains conservation program is to assist farmers and ranchers in developing land-use programs which will help avert many of the hazards that come with drought common to that region.

It is aimed at preserving and enhancing the great productive capacity of the Great Plains. It rests on the foundation blocks of further conservation and wise use and management of the area’s soil and water resources. It recognizes that if the agriculture of the region is to be stable portions ought to be permanently removed from cultivation.

The original Great Plains Conservation Act authorized appropriations of up to $150,000,000 for conservation practices throughout this vast section of the Nation’s midland. This authority expires on December 31, 1971.

Expenditures under this program are approaching the limitations set in the original act. The proposed legislation would extend the authority for 10 years and would authorize an additional $150,000,000 for work under this program. Several minor improvements are also included in the bill to enable it to more adequately meet the needs of the Great Plains area today.

SEVERE CLIMATIC VARIATIONS

The Great Plains region is an area of severe climatic variations which periodically produce widespread suffering and heavy economic losses. In this region farm and ranch families have a continuing need to protect their best cultivated and grazing lands against soil erosion during seasons of high winds and frequent periods of extremely dry weather.

Because these problems directly concern the lives and prosperity of millions of American citizens, the Nation as a whole is directly concerned. Because all Americans are concerned with the maintenance and development of our soil and water resources, we all have an interest in the solution of agricultural problems in the vast Great Plains area.

BASIC POLICIES

I should like to cite 10 of the basic policies of the Great Plains conservation program:

First. The program emphasizes land use changes, wind erosion control and moisture conservation and management practices which provide, over a period of years, the most enduring conservation benefits for purposes of supporting a stable agriculture.

Second. The program is voluntary on the part of the individual producer.

Third. The ability of an owner or operator to carry out his proposed for land-use or cropping operations, including a schedule for conservation treatment, is a prerequisite to participation in the program.

Fourth. The program is in addition to other Department of Agriculture programs. Any phase of other programs that contribute to conservation objectives may be used by the producer to carry out his plan of operation.

Fifth. The producer is responsible for developing and carrying out his plan of operation. The Soil Conservation Service provides competent technical assistance to producers requesting it.

Sixth. The Department of Agriculture offers long-term contracts under which the producer is to share the cost of establishing conservation practices provided for in his farm or ranch plan. These cost-share contracts range from 3 to 10 years.

Seventh. The producer is encouraged to carry out his plan of operation in the shortest period consistent with conditions and his resources.

Eighth. Rental-type payments are not made in the establishment of grassed waterways, the installation of strip cropping plans on more than 57 million acres.

Ninth. The producer may use for grazing or other purposes the land established in vegetative cover.

Tenth. Local soil and water conservation districts are encouraged to assume leadership in facilitating the program.

PROGRAM SUCCESSFUL

The program applies only to counties designated by the Secretary of Agriculture in the 10 Great Plains States. There are 423 counties in the 10 Great Plains States. It would have liked to insert in the Record at this point a listing of the designated counties in the 10 Great Plains States.

This is the 13th year of operation for the Great Plains conservation program. It has proved to be particularly popular and successful. It has brought more than 32,000 farm and ranch operators under contract with the Department of Agriculture to provide conservation plans on more than 57 million acres.

In my own State of North Dakota, more than 3,600 farmers are participating in the Great Plains conservation program. They have voluntarily signed agreements to place more than 4,800,000 acres under conservation plans. Of this total acreage, more than 315,000 acres have been removed from crop production and placed in grass. Other practices have involved installation of strip cropping programs, the planting of shelter belts, the establishment of grassed waterways, the installation of terraces and other water conservation measures, and the countless other practices which will conserve and stabilize our most precious resources, the soil.

As the program nears the date of expiration, the demand for the long term cost-sharing contracts continues to grow. The 1968 fiscal year ended with a backlog of more than 5,000 unserved applications. In fiscal year 1968, 3,227 new contracts were signed covering 5,176,284 acres, obligating all the funds available for cost-sharing and technical assistance for the year.

A major effect of the program is to bring about the conversion to permanent vegetation of cropland unsuitable for sustained cultivation under the conditions of the plains. Contracts signed in 1968 and 1970 encompassed more than 3,150,975 acres, about 18 percent, of the cropland on the farms and ranches involved. To date, more than 1,500,000 acres of cropland conversion has been accomplished under this program. It has been removed from the production of other crops, many of which are in surplus, at a cost far below that of other acreage diversion and land retirement programs.

This is a good beginning, but the job is far from complete. The critical conservation needs of the area cannot be met by the 1971 expiration date. Therefore, I support the provisions in this bill to have the authority extended for 10 years.

The minor improvements included in this bill would:

First. Confirm the role that soil and water conservation districts are playing in implementing the program under the present authority.

Second. Provide additional latitude to the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the need for certain types of existing units to make possible, under certain conditions, contracts on land where annual leases are customary.

Third. Provide for the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into a few contracts on land units not generally considered farms or ranches where serious erosion problems exist.

Fourth. Provide for the addition of practices that will help cope with agricultural pollution problems.

Fifth. Recognize the need for measures to enhance the fish, wildlife and recreation resources which are in danger of cultural pollution problems.

I am joined in consponsoring this legislation by my colleagues Senator Murtha, Senator Tower, Senator Curtis, Senator Doak, Senator Allott, and Senator Dole.

I ask unanimous consent that a list of designated counties be printed at this point in the Record.

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

The bill (S. 1790) to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The list, presented by Mr. Young of North Dakota, follows:

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

[Designated counties as of December 15, 1968]

COLORADO


KANSAS


MONTANA

Big Horn, Blaine, Carbon, Carter, Cascade, Chouteau, Custer, Daniels, Dawson, Fallon, Fergus, Flathead, Granite, Hill, Hunter, Judith Basin, Liberty, McCone, Musselshell, Petroleum, Phillips, Powder, Powder River, Prairie, Richland, Roosevelt, Rosebud, Sher-
dau, Stillwater, Sweet Grass, Teton, Toole, Treasure, Valley, Wheatland, Wibaux, Wallowa.

NEBRASKA (60)
Adams, Antelope, Arthur, Banner, Blaine, Boone, Box Butte, Boyd, Brown, Buffalo, Chase, Cherry, Cheyenne, Clay, Custer, Dawes, Dawson, Deuel, Dundy, Franklin, Frontier, Furnas, Garden, Garfield, Gosper, Gray, Gage, Grant, Greeley, Hall, Hamilton, Harlan.

NEW MEXICO (18)
Chaves, Colfax, Curry, DeBaca, Eddy, Guadalupe, Harding, Lea, Lincoln, Mora, Quay, Roosevelt, San Miguel, Santa Fe, Socorro, Taos, Torrance, Union.

NORTH DAKOTA (20)

OKLAHOMA (50)

SOUTH DAKOTA (29)
Aurora, Bennett, Brule, Buffalo, Butte, Campbell, Clay, Clark, Clay, Custer, Dewey, Douglas, Edmunds, Fall River, Faulk, Gregory, Haakon, Hard, Harding, Hughes, Hyde, Jones, Lawrence, Lyman, McPherson, Meade, Mellette, Pennington, Perkins, Potter, Shannon, Stanley, Todd, Tripp, Walworth, Washabaugh, Ziebach.

TEXAS (99)

WYOMING (13)
Albany, Campbell, Converse, Crook, Goshen, Johnson, Laramie, Natrona, Niobrara, Platte, Sheridan, Weston.

S. 1791—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO FURTHER SECURE PERSONAL PRIVACY AND TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF PEOPLES TO IGNORE CERTAIN UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENTAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, next week the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights of the Judiciary Committee will commence a series of hearings on pri-
vacy, Federal questionnaires, and constitutional rights.

On Thursday, April 24, the subcommittee will meet at 10:30 a.m. in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building. We shall hear briefly from a number of citizens who, I believe, will be representing the interests of many who have of late lived in fear of dangerous invasion of their personal privacy and about increased harassment by Government agencies in the course of their current activities.

Following this, Prof. Arthur S. Miller, of the George Washington University Law Center, will discuss the constitutional issues raised by such complaints, the role of public law, and some of the questions surrounding use of Federal criminal and civil laws or administrative sanctions in order to acquire personal information from individuals.

On Friday, April 25, the subcommittee will meet at 10:30 a.m. in room 2228 of the New Senate Office Building. At that time Congressman Jackson E. Bolling, of Virginia, will describe for the Subcommittee his research into the Federal laws and practices affecting individual privacy, and his proposals for limiting some of the current activities of Federal agencies to acquire answers to Government questionnaires, especially those used in the decennial census.

Other witnesses on that day will include Prof. Arthur Miller, of the University of Michigan Law School, and Prof. Charles Friel, of the Harvard Law School, who will discuss some of the most important complaints now made about Government questionnaires distributed under the auspices of the Census Bureau. We are interested in the opinions of those who have examined the Federal data.

On Monday, April 28, I hope to hear testimony from a number of citizens about the invasion of their personal privacy, and about increased harassment by Government agencies in the course of their current activities.

It is my hope that through this investigation and these hearings, Congress will be able to establish just what rights and duties a citizen has who receives a Government questionnaire. In connection with this subject I am introducing for study a bill to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of persons to ignore certain unwarranted governmental questionnaires.

The background and scope of the problem was outlined in a letter to Secretary of Commerce H. Stans, inviting him or his representative to testify before the subcommittee. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Record.

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

Hon. Maurice H. Stans,
Secretary of Commerce,
Department of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: In the course of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee study of privacy and individual rights, the Subcommittee received numerous letters and telegrams and phone calls from citizens throughout the country complaining that various governmental agencies were using burdensome devices for collecting extensive repetitive data which is irrelevant for the purposes of government. These complaints consistently reflect the situation at the governmental intrusion, apprehension over the consequences of reply or a refusal to reply.

I have done nothing to clarify the situation or to establish guidelines and limitations for the safeguards of those charged with collecting Federal data.

It is in view of the significance of this subject for every citizen, I believe it is essential that Congress conduct a careful and comprehensive review of the public policy and the constitutional and legal issues involved.

The Constitutional Rights Subcommittee is therefore scheduling public hearings to consider these matters. Since your views as Secretary of the Interior of the United States will be invaluable in Congressional consideration of this national issue, we hereby extend an open invitation to appear before the Subcommittee in February or March to describe your Department's authority and purpose in collecting information from citizens and to explain not only in the rights of citizens in surveys conducted by the Census Bureau for its own purposes, but also in those conducted by other Federal agencies. One example of this is the recent questionnaire sent to disabled veterans on behalf of the Veterans Administration requiring a full-scale revelation of the veteran's personal and family financial situation.

The new decennial Census questionnaires will be distributed shortly, and it is therefore our hope that you will be able to testify in February. It is urgent, I believe, that the American people hear from you personally what rights they have and what duties they owe with respect to the new questionnaires. The series of Subcommittee hearings will provide that forum. By affording you and other Federal agency heads the chance to testify in response to such constitutional law and expert from citizens, the hearings will also initiate a long-delayed dialogue between citizens and government. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Record.

With appreciation for your assistance in our study and with all kind wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Chairman.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the members of the subcommittee are Senator John McClellan, of Arkansas; Senator Edward M. Kennedy, of Massachusetts; Senator Birch Bayh, of Indiana; Senator Robert C. Byrd, of West Virginia; Senator Roman L.荷花, of Nebraska; Senator Robert L. Fudge, of Hawaii; and Senator Strom Thurmond, of South Carolina.

I introduce the bill for appropriate reference, and I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed 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. 1791) to further secure personal privacy and to protect the constitutional right of individuals to ignore unwarranted governmental requests for
personal information introduced by Mr. Enskv, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Report, as follows:

S. 1791

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That it shall be unlawful for any officer or employee of any executive department or agency of the United States Government, or for any person acting or purporting to act under his authority: 

(1) to require or to attempt to require any individual to disclose for statistical purposes any information concerning his personal or financial activities or those of any member of his family or concerning his personal or real property or that of any member of his family unless the information is sought as a result of a specific provision of the Constitution and a specific Act of Congress, in which case the disclosure shall be mandatory and the individual shall be informed under which constitutional provision and which Act of Congress the disclosure is mandatory; or 

(2) to request or to attempt to request any person to disclose for statistical purposes any information concerning his personal or financial activities or those of any member of his family, or concerning his personal or real property or that of any member of his family, unless such request has been specifically authorized by Act of Congress, in which case the individual shall be advised that such disclosure is voluntary and that he is not compelled to comply with such request.

S. 1794—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ON TAX REFORM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, tomorrow is the "idea of April," and millions of Americans are today dropping their Federal income tax returns into the mailbox—and burning with indignation and resentment as they do so.

They feel they are not getting fair treatment in the income tax system under the present tax system. They are perfectly willing to pay their share of their taxes, but they are not willing to be taxed under a system that is erratic, unjust, regressive, unpopular, and unfairly damaging to their way of living and to their economic plans and interests. I agree with them.

I have just returned from Utah where I had an opportunity to talk with many people personally. Let me tell you that the "taxpayer's revolt" we have been reading about, and seeing reflected in our mail, is real and it is earnest. It grows in strength every day.

In my estimation, tax reform is the most urgent problem facing this Congress. It is not right to ask the average, middle-income or low-income taxpayer—the men and women who are the backbone of America—to pay such a large burden in taxes when there are millionnaires who pay no taxes at all because of tax loopholes.

It makes me angry, too, to know that in 1965 and 1966 more than 150 persons with annual incomes of above $200,000 paid no taxes at all. Nor do I like it when I hear that more than half of the taxpayers whose income is over $1 million pay a tax rate at less than 30 percent. Our system is supposed to be based on ability to pay—wealthy people are supposed to pay a progressively higher rate than those in the lower brackets—yet because of special deductions and loopholes they pay what is for them little more than the cost of some new luxury.

To correct these inequities, we must move in two directions at once.

We must reduce the burden on the middle and lower income taxpayers, and we must close the tax loopholes which allow very rich to pay very little in taxes, or in some instances, to pay no taxes at all.

I am taking the first step in this program to lower the tax rate for the personal income tax exemption to $1,200. This is the quickest and most equitable way to give relief to the mass of taxpayers.

I take this step not because I believe the personal tax exemptions should be reduced, but because I believe the tax law needs to be simplified and the present tax system made more fair and equitable.

I am taking the second step by raising the capital gains personal exemption to $32,000. 

S. 1795—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. RYBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and 26 other Senators, I introduce a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 in an effort to encourage and accelerate the attack against air and water pollution by private industry.

This bill would permit, for Federal income tax purposes, the amortization of the cost of pollution abatement equipment over a period of 3 years rather than over the period of the equipment's useful life of up to 20 years.

Mr. President, this Nation is daily becoming more aware and worried about the growing menace of our deteriorating environment. The increasing incidents of disease and unhealth are evidence for widespread concern and shame. Time is running short when we can take effective action to clean up this pollution.

The foundation for a national effort against this problem was laid by the comprehensive air and water pollution control legislation which has passed Congress in the last 5 years. But Federal legislation is not enough by itself. To launch a truly effective assault against air and water pollution we must join private industry as a full-pledged partner in the effort. The bill which I introduce today seeks to give this partnership by providing a tax incentive to the industry to purchase and utilize the best pollution abatement equipment available.

If we are to clean up this Nation's air and water we must make pollution abatement a part of the task which will fall to private industry. But we cannot simply point to industry as the culprit and expect the job to be done overnight. Unfortunately, in today's polluted environment, clean air and water are no longer free. We cannot hide the fact that the development, purchase and installation of the most sophisticated pollution control equipment will be an expensive undertaking. The capital charges for other equipment, pollution abatement equipment will not materially enhance a company's profits. This kind of investment is an investment in the public welfare, and we must use tax incentives to ask the public to bear a small share of the cost.

The benefits will far outweigh any tax loss. By encouraging an industry to take immediate steps to curb pollution, we insure the greater success of Federal, State and local control programs. Today, all levels of government are establishing pollution control programs. The funds needed for these programs are not sufficient. We must seek to encourage compliance with these regulations at the earliest possible date. Therefore, I believe tax incentives in this field are a justifiable expense which will return a public benefit many times over.

A major part of this country's air and water pollution can be traced directly to industrial activity. Therefore, industry must bear a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

According to recent statistics, factories and industrial activity may be expected to spend $200 million a year to install efficient anti-pollution devices. This is only a small part of the total cost which industry will face to stop pollution. Industry must face a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

According to recent statistics, factories and industrial activity may be expected to spend $200 million a year to install efficient anti-pollution devices. This is only a small part of the total cost which industry will face to stop pollution. Industry must face a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

I believe tax incentives in this field are a justifiable expense which will return a public benefit many times over.

A major part of this country's air and water pollution can be traced directly to industrial activity. Therefore, industry must bear a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

According to recent statistics, factories and industrial activity may be expected to spend $200 million a year to install efficient anti-pollution devices. This is only a small part of the total cost which industry will face to stop pollution. Industry must face a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

I believe tax incentives in this field are a justifiable expense which will return a public benefit many times over.

A major part of this country's air and water pollution can be traced directly to industrial activity. Therefore, industry must bear a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.

I believe tax incentives in this field are a justifiable expense which will return a public benefit many times over.

A major part of this country's air and water pollution can be traced directly to industrial activity. Therefore, industry must bear a great burden of the cleanup effort. But industrial pollution will be a costly matter to wipe out. Complying with Government pollution regulations will be expensive, but for a company, frankly, the more expensive it is, the longer it will take to make real progress.
Mr. President, I am pleased to have joined in sponsoring this bill the following Senators: BENNETT, BIBLE, BOOCS, BROOKS, BYRD of West Virginia, DODD, EVVIN, FANNIN, GRAVEL, GURNEY, INOUTE, JACOBY, JACOBSON, JACOBSON, JR., JOHNSTON, MILLER, MOTTI, MURPHY, P. H. MILLER, PETERSON, PICKWICK, PELL, RANDOLPH, SAXE, SCOTT, THURMOND, TOWER, and TYNINGS.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at the end of 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. 1795) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months, introduced by Mr. MTECCOFF for himself and other Senators, which has been received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1795

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to section 1795) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of works to abate water and air pollution.

(a) ALLOWANCE OF DEPRECIATION.—Every taxpayer shall, at his election, be entitled to a deduction in lieu of the deduction provided by section 167, with respect to any certified abatement works, based on the adjusted basis of such property, for the 36-month period beginning with the first month for which a deduction under section 167 would (without regard to this section) be allowable.

(b) ELECTION.—

"(1) TIME.—The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to any certified abatement works not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority. The election shall not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary of the Treasury; provided, however, that after the election has been made, the adjusted basis of such works shall be irrevocably determined.

"(2) MANNER; REVOCATION.—The election provided by subsection (a) —

(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations; and

(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) Certified water and air pollution abatement works.—The terms 'certified water and air pollution abatement works' shall mean any certified abatement works which are certified by the Federal certifying authority under the provisions of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to section 1795) to be certified abatement works based on the adjusted basis of which is not a certified abatement works.

(2) PERIOD.—The terms 'certified abatement works' shall apply to such works for purposes of paragraph (2), the adjusted basis of which is not a certified abatement works.

(d) PROFITMAKING ABATEMENT WORKS.—The Federal certifying authority shall not certify any property under subsection (c) (1) to the extent it appears that, by reason of profits derived through the recovery of wastes or otherwise in the operation of such property, the benefit from the amortization will be recovered over its useful life.

(e) ALLOCATION OF BASIS.—In the case of property described in subsection (c) (1), the basis of any property which is not a certified abatement works shall be allocated between the portion which is a certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

(f) CROSS REFERENCES.—For special rules relating to capital gains property, section 168, and like purposes, see sections 167 or section 1795. For purposes of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), the adjusted basis of such property shall be determined at the time an election is made under subsection (a) (1), but the election is irrevocable, and the Secretary or his delegate, properly allocated between the portion which is a certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

(g) CERTIFIED ABATEMENT WORKS.—For purposes of paragraph (3), the basis of any property which is not a certified abatement works shall be allocated between the portion which is a certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

(h) DETERMINATION.—The amount of the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 for each taxable year shall be determined at the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or before the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or at such later time as may be prescribed by the Federal certifying authority.

(i) PROOF OF COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary or his delegate, may, at any time after the certification of any certified abatement works, require the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the Federal certifying authority, for the purpose of determining whether such certified abatement works meet the minimum Federal standards for purposes of paragraph (2), the following information:

(1) The relative amounts of water and air pollution abatement works, the air pollution abatement works over a period of 36 months beginning with the first month for which a deduction under section 167 would (without regard to this section) be allowable.

(2) MANNER; REVOCATION.—The election provided by subsection (a) —

(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations; and

(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) Certified water and air pollution abatement works.—The terms 'certified water and air pollution abatement works' shall mean any certified abatement works which are certified by the Federal certifying authority under the provisions of part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to section 1795) to be certified abatement works based on the adjusted basis of which is not a certified abatement works.

(2) PERIOD.—The terms 'certified abatement works' shall apply to such works for purposes of paragraph (2), the adjusted basis of which is not a certified abatement works.

(d) PROFITMAKING ABATEMENT WORKS.—The Federal certifying authority shall not certify any property under subsection (c) (1) to the extent it appears that, by reason of profits derived through the recovery of wastes or otherwise in the operation of such property, the benefit from the amortization will be recovered over its useful life.

(e) ALLOCATION OF BASIS.—In the case of property described in subsection (c) (1), the basis of any property which is not a certified abatement works shall be allocated between the portion which is a certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

(f) CROSS REFERENCES.—For special rules relating to capital gains property, section 168, and like purposes, see sections 167 or section 1795. For purposes of paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), the adjusted basis of such property shall be determined at the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or before the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or at such later time as may be prescribed by the Federal certifying authority.

(h) DETERMINATION.—The amount of the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 for each taxable year shall be determined at the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or before the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the returns for the taxable year in which the abatement works are certified by the Federal certifying authority, or at such later time as may be prescribed by the Federal certifying authority.

(i) PROOF OF COMPLIANCE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary or his delegate, may, at any time after the certification of any certified abatement works, require the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish to the Federal certifying authority, for the purpose of determining whether such certified abatement works meet the minimum Federal standards for purposes of paragraph (2), the following information:

(1) The relative amounts of water and air pollution abatement works, the air pollution abatement works over a period of 36 months beginning with the first month for which a deduction under section 167 would (without regard to this section) be allowable.
S. 1796—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND SECTION 510, TITLE V OF THE INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall continue its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba.

The bill has been requested by the Chairman of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission and I am introducing it in the belief that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate as an attachment to the bill may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill at such time as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letters from the Chairman of the Committee dated January 14, 1969, and from the general counsel of the Commission dated March 21, 1969.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropiately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter are printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1796) to amend section 510, title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for the extension of time within which the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission shall continue its affairs in connection with the settlement of claims against the Government of Cuba, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1796

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 510 of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act but only with respect to property as to which the first month for which a deduction would be allowable under section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 ends on or after such date.

The letters, presented by Mr. Fulbright, follow:

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION

Dear Mr. Chairman:
The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission has advised the Senate, by request, that the bill which was transmitted to the President on January 13, 1969, is the draft bill which was transmitted to the Administration by the Commission's letter dated January 14, 1969, and was referred to your Committee on January 16, 1969.

Sincerely yours,

ANDREW T. MCGUIRE,
General Counsel.

FOREIGN CLAIMS SETTLEMENT COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
Chairman of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. Chairman:

The Foreign Claims Settlement Commission hereby submits the following statement:

The draft bill proposed by the draft bill would not have affected the settlement of claims against the Cuban regime. These claims were added to Title V of the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, under the provisions of the Act.

The Commission respectfully urges early and favorable action on the draft bill so that the program can be properly completed within the provisions of the statute.

The Bureau of the Budget advises by letter dated January 13, 1969, that the enactment of this proposal would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD V. B. SUTTON,
Chairman.

S. 1799—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL COMMISSION PROPOSED TO MOUNT DANGEROUS OF PESTICIDES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today marks the fifth anniversary of the death of the highly acclaimed environmental author Rachel Carson. It is prior to her death when her perceptive book, "Silent Spring," awakened the American public to the dangers of DDT and other persistent pesticides. Her book vividly shook a country out of its complacent indifference to the indiscriminate use of these long-lived poisons.

She pointed out that most pesticides, especially the chlorinated hydrocarbons, cannot distinguish between man's friends and man's enemies. They are almost as lethal to beneficial insects and creatures as they are to destructive ones.

Although many scientists attacked her thesis on the grounds of inadequate evidence, it is happening now. The question is: Will we temporize with this issue until it is too late? Until, in fact, the land, the water and the air are irreparably damaged by these poisons?
bly polluted and all the living creatures are dangerously compromised. That is the issue we face.

I am introducing legislation in the U.S. Senate creating a permanent National Commission on Pesticides and Investigating problems arising from the use of pesticides and to establish improved programs and regulations for their use.

Under the provisions of this bill, the President will appoint three representatives from Government agencies, three from the scientific and medical professions, two each from conservation and agricultural organizations and three from private enterprise for a term of 3 years to serve on the Commission.

The Commission would be responsible for:

First. Determining and evaluating the present usage of pesticides;

Second. Reviewing existing limitations on pesticide use and current labeling requirements;

Third. Recommending standards of safety for pesticides in water;

Fourth. Developing a continuing monitoring program for pesticides in the soil, air, water, and wildlife;

Fifth. Developing research in the degradability of pesticides;

Sixth. Initiating basic research into the degradability of pesticides;

Seventh. Conducting research on the effects of pesticides on the environment, fish and wildlife and humans;

and

Another recommendation was on the elimination or limitation of use of certain pesticides to the President and Congress.

The Commission will make annual recommendations to the President and Congress concerning improved restrictions on pesticide use and present potential hazards to wildlife and human health. It will be a permanent body to evaluate studies and advise the President and Congress, and the country on its findings.

We must bring pesticide use in the United States into better perspective and completely reevaluate existing regulations in light of the growing documentation of their harmful effects.

Many researchers have been concerned about the effects of persistent pesticides, especially DDT, since its initial development and use in the 1940's to control mosquitoes, flies, and other disease carriers. Even at that time, the fact was known that DDT would kill fish as well as flies, according to Dr. Barry Commoner, noted Washington University environmentalist.

The use of persistent, toxic pesticides has since spread extensively to farms and forest land. Today, more than 600 million pounds of pesticides, including insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, rodenticides, and herbicides, are used annually in the United States, about 3 pounds for every man, woman, and child in the United States. Last year, the sales of pesticides increased by 10 percent over the previous year and, by 1985, it is estimated that they will increase another sixfold.

Reports indicate that about 1 acre of every 100 acres in the United States, as treated with an average of nearly 4 pounds of pesticides every year.

Through this massive, often unregulated use of highly toxic pesticides, every corner of the earth has been contaminated. Living creatures around the world have been reached by the drift of pesticides through the air, water, and soil, and the food chain. The reindeer of Alaska, the penguin of the Antarctic, the petrel of Bermuda, the bald eagle and peregrine falcon of America and the blue shell crab of California have all been predisposed to the brink of extinction by the spread of pesticides through our environment.

While the effects of persistent pesticides have been of major concern for some time, there is growing concern to conservationists over the past few years, in comparison, sparse attention has been given to the implications of pesticide use on man.

The Food and Drug Administration has the Federal responsibility for preventing foods contaminated by pesticides and other harmful substances from reaching the general public. The lengthy history of detaining foods that have accumulated a dangerous level of pesticide residues. But, in almost every case, the foods have been vegetables and fruits, while the use of pesticides or milk, meat, and poultry, which are derived from animals which consumed commodities which are treated with pesticides. For the most part, this pesticide contamination has occurred because of the overuse or misuse of certain pesticides.

However, in recent years the FDA has found that the concentrations of DDT in the salmon in the lake trout points to one characteristic that makes DDT and other persistent pesticides so harmful—biological magnification, which results in an increasing concentration of pesticides progressively along the food chains until it reaches a serious and often lethal level.

A well-researched example of this dangerous phenomenon was documented in Lake Michigan in 1963. The health commission has cited DDT as the pesticide that made the lake trout problem. This finding has raised a serious warning about the future of Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes.

Scientists that the reproduction capabilities of other fish may be harmed. This is especially the case with the Lake Trout, which spend 6 or 7 years in the water before sexual maturity as compared with only 2 years for the Coho salmon.

Lake trout were also the subject of recent extensive research by the New York Health Commission, which reported that high concentrations of DDT and other organochlorines were found in the State's central and northern lakes.

The health commission has cited DDT concentrations in the lake trout up to one part per million in the fatty tissues of the fish. The figure for Lake Michigan is 0.3 parts per million. This is the first time any nation has instigated such a sanction on a pesticide.

During a recent conference on pesticides in Stockholm, Sweden, evidence was presented that DDT, even in very small quantities, could affect human metabolism. One of the studies cited was Russian research that indicated that workers whose jobs bring them in contact with DDT and other organochlorines were found to suffer from changes in the liver which slowed down the elimination of wastes from the body.

Here in the United States, the establishment of firm sanctions on the use of persistent pesticides would be entirely consistent with the recent recommendations of two highly regarded presidential panels.

In my judgment, the most important recommendation of the Wiesner Committee in 1963 was the one urging cutbacks in the use of persistent pesticides as DDT. The panel recommended:

The accretion of residues in the environment (should) be controlled by orderly re-
duction in the use of persistent pesticides. As a first step, the various agencies of the Federal government might restrict wide-scale use of pesticides and develop effective control of disease vectors. The Federal agencies should exert their leadership to induce the industry to take similar actions. Elimination of the use of persistent toxic insecticides should be the goal. (Emphasis added.)

The report of the Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee in 1965 also dealt with this subject. It recommended:

Research should be encouraged toward the development of pesticides with greater specificity, additional modes of action, and more rapid breakdown than many of those in current use.

Pesticide effectiveness should be increased at a total cost of DDT in milk and other food products, has banned the use of DDT within its borders for a year. A Pennsylvania State Senate committee has concluded a 6-month study and has recommended that DDT and other persistent pesticides be banned from use in fields and forests. In addition, the committee has proposed the creation of a Pennsylvania Commission on Ecological Review to advise the public and Government officials on the interrelationships of natural vegetation and animal life with their environment.

Dr. Robert W. Risebrough, an environmental scientist at the State University of New York, Stonybrook, testified on the range of the pesticide residues through the world. He confirmed that DDT has been found to cause eggshells and infant mortality and the extinction of the rare Bermudas petrel, a sea bird which never has direct contact with areas where DDT is used.

Other witnesses have testified that DDT goes into the atmosphere along with evaporating water, builds up to extremely high levels in predator birds and animals, and has caused new insect problems with insect predators that were once held in check.

Dr. Joseph Hickey, a University of Wisconsin wildlife ecologist, said that DDT has been linked to reproduction failures of certain birds, including the eagle, the osprey and the peregrine falcon. Dr. Hickey and other researchers have traced the presence of pesticide residues to a decrease in the weight and thickness of the shells of eggs produced by these birds.

In related testimony, Lucille Stickel, the pesticide research coordinator of the Interior Department's Patuxent Wildlife Research Laboratory, stated that the presence of small quantities of DDT and its derivative DDE in the diets of mallard ducks decreased eggshell thickness, increased egg breakage and decreased overall reproductive success.

This and other testimony has represented the strongest case that has yet been presented in any public forum for new sanctions to be placed on the use of DDT, the most wide-spread persistent pesticide.

A new impetus is needed to provide our country and its citizens with the information and policies we deserve to safeguard our environment from pesticide contamination for generations to come.

Well documented research has indicated that pesticides are a basic cause of serious disruption of the ecological balance, of permanent injury and death to fish and wildlife, and a potential threat to the health and welfare of the general public. A permanent National Commission on Pesticides would provide a significant step toward resolving the difficulties.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the Record at this time, followed by two articles from a recent issue of the Washington Post regarding the banning of DDT in Sweden and my bill to prohibit its interstate sale and shipment here in the United States.

The VICl PRESDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1799) to establish a National Commission on Pesticides, and to provide for a program of research, basic research and development to improve the effectiveness of pesticides and to eliminate their hazards to the environment, fish and wildlife and man, introduced by Mr. Hruska, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

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 "National Pesticide Commission Act of 1969."
rodents has been well established, the widespread and sometimes indiscriminate use of pesticides, especially those pesticides which do not degrade water use, has resulted in serious major problems by disrupting the ecological balance, causing permanent injury or death to fish and wildlife, and by poisoning potential crops and other means of livelihood of the people. It is necessary, therefore, in order to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the people and to promote the conservation and development of natural resources. It is the purpose of this Act to establish a National Commission on Pesticides to study and investigate problems arising from the use of pesticides, to monitor the build up of pesticide residues in the environment, fish and wildlife and man and to develop the development of pesticides that will break down in the air, soil and water more rapidly after use than those presently in use.

TITLE I—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON PESTICIDES

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

Sec. 101. There is hereby established a National Commission on Pesticides (hereinafter in this title referred to as the "Commission").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 102. (a) The Commission shall be composed of members as follows:

(1) Three representatives from Government to be appointed by the President, including representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of the Interior, and the Department of Agriculture.

(2) Three representatives from private life to be appointed by the President representing conservation organizations.

(3) Two representatives from private life to be appointed by the President representing agricultural organizations.

(b) Any vacancy in the Commission shall not be filled by the President until the number of members of the Commission on the day of the act which established the Commission had been reduced to six members.

STAFF

Sec. 105. The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of Title 5, United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service and without regard to the provisions of chapter 61 of such title, relating to classification:

(1) to appoint such personnel as it deems necessary to enable it to carry out its duties, and to fix the compensation of such personnel at rates not in excess of those provided in the General Schedule under section 5320 of such title for employees performing comparable functions, and

(2) to procure temporary and intermittent services, to the same extent as is authorized by section 3109 of such title, but at rates not to exceed $75 a day for individuals.

POWERS OF COMMISSION

Sec. 106. The Commission may at any time request any committee thereof may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or any committee of the Commission may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or any committee thereof.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this title; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

REPORT

Sec. 107. The Commission shall submit a written report of the result of its study and investigation to the President and to the Congress not later than the end of the second calendar year together with such recommendations for legislation or other action as the Commission may deem advisable.

CONCLUSION

Sec. 108. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

The material, presented by Mr. Nelson, follows:
seals in the Antarctic have it, and both are far from the nearest source. Perhaps the Swedish ban will at least eliminate an annual contribution of 700 tons but this is a small amount compared with the 11,000 tons used annually by migrating whales.

The strongest opposition is expected to come from countries involved in malaria control, DDT and its allied compounds are the chief chemicals used to eliminate mosquitoes. And in this field there are no frontiers: even if all Europe and North America were to ban DDT someone would still want an air and seaborne supply from Africa, Asia and South America. But the threat of gathering bans might persuade scientists to develop a chemical without the toxic side effects and penetration of DDT.

SENATOR NELSON INTRODUCES BILL AGAINST CONDOMS

Last Tuesday, Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.) introduced a bill which would prohibit the interstate sale or shipment of DDT in the United States.

He said the accumulation of DDT is reaching "catastrophic proportions," threatening the extinction of some forms of fish and wildlife.

"In a single generation," he told the Senate, "fish and on the East Coast are being wiped out on a worldwide basis, infiltrating the atmosphere, the water and the tissues of most of the world's species.140

"Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000. The revenue lost can easily be recovered by closing some of the expensive tax loopholes that now exist. It is estimated that as much as $50 billion is lost to the Treasury through income tax gimmicks of one sort or another favoring various and sundry special interest groups in our society.

"The most flagrant tax loophole is the 27-1/2 percent depletion allowance for oil companies, which in 1967 paid no tax on its average of $2 billion. Depletion allowances cost taxpayers from $5 to $5 billion annually. The fact is that oil companies have been paying Federal income taxes at about half the average of all large companies paying Federal income taxes at an average rate of 8.2 percent of their net income in 1967. Seventeen of them paid no Federal income tax at all. Eight others were taxed less than 5 percent, and another 13 were taxed from between 5 to 14 percent. The largest of the 14 non-taxpayers were the Atlantic Richfield Co., which in 1967 paid no tax on a net $145 million. This company and its predecessor, the Atlantic Refining Co., accumulated profits of nearly $1/2 billion from 1962 to 1967 without owing a penny in Federal income tax. At the same time a retired Ohio couple both partially handicapped, with an income of $3,976 paid a Federal income tax of $137."

S. 1800—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL INCREASING THE PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION FROM $600 TO $1,000

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, our Federal income tax laws are an abomination and they need to be changed. They are full of tax loopholes favoring a few at the expense of the many that it is no wonder that average American taxpayers are loudly and clearly demanding genuine tax reform.

The truth is that those earning between $5,000 and $15,000 a year—the great majority of citizens—pay a higher percentage in income tax than do those whose earnings exceed $25,000. Middle and lower income Americans bear the heaviest burden of taxation. Of all Federal income taxes paid by individuals, 72 percent comes from those earning less than $15,000, 22 percent with incomes of less than $7,000, and 50 percent from those earning between $7,000 and $15,000. In 1967 American taxpayers of more than $200,000, including 21 with incomes exceeding $1,000,000, paid no income tax whatever. During the same year, 26 million citizens living below the $3,000 a year poverty level paid more than $1.5 billion in Federal income taxes. I have received hundreds of letters from honest hard-working citizens who report that their individual problems in coping with the rising cost of living and with increased local, State, and Federal taxes. It is high time that average-income Americans receive a tax break.

A first step which would help more than the $10 billion given in corrupt taxpayters should be to increase the $600 individual income tax exemption to $1,000. When the $600 personal exemption was adopted in 1948, each exemption was worth a median family income of $3,031. The most recent census statistics place the median family income at $4,017. This means each $600 exemption now amounts to 15 percent of the average family income.

Today the $600 exemption is on its way to becoming merely a token deduction. Site of new, the $600 wage-earners, basic expenses such as food, shelter, and clothing have increased by more than 50 percent. Medical expenses alone have climbed nearly 90 percent.

Therefore, Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000.

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

The bill (S. 1800) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the personal income tax exemption from $600 to $1,000, introduced by Mr. Young of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1465—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I am pleased to offer for introduction today, for myself and the junior Senator from Oregon (Mr. Packwood), a bill to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of drugs, biological products, devices, and medical services.

For some time I have been concerned that the functions of judge and prosecutor relating to new drugs have been consolidated in the Food and Drug Administration. The same group is now involved in determining the propriety of the use of drugs. This is but one example of how the Federal Government is engaging in the business of medicine.

DMISO's medical applications spring from collaboration in the early 1960's of the late Dr. Stanley Jacob, who was working out of the University of Oregon Medical School.

Like antibiotics and cortisone, DMISO cuts across disease lines. The principle of DMISO is that it provides a relatively easy method for the skin. DMISO has developed out of my experience as a member of the Monopoly Subcommittee of the Senate Small Business Committee, in its hearings over the past several years into matters relating to the drug industry, and out of my knowledge of the regulation by the FDA of the use of DMISO—dimethyl sulfoxide—a simple organic compound, developed out of the cement substance of trees, and having the ability to penetrate human tissues.

DMISO's medical applications spring from collaboration in the early 1960's of the late Dr. Stanley Jacob, who was working out of the University of Oregon Medical School.

DMISO's medical applications spring from collaboration in the early 1960's of the late Dr. Stanley Jacob, who was working out of the University of Oregon Medical School.
Only limited formal testing in the United States has been permitted by the FDA, despite its high potentiality for the relief of human ills. In contrast, DMSO has been a prescription drug since June 1967—without any evidence of serious toxicity—in Germany and Austria.

As the areas of concern of the FDA have grown, it has become less efficient and more subject to political pressures. In the case of DMSO, many months—even years—of delay has been caused by the FDA in allowing new drugs, having proven promise of safety and efficacy, to be fully tested or marketed.

A highly competent, professional handling of new drugs is essential for protection of the public health. In my view, any legislation such as this introduced today can the needed changes in the administration of new drug applications be provided. This will give the function of judging new drugs to qualified scientific experts, but leave the prosecution or enforcement function to the FDA.

The purposes of the bill are to—

(a) Secure a maximum of professional competence and thorough review in the evaluation of medical products—that is, biological products, medical devices, and drugs—so that the highest standards of safety for the public are maintained, yet so medical products which have shown proven efficacy and safety shall be made available to the public without undue delay;

(b) Secure the evaluation of all medical products, and to cut down the expense of overlapping jurisdictions and duplicative efforts in this field;

(c) Secure medical products of a fair, swift, and highly proficient evaluation in terms relevant to protection of the public;

(d) Provide for an independent appeals mechanism in cases where there may be an honest dispute over the scientific experts' decision of a medical product or a decision of the Board;

(e) Separate evaluation, primarily a professional function, from legal judgment, from enforcement powers in the regulation of medical products;

(f) Establish standards for the evaluation of medical devices in terms of safety and efficacy—now not provided for in the law—for the increased protection of the public.

This bill provides for—

The establishment of a 15-member Federal Medical Evaluations Board, to be composed of highly qualified eminent scientists, physicians, and clinical researchers to be appointed by the President;

The jurisdiction of the Board to encompass evaluation of all medical products, including drugs, antibiotics and medical devices, and regulatory authority over labeling thereof;

The appointment by the Board of an Executive Director and a highly competent medical staff to aid the Board in its evaluations;

The use by the Board of advisory panels to be called in cases where the Board may deem more professional expertise is necessary to make evaluating judgment.

The mandatory establishment by the Board of ad hoc independent advisory appeals panels in cases where there may be a disagreement over the decision or judgment of the Board.

The review and evaluation of medical devices, both diagnostic and therapeutic, on the basis of safety and efficacy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this section be set forth in full at this point in the Record.

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

The bill (S. 1801) to establish the Federal Medical Evaluations Board to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, and drugs, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Hatfield (for himself and Mr. Packwood), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—FEDERAL MEDICAL EVALUATIONS BOARD

EASTABILSHMENT

SEC. 101. There is established in the executive branch of the Federal Government the Federal Medical Evaluations Board (referred to in this title as the "Board").

MEMBERSHIP

SEC. 102. (a) The Board shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Members of the Board shall be selected from persons in private life who because of their experience, position, or training in the fields of general medical practice, clinical research, or the relevant basic sciences are qualified to carry out the functions of the Board. Members of the Board shall be appointed in such a manner as to provide a balanced representation of views, including in each case:

(b) (1) Executive paragraphs (2) and (3), members of the Board shall be appointed for terms of three years.

(c) Any member of the Board appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of such member's term shall serve on the Board until a successor has been appointed to fill such vacancy.

The Board shall not consist of any medical institution, corporation, or other body corporate.

The Board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business when at least three members are present.

The Board shall meet monthly and at such other times as it deems necessary to carry out its functions, powers, and duties.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND STAFF OF THE BOARD

SEC. 103. (a) The Board shall appoint an Executive Director and fix his basic pay at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code. The Executive Director shall be at the pleasure of the Board.

(b) The Board may delegate to the Executive Director such of its functions, powers, and duties (other than those relating to the making, amending, or repealing or regulating regulations) as it deems appropriate.

(c) With the approval of the Board, the Executive Director may appoint and fix the basic pay of such additional personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties of the Board.

TRANSFER OF BOARD

SEC. 104. (a) There are transferred to and vested in the Board the functions, powers, and duties of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare relating to the regulation of biological products, medical devices, both diagnostic and therapeutic, on the basis of safety and efficacy, to be carried out by the Board in accordance with section 5314 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each other member of the Board shall be paid at the rate of $200 for each day such member is engaged upon the work of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem allowance of not more than $200, as provided by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) The Board shall meet monthly and at such other times as it deems necessary to carry out its functions, powers, and duties. The Board shall be of adequately diversified professional background.

ADVISORY EVALUATION PANELS

SEC. 105. (a) The Board may, from time to time, establish advisory evaluation panels to advise it with regard to the exercise of any of its functions, powers, and duties (other than those relating to the making, amending, or repealing or regulating regulations) as it deems necessary to carry out the functions, powers, and duties referred to and vested in the Board by this section and subsections (1) and (2) of section 512 of such Act; and

(b) (1) Members of such panels shall be paid at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each member shall be paid at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each member shall be paid at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(c) Any member of the Board shall be paid at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code. Each member shall be paid at the rate prescribed for level V-16 of the Executive Schedule by section 5316 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(d) Each member of an advisory panel shall be paid at a rate of $350 for each day such member is engaged upon the work of the Board, and shall be allowed travel expenses, including a per diem allowance of not more than $200, as provided by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(e) The Board shall meet monthly and at such other times as it deems necessary to carry out its functions, powers, and duties. The Board shall be of adequately diversified professional background.
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more than ten members. Members of a panel shall receive as compensation for their services a reasonable per diem, which the Board may by regulation from time to time after the date of its enactment establish for such purpose. The per diem shall be paid for days actually spent in the work of the panel, and shall in addition be reimbursed for their necessary traveling and subsistence expenses while so serving away from their places of residence. The members shall not be subject to any provision of law limiting appointment and compensation of employees of the United States. The Board shall furnish each panel with adequate clerical and other assistance, and shall by regulation prescribe the procedure to be followed by each panel.

ADVOCACY APPEALS PANEL

Sec. 106. (a) The Board shall, upon request of any applicant under section 505, 512, or 514 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, establish an advisory appeals panel to review and advise the Board with respect to any appeal by an applicant for advisory action in the enforcement of any provision of law relating to a decision, determination, or finding of the Board. The members of an advisory appeals panel shall be paid the reasonable per diem established by the Board for their services. The Board may by regulation provide for the submission of briefs and other evidence in any appeal made to such a panel.

(b) The provisions of this title shall not affect the provisions which are pending on the date of the enactment of this title before the Board, and they shall not affect the operation of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Board which relate to functions, powers, or duties transferred by this title; but such proceedings shall be continued before the Board.

(c) Except as provided in paragraph (b) of section 104 of this title, the provisions of this title shall not affect suits commenced prior to the date of the enactment of this title, and (B) in the event any proceedings shall be had, appeals taken, and judgments rendered, in the same manner and effect as if this title had not been enacted.

No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any officer in his official capacity as an officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shall be by reason of the enactment of this title. No cause of action by or against the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare or against any officer of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in his official capacity as an officer of the Board shall arise by reason of the enactment of this title. Causes of actions, suits; or other proceedings may be asserted by or against the United States or such officer or officers on behalf of the United States or such officer or officers, and, in any litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this title, the court may grant such equitable relief as is necessary and appropriate, and in any litigation pending on the date of the enactment of this title the court may enjoin any party which will give effect to the provisions of this subsection.

(b) With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred to such committees and for refunds to such committees and for refunds to such committees and for refunds.
CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 202. Section 501 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 351) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Within one hundred and eighty days after the filing of such application under subsection (a) of section 510(f) of this title, the Board may determine that there is substantial evidence that the device is not safe, effective, or effective within the meaning of such section, and may issue an order withdrawing approval of the device, and order the applicant to cease distributing or using the device until the Board determines that the device is safe, effective, or effective within the meaning of such section, as the case may be." 

SEC. 203. Section 510(k) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 351(k)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(j) Such approval shall expire at the end of 5 years unless the manufacturer of the device, or authorized representative thereof, requests in writing that the expiration period be extended for a period not to exceed an additional 5 years, which request shall be in accordance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a)."

SEC. 204. Section 512 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 352) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(g) Any person may file with the Board a complaint alleging failure to comply with any regulation prescribed under this Act, and the Board may order the Commissioner to investigate and make a determination as to whether any such failure exists."

SEC. 205. Section 514 of such Act (21 U.S.C. 354) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "(h) If, upon the basis of the information submitted to the Board by an applicant under section 515 of this title, the Board finds that the applicant is not entitled to an order withdrawing approval of the device under subsection (f) of such section, the Board shall, upon the request of the applicant, withdraw such approval, and may require such applicant to resubmit such application under section 515 of such Act."
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"Judicial Review"
(1) The applicant may, by appeal, obtain judicial review of a final order of the Board denying an application for
such device or any control in connection therewith. An appeal from any order filed under subsection (b) of this section. The provisions of subsection (b) of section 606 of this Act shall govern any such appeal.
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**PROHIBITED ACTS**

Sec. 211. (a) Paragraph (e) of section 301 of such Act is amended (1) by striking out "or" and inserting "and", (2) by striking out "514(j), or 515," after "512 (j), (j), or (m), (m),"

(b) Paragraph (j) of section 301 of such Act is amended by inserting "514," immediately after "512."

(c) Paragraph (1) of such section 301 is amended (1) by striking out the word "drug" each time it appears thereini

(d) paragraph (3) of such section is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(g) If it is a device and the methods used in, or the facility with which it is manufactured, processed, packing, holding, or installation do not conform to, or are not operated in accordance with, current good manufacturing practice to ass

ure that such device is safe and reliable and has the properties and performance characteristics which it purports or is represented to possess and otherwise meets the requirements of this Act.

**PART C--REQUIREMENT OF GOOD MANUFACTURING PRACTICE**

Sec. 220. Section 501 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 551), as amended by sections 202 and 210 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

..."(g) The term 'Board' means the Federal Medical Evaluations Board..."

**PART D--RECORDS AND REPORTS: INSPECTION AND PENALTIES**

Sec. 230. (a) Chapter V of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C., ch. 9, subch. V) is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(g) Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, paragraph (f) of section 514 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the words 'or devices' after 'drugs'."

**RECORDS AND REPORTS ON DEVICE EFFECTS AND EXPERIENCE**

Sec. 515. (a) (1) Every person engaged in manufacturing or processing, or in distributing, a device that is subject to standards in effect under section 513, or with respect to which standards in effect under such section are to be developed, and every person engaged in dispensing prescription drugs, or who manufactures or processes drugs, or who administers drugs, or who uses drugs, or who maintains records of such drugs, is hereby required to keep records of the facts necessary to accomplish the purposes of this Act, in addition to the records required by such Act.

(b) Paragraph (2) of such section is amended by inserting "or devices", after "drugs" each time such term occurs in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a).

(c) The second sentence of subsection (b) is amended by inserting "or", after "of a drug or device", and "or devices" after "drugs".

(d) The second sentence of subsection (a) of such Act (21 U.S.C. 512(a)) is amended by inserting "or devices" after "drugs".

Sec. 231. (a) The second sentence of such subsection is amended by adding at the end thereof the words "or devices' after 'drugs'."
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S. 1802

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 207(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "Provisions of the Small Business Act of 1958, so far as regards shall be given to the public interest of the areas to be served and without regard to the effect on network competition."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. Murphy) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1762), to amend section 2(b) of the Small Business Act to provide for new interest rates on the Administration's share of disaster loans.

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

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd), the Senator from Virginia (Mr.omon (Mr. Hart), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Hutto), the Senator from California (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. Harris), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. Hart), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. Hartke), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. McGee), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGee), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern), the Senator from Montana (Mr. Metcalf), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. Ribicoff), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond), the Senator from Texas (Mr. Calef), the Senator from Texas (Mr. Yarborough), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. Young), be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1072) to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. Nelson), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. Thurmond) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1363) to provide for support by the Teacher Corps of programs in which volunteers serve as part-time tutors or full-time instructional assistants.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.
ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF RESOLUTION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, in behalf of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. POUYAT), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. 1077), pending a new approach to financing college educations.

The Vice President. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SENATE RESOLUTION 180—RESOLUTION DESIGNATING MAY 6, 1969, AS "A. PHILIP RANDOLPH DAY"

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I submit for appropriate reference, a resolution to declare May 6, 1969, as "A. Philip Randolph Day."

On April 14, 1969, a Philip Randolph will be sixty years of age and on May 6, 1969, his birthday will be celebrated by friends and dignitaries at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The Senate has been informed that Mr. Randolph has made to his people and to this Nation deserve special recognition. He has in the past been referred to as Dean of the Negro labor movement and to the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City.

The initial plans call for open hearings on S. 1077, the bill to amend Public Law 85-905 to provide for a National Center on Educational Media and Materials for the Handicapped, on Monday, April 21; and open hearings on S. 1519, a bill to establish a National Library of Libraries and Information Science, on Thursday, April 24th, both to be held in the hearing room of Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

"I AM CURIOUS—YELLOW"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a Swedish film has been shown and perhaps still is being shown in Washington, D.C. It is being shown in Sweden, Denmark, and the United States. It was banned in Norway. It was censored in France and Germany, and was recently restored in Sweden.

The U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals in New York overturned the finding. It was relying on guidelines in decision of the U.S. Supreme Court. There you have the jury, a bit of ponderous political debate.

The Appeals Court voted two to one to release the film, uncut, saying, "The sexual explicitness than has been seen in any other film produced for general viewing."

The U.S. Customs Office sought to prevent the film's entry into this country, and a jury is currently convened in the U.S. Federal Court. A Court of Appeals reluctantly concluded that it couldn't be banned, however, relying on guidelines of Supreme Court decisions.

The Appeals Court voted two to one to release the film, uncut, saying, "The sexual explicitness than has been seen in any other film produced for general viewing."

Judge S. J. Frey is a proponent of legal guidelines to limit the forms of censorship see it as marking the emergence of the U.S. as a leader in free speech and expression. To quite another group, the film is the final confirmation of a disaster they have long seen brewing. The growing permissiveness of American society, they maintain, has finally reached total depravity.

For or against, it is difficult to argue with one observation: The barriers are coming down. In the Off-Broadway play entitled "Dionysus in '69," five nude men and four naked girls celebrate a Greek rite by alliterating over one another and romping through space. Last week a New York City producer announced plans for a play to include on-stage intercourse. Phil Roth's latest novel, "Portnoy's Complaint," has climbed rapidly to the top of best-seller lists (the author says the book is a deliberate effort to elevate obscenity "to the level of a subject" for serious art).

And as the barriers fall, the debate over what the relaxation means, how far it should go and why it is happening is intensifying.

Father John Culkin, an ardent student of Puritanism, says, "We're reaping a reaction to the very repressive atmosphere we've maintained in our families, churches and schools," Father Culkin notes, "It's as if we've suddenly realized that what we're doing is very uptight. We weren't allowed to have bodies. And what we're going through now is a shakedown cruise exploring a new morality."

The cause of such rapid change, says, Father Culkin, echoing Mr. McLuhan, is the growth in the electronic media. For his part, he says, it took half a century for styles and
mores to change significantly, because infor-
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[From the Sentinel, Apr. 10, 1969]

**THE MESS FOUND ON BROADWAY**

(By William Buckley)

It wasn't hard to predict (I did so at the time) that when the Supreme Court ruled that the states could not suppress reading matter or by extension obscenity legislation without proof of some thing of social interest, that was the end of obscenity legislation, notwithstanding the Supreme Court's reassurances to the contrary.

New York being a vigorous city, full of entreprenurial verve, it is not surprising that it has taken the lead in dealing with the court's decision, as the metropolitan center of pornography. It had, to be sure, a long underground apprenticeship.

A witticism of John Lindsay is recorded that when he was the congressman for Manhattan and voted on a single day against a subversive control bill and against an obscenity control bill, that he commented to an aide that Congress was trying to crack down on his constituency's two major products.

Now the social-interest bit is intellectually confusing. For if anybody can say with confidence that he would like it even if he saw it than he does now without having to be thoughtlessly or disingenuously; disingenuously if it really thought that fine lines would ensue from its decision; disingenuously if it pretended to salvage antiscenity legislation but actually foresaw that with a few years people would be lining the streets outside theaters in New York to see coupling couples on-screen.

The interesting questions at this point are the responses of the community. It is probably fair to say that much of the community is outraged. But my notion is that the Supreme Court and the Congress have trained us well to accept rulings by the Supreme Court as irreversible.

Four years ago the Supreme Court ruled that we could not write a common prayer in the public schools, and which was our business. And last year many people who recognized a communist line when it appeared. Now, why, we wonder, if the persons who want to go to church today are willing to let Senator Dirksen stay away from it, is he not equally willing to let them pay their money and make their own choice as to whether it is art or obscenity. The decision is obviously not an easy one. A Federal District Court jury in New York condemned the picture as obscene. But the Second Circuit Court of Appeals overruled that verdict on the ground that the film was not wholly without redeeming social value. Perhaps the Supreme Court will be asked to add its opinion to the judicial controversy. But in the end, the decision about the merits of this controversy will lie with the public. Is that such a bad idea?

Mr. **DIRKSEN.** I am a great believer in the jury system, and I feel the decision about the merits of this curiosity should be made by a jury.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Part II: Communism," written by Reverend Charles Hubbard, minister of the First Methodist Church, Wilson, N.C., entitled "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Introduction."

Mr. Hubbard has preached a second sermon on the general theme of the freedom of man which bears the title "A Sermon on the Freedom of Man—Communism," which merits the widest possible dissemination. This is so because many people who can't be so, preacher, because free people do not like communism." Yes, but I would accuse half of them of being quite the opposite, that they don't know what will. I ask unanimous consent that this second sermon on the general theme of freedom be printed at this point in the Record.

The motion being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**A SERMON ON THE FREEDOM OF MAN—PART II: COMMUNISM**

In our next section I am going to talk about some of the dangerous causes right in our midst. A lot of these are inter-related with one major and evil cause that I shall hold before you at this time. It is communism. I believe that to a great extent the trends that tend to strangle human freedom in the United States today, in the Communist manifesto, that is not much over a hundred odd years old, and I believe that many foolish responses that are made by people in the United States to present problems have been conditioned by this Communist manifesto. Now, I know there are a lot of people who say, "Why, they can't be, preacher, because free people do not like communism." Yes, but I would accuse half of them of being quite the opposite, that they don't know what will. I ask unanimous consent that this community line when it appeared—half the time, and that's the dangerous cause right in the midst. Our brainwashing—I'll say it again, brainwash ing—has led us to believe what is not true. Yet, we have a tendency to attribute Christian principles and motives to atheistic communist leaders, and that is not true. We also try to believe
that when Communists use the same terminology of freedom we use, they mean the same thing. And that is never true.

First, the word "communism" means "the dictatorship of the proletariat"—and that is all he means! What does he mean by "planning"? He usually means expropriation of property. What does the Communist mean by "liberation"? He means revolution. That's all he means. He disguise the word "communism" for the consumption of Westerners by simply calling it "anti-colonialism," "anti-imperialism," "anti-Fascism." Every time he uses the word "communism," he is talking about capitalism.

And by "peaceful co-existence"—and we heard that at the United Nations—what he means is the complete and total peace in Korea when foreign troops leave South Korea. The speaker didn't mention foreign troops in North Korea. He did not mention foreign troops in East Germany, or foreign troops in Hungary. He did not mention any foreign troops in Poland, on and on and on. And what does he mean by "peaceful co-existence"? He means that we are to be persuaded to abandon our very survival programs, and be persuaded to scrap our military forces so Communism can take over. That's what he means by "peaceful co-existence!"

Well, is that entirely impossible to tolerate? I have even heard a minister or two—and one Catholic priest—say that religion—say that it might be all right for them to take over; and then we can breathe from within. So right now is a good time for me to say to all of you, according to the great Charles Malick, an international statesman from Lebanon, that in the 44 years that communism has been an imperialist movement, not one foot of ground that they have completely taken over has ever been taken away again. So much for your dream—unless you mean—breathe from within? Anybody is free to vote for a communist; but after he votes for them, then what happens? He is going to have to vote for them out. That is a funny freedom! You say it can't be that bad, that people defect from the United States of America. Oh, you haven't seen a lot of people who have defected from the United States of America to communism since the Second World War. Add a few who were escaping communist spies. Add a thousand or so who were dodging the draft or deserting from the armed forces, who did not go to communist countries. We confess to that few. And, of our few defectors, many have returned to the United States voluntarily—return to their homeland, and bread and peace. Since the Second World War, over nineteen million persons have escaped from behind the Iron and Bamboo barriers. (And untold millions are still killed trying to escape.) Why did they leave? Why? Just to be free.

Now, about our problem of comparing a small company of Americans, half of whom are prisoners and brainwashed, with nineteen million people suffering in churches in Russia. Since the Second World War we will not try to make the comparison. But a good Communist writer has tried to do that. And the sobbers continue to cry. "But, it's changed! They can't be that bad!"

Recently, four young Soviet writers were sentenced to hard labor in Siberia because their writings urged the government to grant more freedom to the Russian citizen. First, they were condemned to death for "desecrating the picture of Lenin in your city. All we've got to do is nothing long enough, and pretty soon we will look at our own spilled blood. Our luck won't hold out.

Second, Communists will work to divide America into antagonistic special interest groups—call them friends in need of our own welfare, never the welfare of America as a whole. Now, what has been happening during the last ten years that we are beginning to see? Isn't that the great play of race against race? And the poor against the rich? And classes against classes? Labor against capital? Hasn't it been "Me first and the devil take the rest?" Did you know this condition has been communist policy for the last twenty years for the United States of America?

With regard, Communists manipulate mass thinking. They will find the mood of the masses and then guide this mood to their own use. Obviously, they didn't get hold of me.

Now, using these techniques, the "Reds" are confident that they can get you to accept whatever conditions the Winston Churchill points of view, little by little; until you accept their "bait" today, and tomorrow you will accept something deeper—like "keep to the slaughter-house" and not whimper at all. You will then be conditioned as a socialistic man.

My friends, our problem today is not only that we do not take the Communist threat seriously; we do not even take our own fate seriously. For a generation of young people, we have grown satisfied on the fruits of freedom and the Christianty faith that makes America great. We have returned to God doubt and disobedience. We have made our own little gods of business and pleasure and status-seeking. We have allowed our children to become religious illiterates, and don't tell me they aren't because I know they are! And we are being suckered right now into selling our birthright of responsible Christian freedom for some "devil's potage" of secular materialism. Wake up! Wake up! While you still can wake up!

Your little respect for human freedom is not enough. If a regime that has no democracy is not enough devotion. Your little love for God is not enough love. Wake up from your sleep, America, while you can still wake!

Now, a brilliant man by the name of Dimitri Z. Manuilsky teaches in the Lenin School of Political Warfare in Moscow, and he describes Communist strategy for the period of the sixties, a period just now concluding. We thought we had it easy in sixty-one, two, three, four and five, didn't we? I quote him, "The bourgeoisie"—now that's what I have to say. "The bourgeoisie"—now that's what I have to say. We will begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement in history. There will be nothing heard of concessions; the capitalist community, a little decadent, will rejoice to cooperate in their own destruction. They will leap at another price, of course, and they can do it, but we will have to be conditioned to take it over the world! And when you come to believe that they intend to do it, you can defend against it. But if you continue to think wishfully, probably they shall take it over.

Oh, we want to live too much. Oh, we want to live too much. There are many things worse than death. I would be happy to come to terms—finally, you and all your families, to death today if, for that price, I could buy the promise of real freedom for our great grandchildren. Then that price would cheap indeed. But if we keep swapping a little freedom today and tomorrow for a little more security and time today was worth ten tomorrow we would be anything worth fighting for, and the Communists will prove to be right, because they say that their freedom and dignity will be gone.

Now, what are the Communists trying to do? They are trying to conquer the United States of America. It is not a new program, but you can begin to see some of it. It is already working here.
ing had better negotiate with their eyes open, knowing that they are dealing with atheists, with liars, with wicked doers.

Third, we must be as loyal to human dignity and freedom as they are loyal to degradation and sin. We must remember that we shall commit ourselves totally to the God of Jesus Christ. If we are going to survive, we had better be close to our children; and we who are teachers had better do that too, and make sure that they are being trained to think like Washington, and Jefferson, and Lincoln, and not like Lenin and Marx. And while we provide for the physical needs of our families, we had better not forget their spiritual needs. It is not enough again and again that an agonistic mind is already three-fourths conquered by Communists. And while we provide for the physical needs of our families, we had better not forget their spiritual needs.

Under the administrative agency system, the function of the courts is to review agency decisions applying the law, and to correct the agency when it strays from the congressional will. Just as the National Labor Relations Board is not above the statute and congressional intent, so the courts, including the Supreme Court, must not substitute their own views of desirable labor policy for that of Congress. While many of these days believe that the Supreme Court has a roving commission to rewrite the Constitution however it sees fit, thus far no one has suggested that the Congress itself should legislatively enact and substitute its own view in place of Congress' when it reviews an agency's administration of a statute.

These fundamental canons governing the administrative agency system and the role of the courts seem, from the subcommittee's investigations, to be honored more in the breach than in the observance, at least so far as labor law is concerned. Time after time the subcommittee has seen examples of the Board's aggressive enforcement of statutory language--and to the damage, and the watering down or complete disregarding of portions with which it disagrees.

The Taft-Hartley Act is a complex system of law designed to bring the diverse interests, and the compromises and adjustments that are expressed in the statute, to the working man and the general public into harmony and balance. In writing the statute, Congress sought to find an accommodation of these many competing interests, and to correct the agency when it strays from the statute and congressional intent, so that both the Board and the Court can be held to be performing their functions as Congress intended.

Thus, by that peculiar logic which seems to govern Board decisions, the Board is supposed to protect a worker's free choice. Unfortunately, both the Board and the Supreme Court have failed to protect this right.

Unions have a right to make rules for the retention of membership. This is a right which is explicitly granted by the statute. But both the Board and the Supreme Court have failed to give expression to the balances which Congress sought to achieve.

Regrettably, the Supreme Court has itself failed to perform its function of insuring that the Board applied the words of the statute as written in all of the congressional intent. The Court, too, prefers to emphasize portions of the law it agrees with, and to leave other interests and congressional policies to decay for lack of protection. Even where the Supreme Court may disagree with the Board, too often the result is that Board distortion of the statute is replaced by Supreme Court distortion. The Supreme Court seems to be no less eager than the Board to create its own system of labor law, independent of Congress.

Nowhere has the Court been than in the so-called union-fine cases. Even a passing familiarity with this newly devised doctrine shows that both the Supreme Court and the Board have lost or forgotten a major interest that the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to protect and have destined what is on its face simple statutory language.

The major Supreme Court declaration in this field, and the least defensible, is the Allis-Chalmers case, which was decided in June 1967. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the Board's position that unions can fine members who refuse to participate in union-called strikes, and, furthermore, that they are entitled to keep the money so collected.

And just the other day, the Supreme Court decided the case of Scofield against National Labor Relations Board, which extends the evils of the Allis-Chalmers decision, and makes it possible for workers working hard and too efficiently at their jobs. This decision makes even more imperative the need for a congressional action to restore the original meaning of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The Taft-Hartley Act prohibits restraint and coercion by either union or employer against any employee who exercises his section 7 rights. In plain language, this means the whole policy, not solely those parts which the Board and the subcommittee's investigations, to be honored more in the breach than in the observance, at least so far as labor law is concerned. Time after time the subcommittee has seen examples of the Board's aggressive enforcement of statutory language--and to the damage, and the watering down or complete disregarding of portions with which it disagrees.
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Unions have a right to make rules for the retention of membership. This is a right which is explicitly granted by the statute. But both the Board and the Supreme Court have failed to give expression to the balances which Congress sought to achieve.
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Nowhere has the Court been than in the so-called union-fine cases. Even a passing familiarity with this newly devised doctrine shows that both the Supreme Court and the Board have lost or forgotten a major interest that the Taft-Hartley Act seeks to protect and have destined what is on its face simple statutory language.

The major Supreme Court declaration in this field, and the least defensible, is the Allis-Chalmers case, which was decided in June 1967. In that case, the Supreme Court upheld the Board's position that unions can fine members who refuse to participate in union-called strikes, and, furthermore, that they are entitled to keep the money so collected.
give the union leadership an all-powerful weapon over the livelihood of their members.

The rule which the Supreme Court created in the Scofield case and Allis-Chalmers case is an interesting illustration of the law-revision process which the Board and the Court engage in when they try to legislate in the statutory language. The rule in these cases, the Court now says, is that the statute "leaves a union free to enforce a properly adopted rule which reflects legitimate union interests, irrespective of the right of unions to escape the rule." Of course, the statute means what it says if the Court accepts its meaning. But since the Court has shown no great willingness to come to their defense, despite the shocking number of fines being imposed. Although many legislative alternatives have been considered in the House and Senate, the Court has not given serious consideration to the idea of legislating an alternative rule in Congress to come to grips with the critical distortions of the law which the Board and the Supreme Court have created.

Congress has an obligation to insure that both the courts and the independent administrative agencies operate within the confines of the legislative will. An important part of Congress responsibility is to be alert to what the agencies and the courts are doing with legislation. All too often, as the subcommittee's hearings on the Board have shown, this responsibility is not fulfilled. But usually, the other part of Congress responsibility is to take the necessary action to redress a situation where it is clear that congressional intent has been disregarded. No one need be more evident than in the union-fine cases. Proposals to correct this state of affairs have been in Congress for years. It is high time they were considered by the appropriate committees. Legislation to remedy this crisis should be passed without further delay.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

THE ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Secretary of Defense, Mr. Laird, for not appearing before the Republican National Committee today to discuss the question of the ABM.

I wish to express my concern about reports I have read in the newspapers to the effect that the Democratic National Committee has indicated that the question of the ABM might become a partisan issue.

I also want to express my concern about Republican attempts to make it a partisan issue on the basis of pressures which I understand—but cannot prove—have been in operation during the past several days.

Furthermore, I also wish to express my concern about any Democrat in this Chamber who attempts to make the ABM a partisan political issue.

If so, I am convinced that committees are being set up either for or against the ABM and being allied with either party. I think they should go their own way, make their own case. The Senate will make up its own mind, either for or against.

I commend the President, if a report which I have heard is accurate on the statement attributed to the White House, that he contemplates appearing before the Nation in defense of his proposal for a Safeguard missile system. That is within the area of his responsibility—make his case, so to speak. But the point I emphasize above all else is that this is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. It is a national issue which supersedes the interests of both parties. It is an issue which has two sides. There are meritorious arguments on both—let them be heard in the Senate.

In recent years many issues of foreign relations and military policy have come before the Senate. But questions have been considered in an atmosphere free of partisan political consideration reflects great credit on Senators of both parties.

There has been no hesitancy in this connection in acknowledging a debt to the distinguished minority leader (Mr. Muskie) and to the entire Republican membership. During the Kennedy and the Johnson administrations, there have been no inclinations on their part to play politics with the Nation's security. Equally, there will be no inclination on the part of the majority leadership to play politics with these issues during the current administration.

That is not to say that there will not be differences. There are already differences over issues which have been considered in the past two administrations. The differences, however, will cut across party lines, now, even as they did then. That is to be expected when complex questions of international policy are involved, and it is just as it should be when these questions are examined in the context of the variety of insights and attitudes which exist in the Senate.

The treatment of Vietnam during the last administration illustrates this point. The Senate will recall that policies of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations on Vietnam were disputed, in the first instance, by Democratic Senators, by members of the Democratic majority. My own views of disagreement with these policies are well known because they were expressed publicly and repeatedly by both President Kennedy and President Johnson. Clearly, there was no element of politics involved in Democratic Senators assuming positions of opposition to a Democratic administration.

Distinguished Republican Senators, however, also formed a most articulate and perceptive segment of the opposition to the policies of the Vietnam, to violence during the previous administration.

To be sure, the opposition of these Republican Senators was directed at a Democratic administration. They acted, however, not out of partisanship but on
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the basis of their high constitutional responsibilities. In my judgment, those Republican Senators deserve not partisan labels but national thanks for their consistent effort to prevent the mounting of the tragic conflict in Vietnam.

In the same fashion, the critical examination of the ABM issue has transcended party lines. The opposition to this immensely costly and questionable military undertaking did not begin on January 20 with a Republican administration. The initiative which served to marshal the opposition to the ABM came largely from the perceptive and articulate arguments of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Cooper). What would this distinguished Republican speak out? Did he speak as a Republican to embarrass a Democratic administration? Or did he speak as a Senator of conscience and conviction? Did the Senator from Kentucky speak as an interested politician or as a former diplomat with an immense knowledge of world affairs? And did the distinguished Senator from Maine (Mrs. Smoot), the ranking member of the minority of the Armed Services Committee, in opposing this project last year, speak as a partisan politician? Or did she speak as one of the Senate's ablest experts in military matters, with a far longer experience in the problems of nuclear weaponry than most of the Defense Department officials who were urging the ABM project?

I need not labor the point. I make the point only because of disturbing reports of outside efforts to synthesize a political partisanship where, in fact, none has existed and where none should exist.

We were, none of us, born yesterday. We are, none of us, strangers to the more devious byways of the world of politics. But the attempt to bring political considerations into the arena by the back door of the Senate is not trivial and it is most inexcusable.

What is at stake, here, is not the political popularity of this administration anywhere in the country. What is at stake here, in the end, are billions of dollars of funds—expenditures which have been proposed by the Defense Department. These are public funds which we can ill afford to waste on superficially impractical or irrelevant defenses at a time when inflation and taxes and urgent civil demands are pressing heavily upon the people of the United States.

What is sounding in the ABM question is not the clarion call to politics in 1970 or 1972. It is, rather, the call to face clearly in the Senate the issues of peace and war—to consider deeply what may contribute to the strengthening of peace and what may intensify the prospect of war.

That is what confronts us. I do not know how the Senate will decide this issue. I am confident, however, that Senate, even if it should override President Johnson's veto, would greatly intensify the consideration of the issue this patent attempt to intrude an extraneous politics into the constitutional responsibility which devolves upon each Senator regardless of his views.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield, if I have time remaining.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I thank Senator Mansfield for his very generous remarks. I also speak as a part of the Republican side, and I must say that the debate such as this will be carried on in the Senate to bring before the Congress and the country the merits of the proposed ABM system has been led and shared by many on both sides of the aisle, and I must say that the moral force of the majority leader has been in my view a most important factor.

I share his viewpoint that the ABM issue should be removed from the arena of partisan politics, as far as it is possible. I say—as far as possible—because of public interest in issues and in political personalities may make it impossible that a debate such as this will be carried on wholly apart from political consideration. And beyond the partisan politics, the Executive, as well as Members of the Congress, will have to consider this system, has the right and the duty to the country to call for support.

But I would caution the national committees and political organizations, whether of the Republican or Democratic Party, not to appeal for support or opposition to the system because of party or support of individuals. As Members of the Congress deeply concerned about this issue which affects our country, seek to make their decision, partisan efforts do not help and in my judgment will backfire.

This debate involves the question of national security, which no responsible person of either party would want to compromise. Beyond the question of whether deployment against some sudden or unexpected attack makes any practical defense, or the consequences of deploying it, is the larger issue of determining the elements of security in a world of nuclear weapons, and the wisdom of a preemptive strike. The decision to bring before the country would have the chance to prevent the very course upon which we can expect an opportunity to reach such an accord is that our interests in this case are mutual. The Soviets are unpredictable, but like the United States we can consider that they want to be destroyed.

We must consider the effect of the continued escalation of defensive and offensive nuclear weapons. The continued development cause the balance of terror to become an imbalance of terror with increased danger that one nation may try a preemptive strike? This could provoke the other side to do the same, and certain a sense of futility, particularly among the young people of our country who would like to live their lives in a peaceful world, at least relatively peaceful, and one not overhung by the threat of a nuclear race and a nuclear war. I do not suppose that any of us, young or old, want a nuclear weapons system hanging over us—and to live in mind if not in fact, like our ancient ancestors in caves. It may be there is no other way, but I am constrained to believe that reason can prevail.

Senator Harr of Michigan, and I introduced an amendment last year to postpone the deployment of the ABM system, joined by Members of the Senate from both parties, and we did so that the Senate, the Congress, and the country would have the chance to fully examine its merits and the necessity of its deployment. Throughout last year, as Senator Harr and I persisted in the submission of amendments, joined always by a bipartisan group and as others introduced amendments—Senator Young of Ohio, Senator Nelson of Wisconsin, Senator Clark of Pennsylvania—continuing debate had the effect we had desired—submission of the issue on its merits to the country.

The debate has brought forward many versions of the purpose of the system—whether against a Chinese or Soviet threat, whether to protect our missile sites, whether for a mixed population and missile site protection, or to strengthen the hand of our country in negotiations with the Soviet Union. Each of these purposes has been questioned at times both by proponents and opponents. The debate has helped to arbitrate the merits and not upon partisan grounds. The elected leadership of both the majority and the minority and other Members of the Senate have taken their positions on the merits and some are opponents and some are proponents of the system.

I hope this is the way it will continue and that the decision in the Congress will be made upon the merits. I continue to hope that the President will establish a committee such as Dr. Killian recommended, which working with the executive branch and the best informed minds of our country upon the issue, and that a judgment will result which would have the support of the country and an overwhelming majority of our people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.
MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as long as no Senator seems to be seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent that the record be read a statement which I made on Saturday, so that it will be a part of the record of my position on the ABM:

A HOLD-FAST ON MISSILE DEPLOYMENT

After several years of relative stability, the Soviet Union and the United States are on the verge of major additional deployments of nuclear missiles. The pressure to proceed with the installation of these new systems is on in this nation and the indications are that it is on in the Soviet Union. It is on in the United Nations. It is on in the Administration which has made three overtures which suggested to the Soviets that the last months of the Johnson Administration would not afford the enormous expenditures of these deployments in the light of other national needs. It is on even though, for reasons which the Administration states are national security, the limitations as the better way to national security than the continuance of this appalling missile merry-go-round.

It should be noted, therefore, that during the last months of the Johnson Administration and the beginning of the present Administration the Soviet Union apparently made three overtures which suggested a willingness to sit down and discuss a limitation on armaments of various types. In a similar vein, President Nixon has stated that he wants to replace the era of "confrontation" with the era of "negotiations." He has made clear that he would prefer the "open-hand" to the "closed-fist" in the relationship of the United States and the Soviet Union.

Based on Secretary Rogers' press conference of April 7, I assume that Soviet probing for talks on armaments has received full consideration in the Executive Branch. I quote from that press conference, at which time Secretary of State Rogers was asked if there was anything standing in the way of the strategic arms limitation talks. He gave this answer: "No, there is nothing standing in the way and we can go forward very soon. We are in the process of preparing for them now and we expect that to begin in the late spring or early summer."

It would be my hope that the President, on that basis and on the basis of the preparations which he has made since taking office, would now be ready to set a date certain to open U.S.-Soviet discussions.

I am not suggesting that armaments negotiations should be "linked" with a consideration of political differences and the host of other issues which have separated the United States and the Soviet Union for many years. Panoramic negotiations of that kind may or may not produce some point in the future. In my view, however, first things should come first.

The first thing, in my judgment, is not to be tied up with the many issues of many years standing. Nor is the first thing to be found in arms reduction in a general sense which has been under discussion for two decades. Rather, the most urgent need is to curb the rising pressure in both countries for another major round of new and perhaps the deadly nuclear weapons confrontation.

The time to respond to Soviet overtures for negotiations of a limited nature should be before not after the deployment of new nuclear weapons systems, for which the United States seems to have irreversible momentum in both countries. What is needed before all else are U.S.-Soviet negotiations which, confined to one question, may act to halt these gears promptly. What is needed, now, in my judgment, is the negotiation of an agreement to hold-fest on the further deployment of nuclear weapons in the Soviet Union and in the United States.

If agreement on that single point can be achieved there would be created a climate of calmness, a situation of the sort of the Test Ban Treaty, which might help to bring about solutions of mutual interest to the most complex problems of arms-reduction as well as the resolution of political differences.

At the least, the immediate result of an agreement to hold-fest on further nuclear deployments would be an immense savings of resources which would otherwise be diverted into new weapons systems in both countries over the next few years. Any initiative by the President in this connection, in my judgment, would be gratefully received, not only by the peoples concerned but by the peoples of the world.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is the intent of the leadership to call up tomorrow Senate Resolution 167, a resolution authorizing SECDEF to curtail the test ban system for the U.S. Senate Chamber.

HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION—RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CULVER CITY YOUNG DEMOCRATS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are many times when we become impatient with some of the actions of the so-called younger generation. People point to the misdeeds of some younger people as evidence of the good deeds of the entire generation. Unfortunately, we are not always aware of the truly constructive actions of the younger generation.

Recently I received a resolution by the Culver City Young Democrats supporting the Human Rights Conventions—on genocide, forced labor, and the political rights of women.

This is a constructive action. An unselfish one, and one which deserves our applause. I hope that it will help to bring about Senate ratification of these conventions. I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD, in the hope that it will spur the Senate to action, and remind us all of our common humanity, young or old.

The resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES TO RATIFY THE UNITED NATIONS GENOCIDE, FORCED LABOR AND THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

Whereas, the United Nations conventions relating to Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of women here-in-after referred collectively as the Human Rights Conventions are embodied in the Constitution; and

Whereas, ratification of the Human Rights Conventions would not commit the United States to any action contrary to the laws of the United States or any state or territory thereof; and

Whereas, the Human Rights Conventions assert principles essential to the operation of democratic societies; and

Whereas, the Human Rights Conventions concern the essential precepts of civilization; therefore, be it

Resolved by the Culver City Young Democrats, That, The United States Senate be memorialized to ratify the United Nations Conventions relating to Genocide, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of women with expedition consistent with thoughtful consideration; be it further

Resolved, That pursuant to Article III, Section 4, Clause 1 of the Constitution, the Chairman shall forward copies of this resolution to the appropriate agencies and individuals.

Approved: March 26, 1969.

SHIRLEY SHAFER Chairman.

HOWARD S. WEINSKELY, Parliamentarian.

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, over recent months there has been some controversy over where—in what office or department of Government—responsibility for execution of our foreign trade policies should be vested.

The Congress itself, under article 1, section 8, of the Constitution, is responsible for setting basic foreign trade policy. Since 1934, however, the Congress has delegated the execution of that policy to the executive branch. During most of this period, the State Department has enjoyed a virtual monopoly over the execution of that policy. However, in 1962, when Congress was framing the Trade Expansion Act it incorporated a section—241—which established the Office of Special Trade Representative and made it responsible for negotiating the Kennedy round and any other negotiations and as determined by the President. This special trade representative was reported directly to the President, and in this way it was felt that he would retain independent from the foreign policy orientation of the State Department, any important trade negotiations which the President would defend American commercial interests and not sacrifice those interests for the sake of vague political objectives and sound decisions, representative representation to time emanate from the Department of State.

The question now is whether that office should continue to exist within the White House or whether the many responsibilities of executing the trade policy and legislation enacted by the Congress should be vested in another department, such as the Department of Commerce. That decision, of course, will have to be made by the President him-
self, but with the advice and consent of the Senate.

According to recent press reports, the President has decided to keep the office of special trade representative within the White House, and will nominate a new special trade representative in the near future, subject to the confirmation by the Senate.

Since the Committee on Finance has a major responsibility for the formulation of foreign trade policy legislation within the Senate, and since there have been some misgivings on the part of many members of the committee with regard to certain agreements concluded by the previous special trade representative, I think it is altogether proper and fitting for me to say a few words today about the controversy as to where executive authority over trade policy should reside within the executive family.

Before getting into that concrete issue, however, I would like to state a few basic principles which I think most Members of this body agree.

First, while trade policy is necessarily a part of overall foreign policy in that it involves dealings and negotiations with foreign governments and authorities, the basic purpose of national foreign trade policy—reciprocity—should not be sacrificed for other policy objectives. Commercial policy should never be devolved in the hands of branch agencies of our foreign policy advisers, otherwise we will be continually sacrificing commercial interests—and reciprocity—for vague political goals and ambitions—ever-ready to be promoted to a political job. We all remember that the Trade Expansion Act was billed as a bridge toward a strong Atlantic alliance. We also know that the State Department recommended and the Congress accepted a provision of that act—section 211—which was aimed at encouraging the entrance of Great Britain into the Common Market. General de Gaulle vetoed our approach to our European Community which passed a bill and forced him to sign it and concede that he did not have the authority to do what he had been doing and what he was supporting.

Now, while the President must decide where the major responsibilities for carrying out day-to-day commercial policy with foreign governments should reside, Congress has a constitutional mandate to supervise and overrule our Executive if Congress feels that the law is not being executed as it was intended. I would like to state a few basic principles to which I think most Members agree.

1. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

2. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

3. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

4. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

5. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

6. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

7. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

8. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

9. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

10. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

11. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

12. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

13. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

14. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

15. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

16. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

17. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

18. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

19. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

20. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

21. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

22. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

23. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

24. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

25. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

26. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

27. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

28. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that Code.

29. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

30. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

31. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

32. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

33. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

34. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

35. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

36. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

37. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

38. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

39. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

40. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

41. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

42. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

43. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

44. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

45. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

46. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

47. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

48. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

49. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

50. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

51. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

52. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

53. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

54. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

55. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

56. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

57. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

58. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

59. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

60. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

61. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

62. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

63. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

64. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

65. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

66. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

67. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

68. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

69. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

70. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

71. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

72. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

73. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

74. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

75. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

76. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

77. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

78. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

79. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

80. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

81. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

82. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

83. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

84. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

85. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

86. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

87. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

88. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

89. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

90. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

91. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

92. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

93. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

94. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

95. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

96. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

97. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

98. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

99. The negotiations of that Code were a provision of that law. Congress never intended.

100. The House recommended and the Senate accepted that provision in a provision of that law. Congress never intended.
Maurice Stans, a highly regarded Secretary of Commerce is a protectionist because the Commerce Department is charged with concern for domestic jobs and employment opportunities for the dispossessed. That being the case, the Council of Economic Advisers would all be protectionists, and we know that that is not the case.

The Council of Economic Advisers is as capable as anybody else of agreeing with what Mr. Stans says is true: that no deal is a good deal unless it is a good deal for both partners. Over a period of time, when you are trading with someone, one often trades for the future and he is eventually he is going to quit trading with you, because he cannot afford to trade with someone who is cheating him or when he is not making a profit. So it should be a good deal both ways, and everybody should be in favor of that kind of deal and trade. No one should be in favor of the other kind. We do not want to exploit the other person, and we do not want to be exploited.

In conclusion, it seems to me that the Commerce Department is the logical place where responsibility for executing our trade policy should be vested. No one else is neutral, or even less neutral, and American foreign policy has always been subservient to business interests.

By my lights, Secretary Stans is a very liberal man when it comes to foreign trade. He believes in expanding it drastically. In my judgment, he is unrealistic when he speaks of the fantastic goals of foreign expansion that he has in mind. It would seem to me that to achieve such goals, one of the first things that must be done is to make the Commerce Department be neutral, or at least, try to be neutral, and not to become subversive to vague political objectives, and no one wants to see American jobs and American products sacrificed in the interest of being a "nice guy" to the foreigner in trade negotiations, or for the purpose of taking a so-called vague international point of view which cannot be defined.

I am convinced that Congress will agree on the general proposition that foreign trade policy should be more consistent with our domestic goals of full employment and price stability than it has been in recent years. I am equally convinced that the Secretary of Commerce is the best man to correlate these policies and make them buttress each other rather than conflict with each other.

What I find myself in difference with some of Mr. Stans' views, and always have, I would insist to the end that he is the logical person to handle this office, especially that of trade representative. If we are willing to accept the idea of any trade relations and think of what is good for American workers, American industry, and American investments, as well as what is good for foreign policy objectives, to try to correlate these two desirable objectives, then it occurs to me that the time has come when the responsibilities and duties of the Commerce Department should be recognized in this field.

OIL INDUSTRY CONTRADICTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the contradiction of major oil companies pleading for less Government intervention in the free market, while relying on the Government to fix prices for them, was aptly pointed out in an editorial in today's U. S. Oil Week— an industry publication.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator Stans has done a magnificent job in the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee in exposing how the big oil companies use the Federal Government to fix prices. For the first time academic economists were called to comment on the system of Government contracts which enables the major oil companies to guarantee profits for themselves while, at the same time, hiding their gigantic profits from taxation.

Reform of this system is long overdue. It is injurious to our economy, taking money from the majority of Americans, who consume oil, to help the immensely profitable corporations, while encouraging inflation.

Although it is clear that the administration is going to do very little about the big oil companies inflationary behavior, I was delighted to hear on the Today Show, my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, Representative Wm. R. Parman, offer an interpretation of the whole system of Government regulations, controls, and privileges which so benefit the big oil companies and insulate them from the competitive enterprise system. I join with him wholeheartedly.

Mr. President, I should like to read this editorial, because, as I have said, it comes from an oil industry publication. It is the editorial in today's issue of "U.S. Oil Week."

The next time you hear a major oil company employee wax philosophically on about the horrors of government controls on business, smile.

That is what the oil industry says.

Mr. LONG. If I correctly understand what the Senator is now saying, it is that all oil imports are just a dribble. Is that what the Senator said?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is still reading from an editorial of an oil industry publication which says that the oil imports are just a dribble. They amount to 12.1 percent.

Mr. LONG. Is that what the Senator thinks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the distinguished Senator from Louisiana indicate how big oil imports are, if they are not limited to 12.1 percent?

Mr. LONG. Does the Senator think that that is what he just started reading?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Of course they are.

Mr. LONG. That is what the Senator thinks?

Mr. PROXMIRE. It is not what I think. It is what they are.

Mr. LONG. In terms of total requirements of oil and natural gas in this country, would the Senator like to know what it actually is?

Mr. PROXMIRE. What figure would the Senator from Louisiana like to offer? Mr. LONG. Twenty-five percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana's figures are wrong.

Mr. LONG. Somebody has to be wrong.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator from Louisiana is wrong.

Mr. LONG. May I tell the Senator where he is wrong?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wisconsin is only talking about zones 1 through 4. Did he know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am talking about the oil imports that are allowed into this

When jacked up prices were threatened by oil produced under competitive conditions abroad, a federal import wall was erected with only a dribble allowed in.
country under the Oil Import Administration's program.

Mr. LONG. When the Senator from Wisconsin made the statement that all of the oil that comes into this country is 12.5 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I said 12.1.

Mr. LONG. I thought it was 12.3. I am not going to argue about one-tenth of 1 percent.

When the Senator from Wisconsin made that statement, all he was talking about was zones 1 through 4. Did he know that?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I made the statement about what the oil----

Mr. LONG. Let me tell the Senator what the program is.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Go right ahead.

So the Senator is only talking about zones 1 through 4, foreign crude imports are permitted to be 12.2 percent—I thought it was 12.3 percent—of the domestic consumption of crude oil in zones 1 through 4. Does the Senator know what zones 1 through 4 are?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. What are they?

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are the areas of the country in which the oil import program is organized.

Mr. LONG. What is zone 5? Where is zone 5?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I cannot tell the Senator where zone 5 is.

Mr. LONG. Zone 5 is California, Oregon, Washington, and I believe Nevada and Arizona. It certainly includes most of the West Coast, and I assume it would include Alaska and Hawaii. Zones 1 through 4, generally speaking, start at the Rocky Mountains and come to the Atlantic Ocean.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is only talking about zones 1 through 4 when he uses the 12.2 percent figure. Furthermore, has the Senator heard of residual crude oil?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. This is under an entirely different program, but we produce very little residual oil; we had to use higher gravity oil. We do not find it advantageous in this country to produce much residual crude. However, it is a very cheap fuel, and a huge amount of it is used on the eastern seaboard.

As far as bringing in residual crude, either a coal miner has to lose a job or an oil producer has to produce less, or a gas producer has to produce less, or somebody has to produce less hydroelectric power, in order to consume the imports of residual fuel oil.

Therefore, if one looks at fuel requirements he must also look at residual fuel oil to see how much of our market they are taking, and it also affects our balance of payments.

The Senator should also look at zone 5. In zone 5, the percentage is a lot more than 12.2 percent. That is a heavy import, even though Alaska is coming on strong.

All factors considered, foreign oil exporters to the United States now have 25 percent of the market for oil and liquefied gas products in the United States.

Can the Senator tell me of another instance where an American producer who traditionally produced our requirements and had to accept a situation where foreigners have 25 percent of the market while he sat there?

Mr. PROXMIRE. First, I do not accept the Senator's argument.

Mr. LONG. I heard the Senator's speech.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I just argued the zones covered called for 12.1 percent.

Mr. LONG. I thought the Senator said something about 12.2 percent.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator did not give the basis for his statement that 25 percent are oil imports.

Mr. LONG. I think I inserted a speech which lasted for at least an hour and a half on this subject. Did the Senator read that speech?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I heard part of it.

Mr. LONG. I appreciate that. The figures in that speech are not my calculations but calculations of the staff of the Committee on Finance which has the responsibility of completing the program. It is the calculation they came up with. They came up with that figure after consulting with the best consultants in and out of Government. It is about 25 percent.

The Senator comes from a State which is interested in iron and steel. Is that correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. We process it; we do not mine it.

Mr. LONG. The Senator's State is interested in automobiles.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We process iron and steel. We are not a major producer of oil.

Mr. LONG. But the Senator's State does handle a lot of iron and steel, and he has done some fine work for workers in helping American Motors keep some of them employed. I applaud the Senator for the large payroll in his State. Certainly, the Senator is interested in the United Automobile Workers, and the fact that they can work at high wages, and that they are able to do the fine job that they do. Is that not correct?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will look at steel imports, does the Senator know what percentage of the market steel imports now take?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not know the exact figure, but it is between 10 and 15 percent.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct, if he splits the difference. It is about 12.5 percent; that would be about right the last time I looked at it, but that does not include steel in the automobile imports.

Is the Senator familiar with the large increase in foreign automobiles in this country?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am concerned about all of these things, but they do not have anything like the protection.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator——

Mr. PROXMIRE. If the Senator would permit me to finish, I believe I have the floor of the market.

In the first place, the Government limits the domestic production; and, in the second place, the Government strictly limits foreign imports on the basis of a quota system. When oil officials say they have to stop Government control and that it is an evil thing, this is very contradictory.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator would permit me to interrupt, I wish to ask a question. The Senator is failing to understand what I am getting at. I want to get at it and then hear his reaction. One must add on the steel imports coming into this country the steel that is in the automobiles being imported in this country. What is an automobile? Most of it is steel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator knows, the automobile industry does not receive the kind of limitation on domestic production or the kind of limitation on foreign imports which the oil industry enjoys.

As a matter of fact, American Motors has done a marvelous job selling its product abroad. Eighteen percent of all of this country's cars sold abroad are American Motors automobiles.

Mr. LONG. If the Senator will add the steel in foreign made automobiles coming into this country, and the other steel that is being imported in other forms and, I believe, such as bars and pipe, then one has to conclude, when one looks at the steel in those automobiles and other shapes coming into that market, steel imports have now taken 25 percent of our market for steel.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, I cannot agree with that figure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. PROXMIRE. I question that figure. In the first place, it is true that we import a number of automobiles. I doubt very much that it is anything like 25 percent. The market share of the market is less than that. When one computes the amount of steel in those automobiles, it is small because most of those cars are small. I think the figures of the Senator are subject to some question.

Mr. LONG. I did not say that 25 percent of our automobiles are foreign made. I said if one were to add the steel in the automobiles that foreign countries are shipping to us, to the steel they are sending in in other forms, the foreign producer would appear to have 25 percent of the American market for steel. They may have only about 10 to 15 percent of our market for automobiles, and I could be a little off on that figure. I know what the steel figure is.

If the automobile makers are not concerned about it, the steel manufacturers will be concerned about it if the present trend continues.

I say the automobile workers will become concerned if the Senator fails to do something about it one day, and so will the steel workers. I say that because it is fine for the Ford Motor Co. to build a big plant in England and it is fine for some other American motor companies to build big plants in Germany and Italy and send automobiles here, but the time is going to come when American labor is going to wake up to the fact that they are being traded out.
of good jobs. One day the Senator is going to become as concerned as I am if we have to decide which company to keep in business, and what work we want our people to do. One day the Senator is going to be as concerned as I am. I am afraid that he buys something for 10 percent less is not going to make him very happy because his income has been cut by 75 percent.

When we put those factors together, the consumer may be able to buy for 10 percent less his $5 job but he may be making $1.25. So that, on balance, you have “had it.” Senator. You would really have had the worst of it. When we make that kind of trade we are leaving other people getting taken for a ride.

In the steel industry the wages are $7 an hour. They are concerned. When a boy in Wisconsin or Louisiana has to go to Wisconsin to milk cows, he will not get as much money as he would by working in the steel mill. He is not going to be happy about the fact that he can buy something cheaper, when he looks at the fact that, on the one hand, what he will have gained as a consumer will be lost because his salary will be cut by much more. So that the fact he can buy more with the pitiful amount he has left, on a dollar-for-dollar basis, is not going to make him very happy.

All I am trying to say, Senator, is that when we look at this foreign trade program, we have to look at all the factors not just whether we can buy something cheaper.

One other thing the Senator has not mentioned in his speech—I hope that he will get around to it after a while—is that we cannot be sure that we can buy this product for $1.75 and base impressive figures on that assumption if we are not capable of producing our own requirements. That is what one can buy Arab oil for, when one is in the position of producing every barrel he needs in America. But the Arabs are better traders than to sell us that oil at that price, if we cannot produce our necessary requirements. It is one thing for us to be in the position to buy on a buyer’s market and quite another when we are forced to buy it on the seller’s own terms. We will find that the seller will get every penny he can and that will be a lot more if we are at his mercy either in whole or in part.

Does the Senator know what OPEC is? Does the Senator from Louisiana like to say what it is? Mr. PROXMIRE. Would the Senator from Louisiana like to say what it is? Mr. LONG. First, I would like to know if the Senator knows. What is OPEC? Does the Senator know?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Offhand, no, I do not. Mr. LONG. Well—Mr. PROXMIRE. What is OPEC? I would be delighted to find out a little more about it, but the Senator from Kansas (Mr. Dole) has time reserved to him, to begin speaking at 1:30. I rose merely to make an insertion in the Record, which I thought would take just a minute and a half, but the Senator from Louisiana was in the Chamber, so it has taken me much longer. If the Senator would permit me to finish this brief insertion in the Record, I would be able to enlighten me as to what OPEC means, and we can go ahead.

Mr. LONG. Well, let me say, that if I knew as little about the oil industry as the Governor from Louisiana, I would want to get off my feet, too.
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claim that we can or should buy oil at $1.75 per barrel. I do think, however, that we can get it cheaper than we are getting it now. The oil industry will be in a far better position if we had a somewhat more generous oil import program, so far as the consumer is concerned, than we have at the present time.

No. 29. Senator Hart, to conclude reading from the United States Oil Week, the oil industry's own editorial, it goes on to say:

Many big refiners recently found a windfall in marketing games of chance to captivate resellers. It must be profitable.

Major oil companies, with a few praiseworthy exceptions, are working to protect their new product line by calling on the Federal Trade Commission for more federal regulation. If the Bureau of Mines bought samples of gasoline to check the octanes—as some states do—refiners would cry "foul." As it is the Bureau of Mines takes samples for majors and evaluates them and puts out the findings for all to read . . . all who have the key to the table and only the refiners have the key.

Saves the refiners a lot of money. The government, in my opinion, is adding to the twin horrors of competition and antitrust action in crude marketing and gets "statistical and policing services" from the Interior Department. The Interior Department supports its private price fixing and that would be unlawful if provided by the API or another trade organization," Dr. Herbert Engler, a New York economist testified.

Despite the incentives, he noted, the domestic search for oil hasn't been stepped up. While the economic power of the larger companies has been increased.

Mr. President, this is, as I say, an editorial from the U.S. oil industry and not from a Wisconsin dairy publication. It is a solid indictment of the overwhelming generosity of the American Government—at the expense of the American consumer and taxpayer—to the oil industry.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Majors Love Government

The next time you hear a major oil company employee wax philosophically on about the horrors of government controls on business, smile. You can bet he is guarding against the growing threat of government regulation in our business.

That's the refrain frequently heard from major oil company employees.

Utter humbug.

Without government controls, big refiners would not have been so generous as they are now to private firms to fix prices or allocate markets.

"Yet in the name of conservation the government does for the oil companies what they did not need legally to do for themselves," he noted.

Incidentally, it's a criminal violation to fix prices on goods, and some industry executives have been jailed for it.

Sen. Philip Hart's probe of government intervention in gasoline and oil markets is a means of thinking more realistic than the usual conservative image shown in company magazines.

For oil refiners have destroyed the time-honored vital supply and demand tend to balance each other.

At the state level major companies have won government control over oil production. When jackpots up prices were threatened by oil produced under competitive conditions abroad, a federal imports wall was erected with only a drible allowed in.

Many big refiners recently found a windfall in marketing games of chance to captivate resellers. It must be profitable.

Majors, with some praiseworthy exceptions, are working to protect their new product line by calling on the Federal Trade Commission for more federal regulation. If the Bureau of Mines bought samples of gasoline to check the octanes—as some states do—refiners would cry "foul."

As is the Bureau of Mines takes samples for majors and evaluates them and puts out the findings for all to read . . . all who have the key to the table and only the refiners have the key.

Saves the refiners a lot of money.

The refining industry "neatly avoids the twin horrors of competition and antitrust action" in crude marketing and gets "statistical and policing services" from the Interior Department. The Interior Department supports its private price fixing and that would be unlawful if provided by the API or another trade organization," Dr. Herbert Engler, a New York economist testified.

Despite the incentives, he noted, the domestic search for oil hasn't been stepped up. While the economic power of the larger companies has been increased.

So it seems our sophisticated refining industry has learned what a good friend Uncle Sam can be.

It's a good Uncle who charges small businessmen 20% of their income as federal income tax and no income tax to one refiner, Atlantic Richfield, with well over $100 million in net income.

Maybe the next American Petroleum Institute meeting should set aside a Government Appreciation Day.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. LONG. I am going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he will remain for a moment longer and perhaps learn a few things about the oil industry which he does not know.

In the first place, I have tried to fathom out what those initials OPEC mean, and I think I have it. OPEC means, "Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries." That fits. I think that is what OPEC means, because that is what they are. That would include all the countries in the Persian Gulf, including Libya, and every one else that could get in on it. It does not include Venezuela because they have not been able to persuade Venezuela to join. But Venezuela collaborates with them. Those countries have a common purpose to make every country which buys that oil pay as much as they can get for that oil.

I ask the Members why they should not. They have parallel interests, and they work together to advance their interests. I discussed that matter in a lengthy speech I made on the Senate floor. I recommend it to the Senator. I think he would learn quite a few things that he does not know now.

Here is my second. At the urging of the Hart subcommittee certain people come in and give their opinions. Some may be correct, some may be not; but Senator Hart, when he is a fine man. He used to work with me. I used to be chairman of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee. I think he is a good economist. I would recommend Senator Hart to the Senator from Wisconsin to look into the oil industry. I think I could find someone who knows more about that business than does Walter Adams. He is a good man, he is intellectually honest, so I think he is fair in what he says. But we do not necessarily get the correct answer from a man like Walter Adams, who would look at a price of $1.75 a barrel for foreign oil and say, "See, you can buy all you want at $1.75."

If the United States is in a position to produce all the oil it needs, it will be doing the foreign producers a favor to buy their oil at $1.75. If we told them that we would not buy it at $1.75, the United States could buy it at $1.50.

I ask the Senator if he knew what it would cost to buy all the oil we need? It would be about 10 cents for the lifting price. It is going to cost about 30 cents to ship it over here, or perhaps less. So if we look at the price which will be paid, we see that we can get it for 40 cents from it, which leaves $1.45. So 14½ times the lifting cost, which means 14½ times the cost of production, is being charged. The only reason they are not charging 25 times the cost of production is that they cannot get it.

When Libya raised the price on its oil some time ago, every member of OPEC except Libya raised their support of Libya. They knew that if Libya raised its price, they also could.

So when we take the American price of $3 a barrel at a Gulf port, and subtract $1.75, and then multiply that by 6 million barrels of oil per day and contend that the nation could save $4 billion per year, the Senator is making a great, fatal miscalculation. He is assuming that the American consumer would have to pay $1.75 a barrel for foreign oil at the same price when one is the captive as he could when the other is the suppliant. There is a substantial difference depending on who holds the whip hand.

Mr. PROXMIRe. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I never made the assumption that we could buy it at that price. I said we could buy oil at a lower price than we are paying. There is another advantage—we would not use up our own limited reserves.

Mr. LONG. The Senator from Wisconsin did not say that, but the Senator from Massachusetts came on the floor and said that in my presence a few days ago. I debated that. He did not hear my speech. He heard one of the committee witnesses, who I think was talking about as one-sided a parade of witnesses as I have ever heard of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 3 additional minutes.

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

Mr. LONG. The Senator listened to the Hart subcommittee witnesses explain one side of the argument, and did not hear the other side, which I explained.
but he attempted to reply to a speech he had not heard, and fell into the fallacy which I have been pointing out. I am sorry the Senator is not here. I shall be glad to debate with the Senator any time he wants to. His reply was based on the assumption that if a country cannot produce any oil, it can buy oil at the same price it could if that country could produce the oil itself. The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. Kennedy) is in error when he makes the calculation that we would save all that money, when the fact is that the other countries would raise their prices if this country were their captive buyer.

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

Mr. Long. I yield.

Mr. Proxmire. Would the Senator concede any competence on the part of the witnesses who testified before the committee?

Mr. Long. Some.

Mr. Proxmire. Is it not possible that they may be right and the Senator from Louisiana may be wrong in some respects? Is it not also possible that they may be right and the Senator may be wrong?

Mr. Long. I do not care how good an airplane may be—without some fuel in that airplane it will not fly. Nobody has learned how to boot the thing into the air and keep it up. It will not do the job unless it has fuel.

One thing which was determined by those who studied the problem under Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, and Eisenhower, was that we must be able to provide the requirements of the American national defense position even if it should not be at the mercy of Nasser at the Suez Canal. Let us not be at the mercy of the Sultan of Kuwait—not that he would not help us, but that he would not help us any time he wanted to. Let us not be in a position where we cannot provide our own requirements. The policy was decided, by every President, under his advice, to have a sufficient reserve to meet our own requirements of fuel. That is why we have a domestic petroleum policy.

Even if we did not have those national defense requirements, we would still need to produce oil, because the Arabs and their associates would not stop at a $3 price. They would raise the price until we were able to buy enough out of coal or shale to make it unprofitable for them to further raise the price.

Now for another point. Would the Senator be surprised to know that the oil industry pays more taxes than the average for all manufacturing? Would the Senator be surprised?

Mr. Proxmire. Does the Senator want me to answer?

Mr. Long. Yes, I want the Senator to answer. I asked him the question.

Mr. Proxmire. The fact is that they pay about 17 percent, as far as income is concerned, and their severance is paid to the government. The Senator has many times argued that oil companies pay more taxes than the rest of industry. When he does this he includes the taxes you and I pay when we buy gasoline. The Senator included the severance taxes, the excise taxes, and the gasoline tax that one pays when he fills the tank and then says the industry pays more taxes than the rest of industry. The Senator has made that statement many times.

Mr. Proxmire. On this basis the oil companies pay only a part of the taxes that the average manufacturer pays. The Senator included the severance taxes, the excise taxes, and the gasoline tax that one pays when he fills the tank. The Senator included the severance taxes, the excise taxes, and the gasoline tax that one pays when he fills the tank. The Senator included the severance taxes, the excise taxes, and the gasoline tax that one pays when he fills the tank.

Mr. Proxmire. What is that average for all manufacturing?

Mr. Long. Mr. President, I yielded to the Senator to answer my question, not to make a complete speech on a totally irrelevant question. All I asked him was whether he would be surprised to know that the industry paid more taxes than the average for all manufacturing. He said yes, and I would be surprised, because it is not a fact.

Mr. Proxmire. That is right.

Mr. Long. He said it is not true. Well, it is not true. The Senator again is proceeding under a fatal burden of ignorance that I am including in my assumption the gasoline tax that one pays when he buys the product at the pump. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the product, a product that has a greater burden than any other except tobacco and alcohol. When a product carries a burden like that, it obviously makes it more expensive to tax, and the Senator will find that he is making a bigger point there than he is making any other point.

Mr. Proxmire. I say they do not.

Mr. Long. They do not.

Mr. Proxmire. They do not.

Mr. Long. Mr. President, the answer is that they do. And if the Senator will look about him down, I will prove him wrong again.

You see, when I asked that question, I was not talking about just the Federal tax on the income. I was talking about the property taxes they pay to State governments. I was talking about the tax they pay on the severance, when they take oil out of the ground, which is a State tax. I was talking about the taxes they pay the State, city, and local governments, as well as the Federal Government; because, from the point of view of a businessman making an investment, he would know how much he made after taxes, and it does not really make too much difference whether it was a Federal tax or a State tax he paid, he wants to know how much he paid, after he got through.

If you put it on that basis, you will find that the oil industry pays more taxes than the average for all manufacturing.

The Presiding Officer. The Senator’s time has expired.

Mr. Long. I ask for 3 more minutes.

The Presiding Officer. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. Proxmire. Mr. President, I have made that statement a half dozen times around here, and I am sorry I had to challenge the Senator in order to direct his attention to it, but if he will look at my speeches, he will find that I have been responding to some of his arguments, but he is not responding to mine. If the Senator will look at mine, he will find that I have been responding to the severance tax—does the Senator know how much that is in Louisiana? Between 15 and 23 cents a barrel, depending on the gravity of the oil. The Senator himself admitted the gross, before the producer knows whether he made a profit or not.

When you look at the severance taxes,
the property taxes—why do they tax an oil company so much more than a manufac­
turing company? If you are not going to let me put in any oil, I have no place to put it
and nobody to buy it from you, you
just cannot produce it until you have a
market and a place to sell it. Then we run into the next problem. Here we are, over in Louisiana, looking
at our friends across the Texas line. If you were from Louisiana, you would know
what I mean by the SUIPT program:
“Save Us From Texas.” Every time we
have a chance to get something for
Louisiana, they try to take it away from
us and put it off for Texas. We produce
more oil per capita than they do; we pro­duce more oil per capita than they do;
we produce more oil anyway you want
to count it, except for the fact they are
bigger than we are. That is the only
reason that they produce more oil.
If we had our way, we would take their
market away from them, and if they
had their way, they would take ours
away from us. If you have an oil field,
and no one to sell it to, you should
sell the oil. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The
Senator from Wisconsin, Mr. LONG, asked for 2 more minutes.
Mr. LONG. I ask for 2 more minutes.
Mr. LONG. I am unanimous consent to proceed for 3 more minutes.
Mr. President, I had not read the Sen­ator’s article. I did not object to it when
he put it in the Record, but I would be
curious to know its source.
Mr. President, I was curious to know what is supposed to be an oil publication
that would prove his point against the oil
industry. I will read the article with great
interest.
It may be that that industry is trying
to show as a matter of fairness to the oil
people why somebody else does not like
the oil industry.
I wish the Hart subcommittee would
be fair and bring forth some people
to tell the other side of the argument that
the subcommittee has not heard. I guess
that if I were to come from a State that
produces practically no oil, but mostly
automobiles, I would make the same
argument. Michigan produces very little
oil.
Mr. President, the truth is that the
people in the oil industry are every bit as
honorable, fair, and ethical as those in
any other industry. To cite one example,
the oil industry does more business over
the telephone than does any other single
industry. People are constantly amazed
at the fact that oil men will call on the
telephone and say, “I will let you have that
lease. I will sell you that oil.” This is
done over the telephone, with no written
memorandum. Yet, people can trust them
to deliver on their word given over the
telephone. They have been doing this for
many years. A man’s word is good.
As one who represents a State produc­
ing a good deal of oil, I do feel a sense
of compassion for someone who so poorly
understands Americans as to think they
are not upstanding citizens, to say, in
fact, good, hard-working citizens, try­
ing to make an honest buck, the same as
everybody else.
POLLUTION IN POTOMAC REFLECTS U.S. APATHY

Mr. HARKER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate an article entitled "Pollution in Potomac Reflects U.S. Apathy," written by William Stelf, and published in today's Washington Daily News.

I commend the article to my colleagues for its content and to underscore the seriousness of the problem confronting the country. I also commend the Howard for dealing with this very important subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

POLLUTION IN POTOMAC REFLECTS U.S. APATHY

(William Stelf)

(NOTE.—The following article is the first of a series in which Howard Newspapers will report from time to time on flagging efforts to counter the ever-growing menace of pollution of our environment. This story, while focusing on the Potomac, outlines problems common to many of the nation's beleaguered waterways.

The historic Potomac has become a monument to the nation's apathy toward the pollution of our natural resources.

The Potomac's turbid waters slosh throughout the District, carrying tons of silt from Maryland and Virginia and untreated wastes from hundreds of thousands of people and animals. The shad and herring which can stand on a piling and watch the clean green algae, oil spills and garbage. They say a large drop with more than 100 fecal bacteria is dangerous.

At the Woodrow Wilson Bridge, the standard bacteria count was 29 times the safety limit.

Last July at Memorial Bridge, the fecal bacteria count was 230 times the limit. These counts explain why Don Lear, a biologist at the Annapolis laboratory of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration (FWPCA), says: "People who swim on the Potomac should use bactericide to wash their hands."

DECRYPTS OXYGEN

The worst thing pollution does is destroy the oxygen in the water. Oxygen is needed for the biological process by which tiny organisms in the water "burn up" organic wastes. When too much oxygen is used up, thereby further depleting the water of oxygen, the end product of this chain is the accumulation of enormous "dead" areas in bodies of water, where nothing lives. This already has happened in Lake Erie. It is a threat to Lake Michigan and the Potomac.

The pollution of the Potomac started years ago. In 1894 an Army Surgeon General's report complained that the river was "not fit for bathing as well as for drinking and cooking." In 1907 an Interior Department study fretted over the river's pollution. So have many other studies.

In the 1930s agitation for a waste treatment plant began and in 1938 the District's first plant came into existence. Its capacity was only 78 per cent completed and at the time of its opening it was believed these modest goals could be attained. But the river also is in the midst of one of the three fastest growing metropolitan areas in the nation. Sometime next year there will be three million people in the area, compared to 1.6 million in 1956. The experts say 7.7 million people will live here by the year 2000. And people account for 90 per cent of the Potomac's pollution.

What is pollution? Think of it as being produced by one human being in one day. Multiply that by 973,000. That is the equivalent of how much incompletely treated sewage is pumped into the Potomac yearly. Mixed with the silt are the pesticides drained from nearby farms and gardens.

What do raw sewage and silt do to the river? Every month water is tested all over the Potomac basin. The scientists who do the testing say water is dangerous to swim in if there are 10 bacteria per 100 cubic centimeters of water. They say a large drop with more than 100 fecal bacteria is dangerous.

In 1965 then Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall sold President Johnson on a grandiose plan for the Potomac basin. The FWPCA was transferred from the public health service to the Interior Department, where a strong bureau was created for coordination over Potomac planning. Some FWPCA officials think that because the pollution planners lost to the park planners, the river's filth was ignored. The park plan took three years and is now gathering dust. A squabble over extending a waste treatment plant pipeline across National Park Service land in Maryland has kept a new treatment plant running at a quarter of capacity. Several FWPCA projects designed to be used dally into the ineffective D.C. plant as a result, for conservationists have circulated a petition to Congress for the Interior Department to block the pipeline permit.

Since 1987 only $165 million has been spent on waste treatment plant and sewer separation in the Washington area. That is $15 million a year in an area where municipal budgets total more than $1 billion. It is an index of the apathy toward water pollution.

Now FWPCA wants waste treatment plants which can't achieve 80 per cent reduction in the oxygen demand of their sewage to be pushed to 96 per cent. It demands immediate action on an FWPCA-sponsored sewer separation in the Washington area. That is $15 million a year in an area where municipal budgets total more than $1 billion. It is an index of the apathy toward water pollution.

The report noted that oxygen in the water had been reduced to "levels that would not support "reproductive debris . . . fish kills . . . offensive odors" and nutrients—phosphates and nitrates—which support "excessive growths" of slimy algae.

The D.C. waste treatment plant at Blue Plains which today serves 1.8 million people in the District was certified by the FWPCA in 1974 so that just over 70 per cent of the sewage's demand for oxygen in the river is eliminated. Two of the eight raw sewage treatment plants also fail to come up to the 80 per cent standard.

The separation of storm and sanitary sewers—78 per cent of which in the present rate won't be finished until the year 2000.

The main reason, it is agreed, is local, state and federal apathy.

Some George Aronowitz, a social scientist working on an ecology project for the National Academy of Sciences: "If water pollution were nuclear radiation, you can bet very little something would have been done about it."

Mr. Aronowitz has a tongue-in-cheek proposal: "In the Potomac basin have all communities to put their waste intakes below their waste treatment outfalls?" Cloud pressures also keep the Potomac dirty:

In 1956 then Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall sold President Johnson on a grandiose plan for the Potomac basin. The FWPCA was transferred from the public health service to the Interior Department, where a strong bureau was created for coordination over Potomac planning. Some FWPCA officials think that because the pollution planners lost to the park planners, the river's filth was ignored. The park plan took three years and is now gathering dust. A squabble over extending a waste treatment plant pipeline across National Park Service land in Maryland has kept a new treatment plant running at a quarter of capacity. Several FWPCA projects designed to be used dally into the ineffective D.C. plant as a result, for conservationists have circulated a petition to Congress for the Interior Department to block the pipeline permit.

Since 1987 only $165 million has been spent on waste treatment plant and sewer separation in the Washington area. That is $15 million a year in an area where municipal budgets total more than $1 billion. It is an index of the apathy toward water pollution.

Now FWPCA wants waste treatment plants which can't achieve 80 per cent reduction in the oxygen demand of their sewage to be pushed to 96 per cent. It demands immediate action on an FWPCA-sponsored sewer separation in the Washington area. That is $15 million a year in an area where municipal budgets total more than $1 billion. It is an index of the apathy toward water pollution.

The report noted that oxygen in the water had been reduced to "levels that would not support "reproductive debris . . . fish kills . . . offensive odors" and nutrients—phosphates and nitrates—which support "excessive growths" of slimy algae.

The D.C. waste treatment plant at Blue Plains which today serves 1.8 million people in the District was certified by the FWPCA in 1974 so that just over 70 per cent of the sewage's demand for oxygen in the river is eliminated. Two of the eight raw sewage treatment plants also fail to come up to the 80 per cent standard.

The separation of storm and sanitary sewers—78 per cent of which in the present rate won't be finished until the year 2000.
the only kind applied to the Potomac—and the Ohio, Mississippi, Platte and Tennessee rivers—for years to come.

DECISSIONS OF PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION ON CURTAILING RAILWAY POST OFFICE OPERATIONS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, it has been nearly 2 years to the day since this Senate introduced legislation in the 90th Congress aimed at preventing the Post Office Department from further curtailing their railway post office—RPO's.

For many years the Post Office had utilized RPO cars for significant long-distance mail routes. While RPO's took a greater length of time in traveling from place to place than did planes, the mail on the RPO's was sorted en route to its destination which meant that it was ready for home delivery when it was unloaded at its final destination. The Post Office, over a long period of time, had been substituting other modes of transportation for RPO's here and there, as the need of the Department required it. Yet just 3 years ago, a great decision to abandon the RPO's was ordered via Resolution 25 which I mentioned.

To save the Government money, the Department when the Post Office appeared before the Treasury Post Office Subcommittee of Appropriations, I tried to learn the true reasons for the decision to abandon the RPO's.

The man who essentially made that decision was William J. Hartigan, who was Assistant Postmaster General for Transportation, and to ask him to explain what the elimination of RPO's would mean was an "improvement." He told the Congress that this move would save the Government money.

From the reaction I received from throughout the Nation to my campaign to save the RPO's, and the documented evidence which pored into my office, I could only conclude that mail service had substantially deteriorated as a result of this move. In addition, no figures were ever presented to the Congress which satisfactorily proved that the elimination of RPO's saved the Government money. In fact the opposite appeared to be the case.

Nevertheless, I continued to probe and question. I was determined to find out just why the discontinuance of RPO's was being pursued with almost ruthless determination by Mr. Hartigan and the Post Office.

Finally, on September 23, 1967, my patience was at an end. I issued a statement calling for the termination of Mr. Hartigan's employment with the Post Office.

Unbeknown to me and other legislators similarly concerned with this problem, but certainly known to Mr. Hartigan, another important event occurred in September 1967.

In that very eventful month, The Sel dalia Marshall Boonville Stage Line, Inc., began air taxi mail service. This firm, with headquarters in Des Moines, Iowa, had no air taxi mail service prior to that time, but it wasted no time in acquiring prime contracts from the division of the Post Office which Mr. Hartigan administered.

Now, later on in 1967, in fact just before the year ended, I was contacted by Mr. James H. Phelps, who was at that time the national representative for the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen in Idaho.

Mr. Phelps speaking by phone from Pocatello, said he had heard from a reporter who would soon leave the Post Office Department and would take a position with an air taxi service which had just begun to operate at many important air taxi mail contracts. He asked me to check out this report.

Shortly after the first of the year, when Mr. Hartigan announced that he would not run for re-election, the junior Senator from Colorado and would be finding employment elsewhere, I determined to watch closely exactly what position he would take.

However, Mr. Hartigan apparently felt that an up and coming youth who choose not to destroy, who seek not to undermine, who elect to build and rebuild. In that 99 percent are reflected the good in America, the strength of America, the future of America.

They are the ones who by their example demonstrate their faith in America. To them, good deeds are their thing, on a daily basis. The youth of Iowa are in that category.

The Iowa story is the story of the real America, a story repeated in every State of the Union. But their good deeds, and warmth and compassion are usually not the stuff of headlines.

However, last week the good in our youth did make the headlines across the State of Iowa. In an excellent article, Iowa Associated Press Writer John Armstrong chronicled the community service activities of Iowa youth. As Armstrong put it:

Without fanfare, thousands and thousands of young Iowans are proving each day they're not such bad kids after all.

I believe his article, which appeared in the Cedar Rapids Gazette of April 8 and in other Iowa dailies, merits the attention of every legislator and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It truly underscores that when all seems lost, you can always depend on our youth to come through. Perhaps printing of the Iowa youth story will lead to a national movement to reporting the good in our youth, not the isolated bad which makes the news so frequently and which leaves in its wake the impression that most of our youth are bad.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Good Deeds Everyday Thing for Young Iowans," be printed in the RECORD.

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

GOOD DEEDS EVERYDAY THING FOR YOUNG IOWANS

By John Armstrong

They pitch in by the hundreds to help cities fight back floods. They take orphans to parks and art galleries. They raise thousands of dollars for starving Biafra children. They show juvenile delinquents that someone cares.

Mr. Hartigan's jurisdiction were fair and just and in the national interest. If they were not, they should be rescinded immediately.

GOOD DEEDS EVERYDAY THING FOR YOUNG IOWANS

By John Armstrong
sands of young Iowans are proving each day they're not such bad kids after all. Despite talk of sex organs and pot smoking, four-letter words and unruly draft protests, marijuana use at Des Moines high schools, most students were quite "doing their thing." Little forming teams to help river communities erect sandbag dikes. "These young people do a tremendous job," said Civil Defense Director Joseph Dooley in Davenport. "Some of them do it as a lark. Others like the exercise. All of them make good deeds an everyday thing."

Communities erect sandbag dikes. Of them are impressed with the fact they're job," Sandbags, but adults were reluctant with the back-breaking work. Sandbags from a brush fire at Water Works park. The of the Des Moines fire department. Day when they helped firemen douse flames of male students at Iowa Hammer county home. Elderly men at the Hamilton county home. It is a minority, yet a group to which is a minority group whose existence can be solved or soothed by religious beliefs, political personal choice—a group whose require twelve hours a day, for our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yes, too many women, and children—who cannot achieve full physical, mental, and social potential because of disability. And in contrast to most people, thousands of adults and children suffer mental or emotional disorders which hinder their abilities to learn and apply what is learned and to cope adequately with their families, jobs, and communities. Then there are those who are afflicted with combination or multiple handicaps. For our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yes, today, and tomorrow are not filled with "everyday" kinds of problems which can be solved or soothed by "everyday" kinds of answers. Their daily challenge is: accepting and working with a disability so that the handicapped person can become as active and useful, as independent, secure, and dignified as his ability will allow.

Handicapped Americans

Dole, Mr. President, my remarks today concern an exceptional group which I joined on another April 14, twenty-four years ago, during World War II. It is a minority group whose existence affects every person in our society and the very fiber of our Nation. It is a group which no one joins by personal choice. Their requirements for membership are not based on age, sex, wealth, education, skin color, religious beliefs, political party, power, or lack thereof. As a minority, it has always known exclusion—maybe not exclusion from the front of the bus, but perhaps from even climbing aboard it; maybe not exclusion from higher education, but perhaps from experiencing any formal education; maybe not exclusion from day-to-day life itself, but perhaps from an adequate opportunity to develop and to contribute to his or her fullest capacity. It is a minority, yet a group to which at least one out of every five Americans belongs. Mr. President, I speak today about 42 million citizens of our Nation who are physically, mentally, or emotionally handicapped.

Who are the handicapped? They are persons—men, women, and children—who cannot achieve full physical, mental, and social potential because of disability. Although some live in institutions, many more live in the community. Some are so severely disabled as to be home-bound for ever others are able to take part in community activities when they have access and facilities. They include amputees, paraplegics, polio victims. Causes of disability include arthritis, cardio-vascular diseases, multiple sclerosis, and muscular dystrophy.

While you may have good vision and hearing, many persons live each day with limited eyesight or hearing, or with none at all. While you may enjoy full muscle strength and coordination in your legs, there are those who must rely on braces orutches, or perhaps a walker or wheel chair. While you perform daily millions of tasks with your hands and arms, there are those who can do little with limited or total disability in theirs.

And in contrast to most people, thousands of adults and children suffer mental or emotional disorders which hinder their abilities to learn and apply what is learned and to cope adequately with their families, jobs, and communities.

Then there are those who are afflicted with combination or multiple handicaps.

For our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yes, today, and tomorrow are not filled with "everyday" kinds of problems which can be solved or soothed by "everyday" kinds of answers. Their daily challenge is: accepting and working with a disability so that the handicapped person can become as active and useful, as independent, secure, and dignified as his ability will allow.

Too many handicapped persons lead lives of loneliness and despair; too many feel and too many are cut off from our society. While you may have good vision and hearing, many persons live each day with limited eyesight or hearing, or with none at all. While you may enjoy full muscle strength and coordination in your legs, there are those who must rely on braces orutches, or perhaps a walker or wheel chair. While you perform daily millions of tasks with your hands and arms, there are those who can do little with limited or total disability in theirs. And in contrast to most people, thousands of adults and children suffer mental or emotional disorders which hinder their abilities to learn and apply what is learned and to cope adequately with their families, jobs, and communities. Then there are those who are afflicted with combination or multiple handicaps.

For our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yes, today, and tomorrow are not filled with "everyday" kinds of problems which can be solved or soothed by "everyday" kinds of answers. Their daily challenge is: accepting and working with a disability so that the handicapped person can become as active and useful, as independent, secure, and dignified as his ability will allow.

Too many handicapped persons lead lives of loneliness and despair; too many feel and too many are cut off from our society. While you may have good vision and hearing, many persons live each day with limited eyesight or hearing, or with none at all. While you may enjoy full muscle strength and coordination in your legs, there are those who must rely on braces orutches, or perhaps a walker or wheel chair. While you perform daily millions of tasks with your hands and arms, there are those who can do little with limited or total disability in theirs. And in contrast to most people, thousands of adults and children suffer mental or emotional disorders which hinder their abilities to learn and apply what is learned and to cope adequately with their families, jobs, and communities. Then there are those who are afflicted with combination or multiple handicaps.

For our Nation's 42 million handicapped persons and their families, yes, today, and tomorrow are not filled with "everyday" kinds of problems which can be solved or soothed by "everyday" kinds of answers. Their daily challenge is: accepting and working with a disability so that the handicapped person can become as active and useful, as independent, secure, and dignified as his ability will allow.

Too many handicapped persons lead lives of loneliness and despair; too many feel and too many are cut off from our society.
about 200,000 persons with cerebral palsy who are of working age are employed.

Beyond this, far too many handicapped persons and their families bear serious economic problems—despite token Government pensions and income tax deductions for a few, and other financial accommodations of which I received recently from the mother of a cerebral palsy child in a Midwestern urban area:

There are the never-ending surgeries, bracing, orthopedic shoes, wheelchairs, walkers, standing tables, bath tables and so on. . . . we parents follow up on every hopeful lead in the medical specialty of cerebral palsy. Sometimes I have to go up and down paths blindly and always expensively. . . . I have talked with four major insurance companies who do not, or infrequently, insure CP children. . . . although our daughter is included in her father's group hospitalization plan, many families are not as fortunate. These are just a few of the problems, compounded by the fact we must try to adequately meet the needs of our other “normal” children. In many cases, some kind of financial assistance would enable us and others like us to provide for health care, education, and other needs. It is overreaching of already overworked facilities and further adding to the taxpayer's burden costs for complete care.

There are other problems—availability and access of health care personnel and facilities at the time and place the individual with handicaps needs them. In my own largely rural State of Kansas, many handicapped persons travel 300 miles or more to receive the basic health services they require.

Education presents difficulties for many parents of handicapped children. Although a child may be educable, there may be few, if any, opportunities in the community for him to receive an education. Private tutoring, if available, is often too expensive. Sadly, to date, the Council for Exceptional Children estimated that over one-third of the Nation's children requiring special education are not receiving it.

In rehabilitation, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said recently that America's disabled have not received rehabilitation services and do not know where to seek such help. They estimate that at least 5 million disabled persons may be eligible for assistance.

Other problems the handicapped person faces each day include availability and access of recreation and transportation facilities, architectural barriers in residences and other buildings, and many, many more.

STILL A PROMISING OUTLOOK

We in America are still far from the half-way point of assuring that every handicapped person can become as active and useful as his capacities will allow. The outlook for the handicapped person in 1968, however, is not altogether bleak. Unparalleled achievements in medicine, science, education, technology as applied to medicine. . . . The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has acknowledged a framework in which the handicapped person today has more opportunities available to him than ever before. Consider what Government is doing.

THE GOVERNMENT STORY

The story of what the Federal Government, hand in hand with State governments, is doing to help meet the needs of the handicapped is not one that draws the biggest headlines. Broadly, the story is a “good” one, consisting of achievements in financial assistance, rehabilitation, research, education, and training of the handicapped or extensive effort to help many disabled Americans live as normal, as full and rich lives as possible.

It is, in part, the story of a man who, at age 17, was a paraplegic after sustaining injuries to his spinal cord and head in an accident while on the job.

In 1968, he joined over 2,500,000 other disabled men and women who have been restored to work through useful and meaningful lives. Since the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program began 48 years ago. In 1964, the young man—a high school dropout with a wife and child—was referred to his State's division of vocational rehabilitation where a thorough program of total rehabilitation began. In addition, he was enrolled in a training school and was graduated as a medical technologist.

Today—4 years later—he has his own successful insurance business. He and his wife have built a new home and adopted a baby.

It is a measure of America's concern for its handicapped citizens that even 50 years ago, this story could not have been told.

It takes place now because the Congress and the Federal Government initiated and guided a vital, vigorous program of vocational rehabilitation.

Mr. President, vocational rehabilitation is one of the many Federal efforts that the Federal Government works to aid the handicapped. But none of the Federal programs necessarily reaches or helps every handicapped person.

Nevertheless, the role of the Government has been basically successful in terms of numbers assisted, basic research performed, and the movement of increasing numbers of handicapped persons into more productive, satisfying channels. It demonstrates what Congress and Federal and State governments are doing to help America's handicapped better participate and achieve a life he most needs it.

Mr. President, at this point, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record, at the close of my remarks, a brief summary of Federal programs for the handicapped.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President: It is in the American tradition and spirit that parallel to Government effort there has developed the vital and growing effort for the handicapped. It is a voluntary effort, and a financial effort by the private and voluntary organizations. It is a herculean effort that has been attacked the very programs and personnel for whom they were intended and at the time and place he needs them.

Some sincerely believe there may be better ways we can demonstrate our concern and be assured that the person with handicaps the independence, security, and dignity to which he is entitled.

I am reminded of a statement given recently by the 1968 president of the National Rehabilitation Association:

It is the person, not the program that is of overwhelming importance. It is not the disability that claims our attention. It is the person with handicaps. It is not the
tance of prestige of a particular profession that matters. It is the contribution of the profession to solving the complex problems of the individual who has handicaps.

When more of this emphasis on the individual better influences the development and acceptance of what is done with the handicapped, I believe we can begin to open new, more meaningful vistas for more persons with handicaps.

We have been involved in efforts which have been creditable to date. Of this, there is no doubt.

But are we doing our best?

A highly respected official of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare summed up the problem this way:

"I do not feel we are spending our dollars—public or voluntary—as effectively as we could. We need to take a whole new look at what is going on, where the service is given. We need to try to design new methods and creative services. We need to relate our efforts more closely to the needs of a community, to the needs of its individuals. And, where we can, we need to be more specific and concretely as possible what is actually achieved by our expenditures."

Our handicapped citizens are one of our Nation's greatest unmet responsibilities and untapped resources. We must do better.

**Presidential Task Force**

With this in mind, I suggest the creation of a Presidential task force or commission to do the following:

- Review what the public and private sectors are doing and to recommend how we can do better.
- Composed of representatives of the public and private sectors, this task force or commission could provide an overview of how to provide the handicapped more help and hope.
- Such a task force or commission could provide valuable assistance to Congress and the administration as we develop programs and allocate comparatively limited funds for the handicapped.
- It could also help public organizations and voluntary groups conduct their efforts more efficiently and effectively.

The goal of a task force or commission, to achieve maximum independence, should concern itself with the handicapped. Those with handicaps, should encompass the total needs of the handicapped, not just employment or education or any other.

Rather the task force or commission should concern itself with the whole broad spectrum of needs and services, because as I have pointed out the problems of the handicapped do not begin and end with the handicapped itself.

This is the philosophy that a task force or commission could review, I am hopeful, if created, it would include the following subjects:

**First. Expansion of Employment, Transportation, and Recreation Opportunities for the Handicapped.**

Second. A directory or central clearinghouse to help inform the handicapped person and his family of available public and private assistance.

There are many helpful handbooks and information sources available. But most are not comprehensive and are more like a bell weather in the field than to the handicapped who really need the guidance and information.

**Third. Removal of Architectural Barriers.**

Many persons cannot secure employment or fill their leisure hours because their disabilities bar the use of the facilities. It is just as easy to build and qualify buildings so that the handicapped and unhandicapped can use them. The Federal Government is doing this now for federally financed structures.

**Fourth. More Adequate and Health Care**

There is no doubt.

**Fifth. Better Serving the Special Educational Needs of the Handicapped.**

Both the person and the Nation suffer when any educable child—handicapped or unhandicapped—does not receive an equal education.

**Sixth. Income Tax Deductions and/or Other Financial Assistance to Extend Relief to More Handicapped Persons and Their Families.**

**Seventh. More Attention on the Family of the Handicapped Person.**

These are the people who often need a degree of encouragement, counseling, and rehabilitation to extend the very limits of the handicapped person's personal abilities.

**Eighth. More Effective Coordination Between Private and Voluntary Groups and Government Agencies to Avoid Multiplicity and Duplication.**

What is at stake is the future of the handicapped person with his own abilities and potentialities.

**Conclusion**

This, then, Mr. President, is the sum and substance of my first speech in the Senate.

I know of no more important subject matter, not solely because of my personal interest, but because in our great country many Americans suffer from a physical, mental, or emotional handicap. Progress has been and will continue to be made by Federal and State governments, by private agencies, and individual Americans; but nonetheless there is still much to be done, if the handicapped American young, old, black, white, rich, or poor is to share in the joys experienced by others. The task ahead is monumental, but I am confident that there are forces in America ready and willing to meet the challenge—including distinguished colleagues who by their acts and deeds have demonstrated their great interest.

**Exhibit 1**

**Federal Programs for the Handicapped Disabled Veterans**

The program of services for disabled veterans is the outgrowth of the establishment of the Soldier Rehabilitation Act, which was passed unanimously by Congress on June 29, 1919 (P.L. 78, 65th Congress). Under this law, the Federal Board for Vocational Education, created by legislation the year previous, was authorized to establish vocational rehabilitation programs for disabled veterans.

The program was finally closed out July 2, 1928. In the program's 10-year existence, about 675,000 veterans applied for training. About 350,000 completed their courses satisfactorily and were discharged, and about 98 percent of them were employed at the time their training was completed or terminated.

Soon after the U.S. entered World War II, planning began for vocational rehabilitation programs for disabled servicemen returning from that war.

On March 13, 1943, after much discussion of whether the veterans program should be allied with the civilian vocational rehabilitation program, the House passed a bill authorizing the establishment of a separation program. It was signed into law 11 days later as P.L. 16, 78th Congress, and covered veterans who served in the armed services between Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, and the declared end of the war. This legislation set into motion an effort which, before termination, benefited several hundred thousand disabled veterans.

When the U.S. entered the Korean conflict, the Congress enacted legislation to assure that the men who fought there could receive the same services as World War II veterans. In 1958 alone, about 805,000 veterans had received vocational rehabilitation training for service-connected disabilities.

Later legislation made it possible for veterans disabled after the conclusion of the Korean conflict to receive rehabilitation and other services of the Veterans Administration, income tax deductions and/or other financial assistance to extend relief to more handicapped persons and their families.

**Programs for Disabled Civilians**

A rehabilitation program for disabled civilians was not enacted with the veterans' program because of opposition that it was not practicable and also not the responsibility of the Federal Government.

Two years later—June 2, 1920—President Wilson signed into law the Civilian Vocational Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 236, 66th Congress). The bill, known as the Smith-Pess Act, is one of the oldest grant-in-aid programs for disabled civilians.
Programs to treat mental retardation for a large segment of the population were also authorized. The 1943 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (P.L. 80-339) authorized more liberal financing, increased efficiency, expanded services, and reached more handicapped persons. The act also authorized the establishment of an interdisciplinary approach for clinical training of specialized personnel and for demonstration of new service techniques.

Senator John J. Sparkman of Alabama and Senator Al Gore of Tennessee introduced a bill in 1967 (P.L. 90-170) to extend these two programs and established a new grant program to develop and implement comprehensive and technical personnel in community facilities for the retarded, for initial operations of new community facilities in a facility. Projects have been approved for construction of 242 community facilities to serve 3,715,000 persons.

In 1969, Congress authorized the hospital improvement program to support projects to improve services in State mental retardation institutions. This program is assisting about 100 of the 160 existing facilities.

The Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968 (P.L. 90-381) authorized grants for rehabilitation of mentally retarded persons not eligible for vocational rehabilitation programs, but many did not. Development on a national scale had been uneven.

There were problems, however, partly because the financial system was becoming inadequate and because there was no provision for research, professional training, and other features, essential progress was not being made.

Legislation in 1934, supported by President Roosevelt, was an effort to remedy these problems. While retaining the basic pattern of services, the 1934 amendments (P.L. 556, 73rd Congress) added the vocational rehabilitation program, among other items. They included provisions for research, demonstration, and training activities. The Federal funds, based on a federal-aid formula, to give greater support to States with relatively large populations and relatively small per capita population, were also authorized.

In 1964, Congress also amended the Hill-Burton Act to extend the non-profit hospitals to provide Federal grants to help construct rehabilitation facilities.

While in 1969, 84,275 persons were rehabilitated under the vocational rehabilita-

ized grants to States to construct facilities to serve the mentally retarded. It also provided grants to assist in construction of unified programs in State institutions. An interdisciplinary approach for clinical training of specialized personnel and for demonstration of new service techniques.

Finally, just this past year, Congress passed another major rehabilitation measure known as the "An Act To Promote the Education of the Blind." This law set up a perpetual trust fund of United States Revenue from which, in the amount of $410,000 a year, would go to the American Printing House For the Blind in Louisville, Kentucky, so that books already used could be distributed among the schools for the blind throughout the country. Subsequent amendments extended facilities and services for the blind, and in 1966, the program was approved March 3, 1879, under the title "An Act Establishing the Rehabilitation Services Administration."

Today, there are 300,000 blind in the United States. Congress in 1964, enacted the so-called Pratt-Smoot Act (P.L. 787, 71st Congress) to "Provide Books for the Use of Blind in Schools in the United States," This legislation formed the basis for the Federally-supported library service to the blind vested in the division for the blind and physically handicapped in the Library of Congress.

In 1953, an amendment to the act made available for distribution talking books, or phonograph records, in addition to the Braille books already used.

As commercial firms became interested in producing talking book records, a 1969 amendment gave preference to "nonprofit-making institutions or agencies whose activities are primarily directed specifically to the blind." A 1942 amendment provided maintenance and replacement of talking book machines as well.

Then in 1953 Congress enacted an amendment removing the word "adult" from the act. This made it possible for young blind persons, between the ages of 18 and 21, to also benefit from the program. In 1966, another amendment extended the program to include other physically handicapped persons. In 1966, 140,000 handicapped readers received catalogs from which to select reading matter and circulation of the containers, and in 1967, over 250,000.

The expenditure for the program in 1968 was $5.5 million.

One aspect of the vocational rehabilitation program is the emphasis given to adjustment,
training, and placement of blind persons in competitive employment. Attention was first focused on this severely disabled group as a result of the passage of P. L. 115 in 1943.

The first phase of employment for the blind was made possible through the provisions of the Randolph-Sheppard Act (P. L. 732) in 1938 which gave preference for operation of small vending machines on Federal properties to qualified blind persons. Installation of facilities, training, and supervision of blind operators are responsibilities of the State licensing agencies. In 1968, 8,569 blind persons earned $16.6 million, an average of $5,580 per operator.

**EDUCATION OF THE HANDICAPPED**

In 1964, President Johnson signed into law a bill establishing a national college for the deaf later to be known as Gallaudet College, and in 1978, Congress enacted amendments authorizing financial aid to the American Printing House for the Blind. Unfortunately, these two programs were the extent of Federal activities for education of handicapped children for the next three quarters of a Century.

In 1954 Congress enacted the cooperative Research Act (P. L. 83-531) for research grants in education. In 1957, $675,000 of the $1 million appropriated under the Act was made available through the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (P. L. 89-994) to provide grants to public and private agencies and organizations for establishing and operating training programs for handicapped children by the Office of Education. In addition, the Congress undertook a limited precedent, the establishment of the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped. This was referred to the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped by the Office of Education. In 1966, Congress passed further amendments (P.L. 89-750) to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provided authorized funds to assist the States in improvement of programs and projects for handicapped children at preschool, elementary, and secondary levels. The 1968 amendment also required establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Handicapped Children to make recommendations concerning programs carried on for handicapped children by the Office of Education, and to hire the handicapped. The Federal Government is involved in several programs to develop new or improved means of providing housing for low-income persons, the physically handicapped, and disabled. The Housing Assistance Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides loans and contributions to local housing authorities which, in turn, provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families. Demonstration of means to provide employment for the handicapped whose incomes are above the levels set for admission to public housing projects, but below that needed to pay rents for available private housing. This program was enacted by the Housing Act of 1968 (P. L. 86-374).

**HOUSING FOR THE HANDICAPPED**

The Federal Government is involved in several programs to develop new or improved means of providing housing for low-income persons, the physically handicapped, and disabled. The Housing Assistance Administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development provides loans and contributions to local housing authorities which, in turn, provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families. Demonstration of means to provide employment for the handicapped whose incomes are above the levels set for admission to public housing projects, but below that needed to pay rents for available private housing. This program was enacted by the Housing Act of 1968 (P. L. 86-374).

The Housing Assistance Administration administers government-backed long-term loans to private nonprofit corporations, consumer cooperatives, and public agencies for new and existing decent, safe, and sanitary rental housing, dining facilities, community centers, and similar improvements for the elderly and the handicapped whose incomes are above the levels set for admission to public housing projects, but below that needed to pay rents for available private housing. This program was enacted by the Housing Act of 1968 (P. L. 86-374).

The Housing Act of 1961 (P.L. 87-70) establishes a program for public and private agencies to develop new or improved means of providing housing for low-income persons, the physically handicapped, and disabled. The Act also established a program to assure that the handicapped and disabled have access to appropriate services, facilities, and programs for the handicapped.
designed and constructed to be accessible to the physically handicapped (F.L. 90-480). This legislation applies to any public buildings constructed in whole or part with Federal funds. Facilities in hospitals, schools, and public buildings, as well as those acquired or constructed by the State, are not covered by this act.

Vocational Rehabilitation Program to pay for services to disabled beneficiaries, most of whom can be restored to activity and work, thereby resuming their payments into the Federal Treasury. $18,077,000 was transferred for this work.

SUMMARY

The above Federal programs have been described briefly and quite possibly some programs may have been unintentionally overlooked in our research.

At any rate, the summary may be of assistance in making a greater contribution to the problems and programs concerning handicapped Americans.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I should like to express great pride in, and ask that this be associated with this most excellent statement just made by my distinguished colleague. He speaks of a problem which, in his own words, affects every person in our society and every fiber of our Nation.

I concur to a distinction and with a solution and, treated with sympathy and yet with reason, an approach, I am sure, that will yield to progress.

I think that one point he so clearly set forth is the challenge. That is when he asked all of us:

Are we doing our best to see that all the knowledge, the information, and money, and also the care that is available for the handicapped person in the form he can best use and in the time and place he needs it most?

I think he answered that question by saying a little later on that we must do better. He makes a proposal which is specific in its recommendations, and is an enormous contribution, I think, to a very great problem.

To look toward to the other proposal that he shall be making in the days ahead in regard to what is, really, one of the great problems facing this country in the last third of the 20th century.

I congratulate him, distinguished colleague. I am very much pleased to be here today when he makes his first speech in the Senate.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Vocational Rehabilitation Program yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I should like to join my friend, the other distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. Pearson), in commendation of the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) for his contribution this afternoon.

I have served in this body many years. I do not know that I have ever heard a new Senator make a greater contribution in what he characterizes as his first speech in this body.

He talked on a subject which is close to the hearts of all Americans. This country has grown so fast, with over 300 million people in it, with a huge Government requiring complicated machinery, that it is a superb task for us to try to see things. Unfortunately, a tremendous number of people in this country are not under the wheels of the massive instrument that we have played our part in creating.

I predict for the junior Senator from Kansas a long and distinguished career. I venture to say that although his contributions, I am sure, will be great, he can always remember with pride the fact that he has contributed in a subject which is so important to all Americans.
man can serve his country despite a handicap.

Mr. President, I congratulate the junior Senator from Kansas on his fine remarks to the Senate.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the Senator from Nebraska.

**UTAH GIRL WINS ABILITY COUNTS CONTEST**

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for the third time in the last 5 years, a Utah high school girl has been named national winner of the Ability Counts Contest, sponsored by the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Taking top honors in the 1969 contest is Miss Kathy DeAnn Saxton, 17, of Ogden. She won in competition with upper class high school students from 47 States, the District of Columbia, and the Virgin Islands, all writing on "What Every Employer Should Know About Handicapped Workers."

In 1965, Marilyn Daurich of Salt Lake City's Granite High School, won first-place honors in the essay contest. The following year her sister, Ann, won the same honor. The back-to-back winners by sisters was unprecedented in the contest's history.

This year's winner, Miss Saxton, is a junior at Bonneville High School, in Ogden. Along with first-place State winners, she will come to Washington during May to meet with the President's Committee, and to receive her $1,000 national award, contributed by the Disabled American Veterans.

The Ability Counts Contest is aimed at making us aware of the problems faced by the handicapped in obtaining employment, and the many high achievements of severely disabled persons.

Miss Saxton's excellent paper, which was written after a good deal of research into the problems faced by the handicapped, what is being done to meet these problems, and what will be needed in the future to aid Utahans, shows what can be accomplished to tap the potential of these citizens.

As she says in her theme:

> It is our duty and our opportunity to help give the disabled a chance to prove their own worth and retain their dignity. To produce useful and lasting citizens, rehabilitation of both employer and employee must take place from the shoulders up.

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

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

**WHAT EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW ABOUT HANDICAPPED WORKERS**

(By Kathy DeAnn Saxton)

There are nearly eight million disabled people in our country. We have a responsibility to assure each American a prosperous life. The hiring of the disabled can prove to be an advantage to the employer and employee. Our society can, and will help find employment for these Americans.

In ancient times, people were thought to cause disease. The physically handicapped or mentally retarded persons were given as sacrifices to the gods. If a child was born deformed, in ancient Greece or Rome, he could be killed at birth.

Americans of our generation have placed a great emphasis on a beautiful body with no physical or mental deformities. When people see an individual who is deformed in ancient Greece or Rome, they see an individual who is crippled and is doing an excellent job. Acting as mail handlers for the U.S. Post Office, Salt Lake City, Utah, they can "run rings around the other employees." A secretary in a Salt Lake City, Utah business firm functions efficiently as a typist. She has only one arm and is paralyzed from the shoulders up. While in college, a young man is employed by the Security Employment Office, Salt Lake City, Utah. He is a journalist by everyone and is doing an excellent job. Acting as mail handlers for the U.S. Post Office, Salt Lake City, Utah, some individuals are reported as doing excellent work.

To help give the disabled a chance to prove their own worth and retain their dignity. To produce useful and lasting citizens, rehabilitation of both employer and employee must take place from the shoulders up.

**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.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the day be continued.

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

**SENIOR RANDOLPH OPPOSES BUDGET CUTS IN NATURAL RESOURCES PROGRAMS AND ASKS FOR $10 BILLION CUT IN DEFENSE SPENDING**

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the annual submission of the budget of the U.S. Government has again become the signal for the opening of public discussion on cutting back programs in the development of our human and natural resources.

Invariably, the first things looked at are those programs which concern themselves with the improvement of the quality of our environment. Natural resource programs of every kind become suspect. Some programs provide for the management of our water supply, air and water pollution control, education, hospital construction, recreation, manpower training, and urban and transportation development. Programs which constitute the investment in our future are the ones which are most acceptable to the American people. Inflation has directly affected the cost of Government services.

On Monday, March 24, 1969, the Director of the Budget, Robert P. Mayo, in an appearance before the Senate Committee on Finance, discussed the possibility of a freeze on public works. The objective of the freeze, the reduction of inflationary pressures, is indeed noteworthy. However, since this is not the first such moratorium on our national public works investment programs, it is time for us to evaluate the relationship between these programs and our national fiscal policy, and indeed the very purpose for which we have resource development programs.

For a decade the pressures of rising costs have borne down heavily upon the American people. Inflation has directly affected the cost of public services. In a period of great prosperity, we have experienced tremendous increases in the cost of services, along with an expansion of the kinds of services needed by our expanding population. As the total
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budget of the Federal Government has risen, however, that portion of it devoted to the preservation, conservation, and improvement of our human and natural resources has decreased.

The problem is not just on such things as water pollution control, air pollution control, parks, recreation, water resource development, solid waste disposal, and the like have stayed fairly constant, or decreased. Expenditures relative to the Federal budget has steadily decreased. We have, in the parlance of business, curtailed our investment in plant and equipment, and have tried to meet the impacts of defense needs in inadequate and obsolete facilities. I am deeply concerned that the Bureau of the Budget should again be considering a freeze on "all but the most urgent public works projects," in view of the fact that in the last 20 years, the Bureau of the Budget itself has exercised such strict controls over our public works programs that only the most urgent national projects have been submitted to the Congress.

In the budget for fiscal year 1970, submitted by the Johnson administration, our total outlays were estimated to be $118 billion; $55 billion would be obligated for national defense; some $55 billion would be for social security, unemployment insurance and Medicare programs; more than $30 billion would be needed to service the national debt. Of the total budget, only $19 billion would be available for programs which related in greater or lesser degree to our investment in the future of the human beings and its people. Of this amount, the net expenditure for those primary categories traditionally considered as "public works," that is, water and land resources and power development, as my knowledgeable colleague who honors me by listening to these remarks, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER), well knows, will be less than $2 billion.

We are not only at the revisical of the Johnson administration for fiscal year 1970, submitted by President Nixon, will be transmitted to the Congress tomorrow. Reports in the press, for example, the Johnson budget will be trimmed by $4 billion, with $11 billion coming from the defense related budget—now in excess of $83 billion—and $2.9 billion being cut from the so-called controllable nondefense expenditures which are estimated at less than $20 billion. Mr. President, I respectfully suggest that this proposed allocation of cuts falls to acknowledge the mounting criticism of independent scientific and military experts and of Members of Congress regarding the policies and practices of the Defense Establishment. And I suggest also that both the Johnson and the Nixon budgets express the continued confusion of values and priorities which has been dominated by a militaristic perception. The Johnson and the Nixon budgets are frozen in the ice of the cold war. And as the knowledgeable senior Senator from Connecticut (Mr. MCCARTHY) demonstrated in his remarks to the Senate this afternoon, and as others in the Senate have said, we have been operating under a cold war mentality, ignoring the signs that war is no longer relevant to the world of today.

The great tragedy of the world today is that we have not tried to get at the mechanics to carry out the will of the common people that war shall be non-existent, and that the problems of our day shall be put to the solution by the will of their leaders ... I believe it is the mass opposition of the rank and file against war which offers the greatest possible hope that there shall be no war.

I stated at that time in Morgantown, and I assert here vigorously again this afternoon, that it is quite possible that we are beginning to see the genesis of mass opposition to war in the attitudes and protests—though I am strongly against violence and often speak out against it—of what is thus far a small segment of the young people of the United States and other States. Although all reasonable persons wish for peace, it is our young people who most often have taken an active part in translating that desire into affirmative action.

I talked not only with students in high school and college, but with other young people who are working at jobs in our labor forces in the West Virginia coal fields and on the West Virginia hills. I talked to young men who are beginning to rear families, and to realize the responsibility of bearing the heavy costs under which they live in these troubled times.

Mr. President, I honor the patriotism, the sincerity, and the integrity of the career military officers of the armed services. And I do not imply a conspiracy with the military-industrial complex. Though I do believe the military-industrial complex is a reality, and the problem of controlling it is made more difficult than if it were dominated by a conspiracy; for if that were the case we could ferret out the conspirators and be done with it. The problem is much more deep seated and pervasive than that of a conspiracy; for it stems from attitudes and habits of thought generated more than 20 years ago which are no longer relevant to the world of today.

Too much of the thinking of our Defense Establishment and foreign policy planning is frozen in the ice of the cold war. And as the knowledgeable senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) demonstrated in his remarks to the Senate on April 1 of this year concerning his recent trips in the Soviet Union, the rigid, inflexible attitudes of the cold war are no longer relevant to the realities of today.

As the senior Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) stated at that time, "Almost 30 years ago, us in the Congress have more or less blindly followed our military spokesmen. Some have much more deeply seated and pervasive than that of a conspiracy; for it stems from attitudes and habits of thought generated more than 20 years ago which are no longer relevant to the world of today."

I have spoken with many of these young people on college campuses throughout the United States. In recent months, and I know of their longings for peace and for the opportunity to make creative contributions to our society in the years ahead. Last Friday, April 11, I spoke in Morgantown, W. Va., where I quoted remarks of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur when he stated:

Not long ago, Under Secretary of Defense, Mr. packard stated that the problem of defense had been dominated by a militaristic psychology, which has resulted in our de-
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Mr. President, I shall long remember the year 1963 in the Senate. That was the year Senator Randolph from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) in offering an amendment to cut military appropriations by 10 percent, and the amendment received two votes—the votes of Senator McGovern and Senator Randolph. That was 6 years ago.

On that occasion, I stated:

'75d men, arms and materials almost heedlessly about the world.

Mr. President, I shall long remember the year 1963 in the Senate. That was the year Senator Randolph from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) in offering an amendment to cut military appropriations by 10 percent, and the amendment received two votes—the votes of Senator McGovern and Senator Randolph. That was 6 years ago.

On that occasion, I stated:

'75d men, arms and materials almost heedlessly about the world.

During the same decade, defense expenditures have almost doubled; and in recent months we have learned—from reports of the General Accounting Office, testimony from such experts as Admiral Rickover, and from committee investigations in both the Senate and the House of Representatives—of vast overruns in defense contracts, the failure of weapons systems to function with more than a fraction of their specified capabilities, and of the increasing use of competitive bidding among defense contractors. These conditions were summed up in the 1969 report of the Joint Economic Committee in the following statement:

'75d over $44 billion was spent on the purchase of weapons and other military goods last year, only 11 percent of the contracts were awarded through formal adversarial bidding, and 42 percent of the costs exceed those estimated for 57.9 percent. It is the sole source procurement of major weapons systems where much of the problem of excess costs and cost overruns has occurred. Cost increases of 200 percent and more over original estimates have been common.

The conditions prevail, Mr. President, because we have not established in the Department of Defense or in any other agency of the Government machinery to assure effective, audit, control, and program management of defense expenditures. The Defense Contract Audit Agency, which was established by Secretary of Defense as of July 1, 1965, has made progress in postaudit reviews of contract prices. But this is only a partial attack on the general problem of defense procurement and contract administration. As this agency becomes more effective, it is the intention of the Comptroller General to shift the emphasis in the very competent work being performed by the General Accounting Office from individual contract audits to the broader arena of procurement and contract administration. Under the present allocation of manpower, the General Accounting Office devotes 90 percent of its staff to audits of Defense Department activities. This seems to me a fair allocation of manpower, considering that the GAO also has to respond to many unclassified requests from the committees of Congress. But I believe the appropriate committees of Congress should also give consideration to increasing the general professional personnel of the General Accounting Office, especially in view of the savings that have accrued to the Government as a result of GAO audits of Defense Department contracts.

But the kind of control of the Defense Establishment which is now required is not the function of an arm of Congress, nor of Congress itself. Certainly, no committee in the Senate has carried a greater burden than has the Committee on Armed Services, chaired so long and so ably by the distinguished former chairman, the senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell), and now led by the knowledgeable and diligent Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Stennis). A Senate committee has neither the time nor the staff adequately to control as massive an operation as the Department of Defense.

Indeed, the primary responsibility for weighing the requests for defense expenditures in relation to competing claims from the non-defense sector of the Government rests with the Bureau of the Budget. Yet, among the 500 professional staff persons in the Bureau of the Budget, only 45 are assigned to audit, control, and program management of national security programs—that is, less than 10 percent of BOB personnel assigned to manage the expenditure of 50 percent or more of budgeted funds, depending on how one categorizes “national security” expenditures. Five hundred professional staff persons are employed in the Bureau of the Budget, but only 45 are assigned to audit, control, and program management in our national security efforts—less than 10 percent of the personnel assigned to manage the expenditure of 50 percent or more of budgeted funds.

I desired to make a comparison between BOB manpower allocation to national resources programs and national security programs and requested this information from the Bureau of the Budget. I ask unanimous consent to have the two tables printed in the Record at this point.

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

[Estimated fiscal year 1970]

Budget analysis (Estimated fiscal year 1970)

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Agriculture price support, Public Law 480, and related programs ____________________ 2
Conservation programs ____________________ 1
Credit programs ____________________ 1
Forestry programs ____________________ 1
Marketing, foreign agriculture, and food programs ____________________ 1
Indian programs ____________________ 3
Territories ____________________ 1
Mineral exploration, production and supply ____________________ 1
Land, forage, timber ____________________ 1
Recreation use and preservation; also includes fish and wildlife programs ______ 2
Water supply and conservation ______ 1
Corps of Engineers-Civil, including project report reviews ______ 7
Power and energy ______ 4
General program support ______ 4
Total ______ 38

NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS

Strategic forces ______ 6
General forces ______ 15
Intelligence and communications ______ 7
Research and development ______ 3
Logistics, construction and general support ______ 4
Support to other nations ______ 2
Total ______ 45

1 All but 10 of these positions are located in the national security programs division; one is an assistant director; seven are located in the international programs division; two, in the general government division.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President (Mr. Dole in the chair), it is, of course, virtually impossible to make a refined comparison of man-per-dollar volume between the two categories of programs—the natural resources and the national security programs—because they do not follow the overall budget categories to which funds are allocated. However, one does need a definitive analysis to see the grossly disproportionate allocation of manpower to natural resources programs compared to those associated with national security. Recently, in the field of national security programs of research and development, the budget estimate for fiscal year 1970 is in excess of $9 billion, reducing the $82 billion entered for weapons research by the Atomic Energy Commission and thus not carried
in the Defense Department budget. In order to monitor this massive program—where some of the most flagrant examples of mismanagement and cost overruns have taken place—the Bureau of the Budget has assigned three, only three, budget analysts. On the other hand, for natural resources programs, which, in their entirety, do not approach fiscal 1970 obliga-
tions, the Bureau of the Budget has assigned 33 budget analysts. For water resources and power development alone—
programs administered largely by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, the Federal Water Pollution Control Admini-
tration, with combined budgets of less than $1.8 billion for fiscal year 1970—
for these programs alone, the Bureau has assigned 16 budget analysts, or more than five times the manpower for pro-
grams which are less than one-fourth the size of our weapons research and develop-
ment efforts.

Given this kind of manpower allocation, it is no mystery why the unvarying reflex of the Bureau of the Budget, dur-
ing the fiscal year, is to trim the natural resources programs—
the programs of people, the programs to help people, the programs to strengthen the very vitals of this Nation. Yet, it is these programs which provide the food, the water, the fiber, the wood, the natural resources, which provide the real bone and muscle of our national se-
curity, not only today but also for the years ahead; for if it were not for the great natural wealth of our country, the economic strength generated by these programs, we could not afford the fat and waste in parts of our defense effort today. To cite only two examples, it was the control and har-
nessing of the Tennessee River that helped make possible the development of the aluminum industry so vital to our air strength in World War II, and the development of the atomic bomb at Oak Ridge with which we ended that dread-
ful conflict. And, similarly, the naviga-
tional development and the control of floods on the Ohio River have made the Ohio River one of the greatest industrial centers of the heartland of America.

It is for these reasons, and countless other benefits which could be cited, that I oppose, vigorously and earnestly, any so-called moratorium or cutback on our programs of natural resources develop-
ment, and I shall oppose with equal

Mr. President, it was on March 10 of this year that the senior Senator from Wisconsin offered eight or nine specific recommendations in the Senate for ways in which we might control the runaway growth in government which has been developing from his penetrating investigations, as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Economy in Government of the Joint Economic Committee. We should address
ourselves seriously to these recommenda-
tions.

Other suggestions have been offered, including the recommendation of a na-
tional commission to review all defense programs which would include experts not only on matters of foreign policy and defense but also individuals committed to solving the urgent domestic problems which face us today.

To analyze the assumptions of the defense

Mr. President, I recognize the thief of inflation, the hidden taxes which all Americans pay, as an urgent cost. And I join with this administration in the effort to curb inflation. But I suggest to Members of this body that we con-
centrate on those areas of most rapidly rising costs and cost overruns in the $53 billion defense budget rather than on the less than $20 billion of so-called controlable nondefense programs which invest in the development of the human and natural resources of this Nation which we love.

I am very grateful for the attention

of several of my colleagues as we counsel together on this subject. I am not an expert and I do not pose as one on this matter. But I am a student of this sub-
ject, and I have been working, as other Senators have, in relation to the many matters of concern not only to us but to our constituency and the people of the United States.
up cannot continue to be delayed in order to protect the funding of other projects that do not pay their way or have not been proven economically feasible by time consuming and costly benefit-to-cost-ratio studies. I refer to the millions upon millions of dollars spent on water resources programs that do not pay their way or that are not intended to do so.

The administration has fallen heir to the problems of the billion dollar reclamation project of the 1930's, the Grande Ronde, in Oregon, which was intended to prevent loss of life and property while preserving the natural resources. The Senator from West Virginia has said that the frontier of the Middle West, like most regions of the Nation, has always been plagued with the deteriorating floods there at present and the devastating floods there in the past. The Grande Ronde project was completed in December 1964. When the backlog of reclamation and control projects presented this year in which the Corps of Engineers testified before Congress last spring that new starts in the contracts scheduled for award in fiscal year 1969 will be delayed, some estimates are up to 18 months and that is the water resource. I could talk about all the other resources to which I have referred today—such as human resources, the need for education, for housing, for job developments, for health facilities and programs, the needs of the aged and the poor, the needs of the young—all of these things bear great comment and further discussion; but I wanted to touch briefly this one, small facet of the greatest of all resources, namely, that of water, and how fundamental it is, not just to the West and to my own State, but also to the entire Nation.

Again I compliment the distinguished Senator from West Virginia for drawing our attention to this question.

I think the fundamental question is one of priorities. Are we going to put the priorities upon becoming involved in a new work of the Congressional record by all Senators into the revolution which is taking place here at home, or are we going to spend more money to destroy cities and villages in the South to rebuild and reconstruct here at home?

These are some of the priorities which have certainly challenged my thinking and I know they will be read tomorrow in the Congressional record by all Senators not privileged to hear the presentation of the Senator from West Virginia today.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the able Senator from Oregon and most appreciative of the thoughtful manner in which he has made a compelling argument to advance the water resources development programs in this country. The distinguished Senator from Louisiana (Mr. ELLENDER) has painstakingly, day after day and month after month, looked into these projects which are so glibly called pork barrels. There is no Member of this body who could so cogently present the Senator from Louisiana the falsity of the term "pork barrel" when applied to vital flood-control projects which protect the lives and property of our citizens.

I am very appreciative in the time the Senator from Oregon has taken to listen to my remarks this afternoon and to make his very helpful comments on what I hope will be a partial building of the Reservoir Grande Ronde.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I share the apprehensions of the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. The week before last, the extent of this problem to the Corps of Engineers and I have heard all the Corps of Engineers witnesses in respect to our public works programs for fiscal 1970, Congress approved, close to $300 million, for the Corps of Engineers construction program for fiscal year 1969.

Last week, I learned that based on the need to pay for past commitments sub­stantially less than the amount we made available to them.

As we are discussing this problem, the Senator from West Virginia agreed with the vast damage now being caused in the States of Iowa, Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota—fact several other States in the North. If we in the past had been provided enough money to con­struct the projects which were author­ized in those areas, a large portion of the damage we are reading about now would not have occurred.

If the President would do, but if he further curtail the expendi­tures of money to take care of natural resources, there is no telling the extent to which the damage our country will suffer in the future. We must pursue, in other words, at least half a dozen projects presented this year in which the increase in cost of some of these projects because of delays and slowdowns is more than the appropriation request to con­struct all projects for fiscal year 1970. In other words, we had at least half a dozen projects presented this year in which the additional cost to the Government be­cause of delays and slowdowns in the sum we are being asked to appropriate.
tion and let Congress appropriate sufficient funds to carry out these urgent and worthy projects.

I did hope to speak with the President on this matter, but I have not had occasion to do it so far. Insofar as I am concerned, I am going to recommend that the committee put into the bill whatever is necessary.

As the Senator well knows, the late President Eisenhower vetoed a public works appropriation bill in which we had quite literally put some $600 million for the construction of navigation, flood control, and beach erosion projects on various rivers in our country, particularly the Ohio and the Missouri, in the states of may friend from the present President. Now, notwithstanding the fact that the President vetoed the bill, the Congress overruled him. Congress felt it was most necessary for the continued maintenance of these projects.

For quite some time now—in fact long before I came to Congress—it has been my belief that we must do what we can to protect our two most important resources, our people and our财力, to do that, our country will sustain great losses.

I am very hopeful that, if, as, and when I present my report to the Congress to continue the existing resource programs, I shall receive the support of the Senate. Insofar as I am personally concerned, I intend to add quite a bit more money to those programs.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this is a well reasoned comment of caution and counsel which the Senator from Louisiana makes to the present administration and to the President of the United States. I hope the opportunity will be provided for him, informally and officially, to talk with our Chief Executive with reference to matters of overriding concern to the people of the United States.

Mr. President, we are at a great threshold. We are at a great watershed in the history of our people and in the thinking of our people. Here the Congress must be responsive to the electorate. The people are evaluating the situation today. They are thinking in a summary way, because it is not there to hide in. The problems are all about us. We must face them, as I hope we do, realistically and courageously as Members of the Senate.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia on an excellent speech. I feel as though he has put the matter in proper balance.

It is always difficult to criticize military spending. There is not a Member of the Senate who does not want to have a strong defense, a strong Navy, and Air Force. We know defense cannot be bought at bargain basement prices. We must pay for it. At the same time, as the Senator has well indicated in his speech, there is waste in the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and, as the Senator has suggested in the last few minutes, it has not been scrutinized the way it should have been. We have not devoted the resources of the Budget Bureau to a scrutiny of defense expenditures. There are 500 people in the Bureau of the Budget, and only 50, according to the Director of the Budget, have responsibility for auditing defense operations.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Forty-five, to be exact.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Forty-five. I stand corrected.

Even more important, when the Army, Navy, or Air Force comes before the Bureau of the Budget, they come in a position of power which the other agencies do not enjoy. When the officials of the various bureaus come to the Budget, an official of the Bureau of the Budget will sit in on the request and will determine, more or less, what the budget will be. While the Army, Navy, or Air Force agencies come before the Bureau of the Budget, there will be presiding an official of the Bureau of the Budget and also presiding an officer of the Bureau of the Budget over congressional review. Because they have a technical advantage, this gives Army, Navy, and Air Force officials a special advantage. Any recommendation of the Bureau is likely to be adopted by the executive branch, the President, and large, the Secretary of Defense backed up by the power of the joint chiefs, is in a peculiarly strong position with the President, not criticism of President Nixon or any President; it is just a statement of the fact.

As for congressional review, we all know the problem we have on the defense, on the average, we come before us with more than $70 billion to be debated in a few hours. In the 12 years I have been in the Senate, I have never heard an effective debate responsibly, responsibly, responsibly, and large, the Secretary of Defense backed up by the power of the joint chiefs. I am quite a bit more than that implied in the term budget, this very large proportion of all Government spending.

I should like to make one other point in connection with military expenditures. The Armed Services Appropriations Committee has a very fine analyst in Richard Stubbings. He made a report a few weeks ago pointing out that in this decade, of 11 major weapons systems developed, six have been completed and they did not work even up to 25 percent of standard specifications called for in their contracts. On the other hand, their cost was 100 to 200 percent more than the Fenta­nyl, when Congress told them they were authorized. They were delivered more than 2 years late on the average. This is an unfortunate situation, because these weapons become obsolete swiftly. Finally, not only that did the worst job, that failed most miserably, made the highest profit.

So it is difficult for Congress to be able to step aside and look at each of the myriad of items in the Defense Department budget. But cut this budget we must. Let me suggest how appropriate such a cut would be. I have read Quarterly Magazine as a fascinating study, some 3 or 4 months ago, in which it was argued that if we cut the defense budget by $10.8 billion, we would have a leaner, harder, tougher, better military operation, and we would not damage our combat effectiveness. The study pointed out that there were between 10 and 11 support personnel in Vietnam for every one engaged in combat, and 20 commissioners were needed per army in Viet­nam for every command post.

I think the Senator from West Vir­ginia is on sound ground. It will be difficult for us to do it. If I have a criticism of the Nixon budget-cutting proposals, it is to be sure, looking at it only overall, as it has been reported to us—it seems to me that to cut only $1.1 billion, which the newspapers report is what is expected to be cut out of the defense budget, is grossly inadequate. I say we have to do far more than that, and I think with leadership such as that of the Senator from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Public Works, who has made such a fine speech here this afternoon, we can do it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, I am, of course, appreciative of the references made to my remarks by the knowledgeable Senator from Wisconsin. I referred to him in my speech, not merely in pleasantness, but because of the work he has been doing in this field, and doing so very effectively.

If, of course, realize that there are different opinions among Senators about such programs as the Job Corps. I refer specifically, among others, to the Senator from California (Mr. CASS), known earlier this afternoon, though not in the termology I shall now use. But what do we find? We find a mistake in a defense item can run $50, $100, or $15 million. We can gloss such mistakes over very easily.

If, however, a $10, $12, or $15 million mistake is made in connection with conservation or resource development programs, or even programs of helping people to help themselves, such mistakes are disproportionately inflating before the American people.

So I think there is as was stated earlier today by the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), a need to understand the priorities and attempt to establish them.

I believe Congress is ready to try to do that. I referred earlier to the absence of my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, at the time of the vote in 1963 when the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGovern) and I offered an amendment to cut 10 percent of the appropriations, across the board. I am not sure that such a figure was the correct amount at that time. I am not an expert. I do not see why Congress is not given an opportunity for the Senate to express a deeper concern than just that implied in a figure.

We received two votes—that is all—out of all the membership of this body. I do not know what we should have received then, 6 years ago. Let us say the matters that concerned us then were not as relevant as they are today. I am now critical of the budget. I am critical of the attitude or position he may take on this problem, but I do feel we must come to grips with the issue as we never have before. We can no longer push it aside. And we ourselves can contribute to the obligation of being responsible Senators to a responsible electorate.

KENNEDY, KHRUSHCHEV, AND CUBA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an interesting article entitled "Kennedy, Khrushchev, and Cuba,"
SKHURSHCHEV, and Cuba

(As Printed by the Senate)

KENNEDY, KHRUSHCHEV, and Cuba

written by the distinguished commen­
tator, Drew Pearson, and published in the
Saturday Review of March 29. The arti­
cle is based upon several personal visits
with Khrushchev.

There being no objection, the article was
read to be printed in the Record, as
follows:

KENNEDY, KHRUSHCHEV, AND CUBA

(As Drew Pearson)

(Note—The tides of peace were at their
crushing high in October 1962 during
which the United States almost went to
war with Soviet Russia over the Cuban
missile crisis. Kennedy's book is being
cited by Secretary of State George C.
Nixon, and it is. David Schoenbrun, who
covered the crisis for CBS, warns that Mr.
Nixon and his aides are making errors
that cause historians to save them and
specifies some lessons for the
Nixon Administration.)

"I tell," said the late Senator Robert P.
Kennedy, "that we were on the edge of a
precipice with no way off." He was describ­
ing the "Thirteen Days" in October 1962
during which the United States almost went
to war with Soviet Russia over the Cuban
missile crisis. Kennedy's book is being
cited by Secretary of State George C.
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"I tell," said the late Senator Robert P.
Kennedy, "that we were on the edge of a
precipice with no way off." He was describ­

bly giving "the chief" some fishing. Our
Montengrin hosts had taken us to a seclud­ed
inland lake and set us in a rowboat to test its
potentials. Stevenson and I, meanwhile, walked
among the pine trees along the shore. It was late in
the season, and Khrushchev appeared to be
enjoying the beatification of the spot, but he began
talking of his trials and tribulations as Ambassador
to the United States. When we got back to
Washington he gave him little authority. He was
a diplomatic puppet, dancing to the tune of
the career men in Washington. Dean Rock was
slow, sometimes to the point of exaspera­
tion.

Stevenson's chief hope had been that he
could use Khrushchev as a backboard to
improving relations with Soviet Russia. To
that end he urged Kennedy, in December
1960, shortly after he was elected and before his
Inauguration, to take the initiative with the
Soviet government. Khrushchev, he said, was
ripe for friendly overtures, Averill Harran
had reported, even before the election, that
Khrushchev was throwing whatever indi­
rect influence the Soviet had against
Kennedy. Stevenson believed that an
announcement that the United States was
ready to take the first step toward peace
would be a political winner.

After Stevenson's return to Moscow, Khrushchev
suggested through Ambassador Anatoly Dobryn
in Washington that the Soviets might
consider sending a rank commander to the
Inauguration. Kennedy turned this
down. On Inauguration day, Khrushchev sent
an informal note to the young President. So
friendship to the new President. Kennedy
replied with a curt three-line message.

After the Inauguration, following con­
cernment at the Khrushchev's lack
of diplomacy, Stevenson was asked by
newsmen whether Kennedy
would confer with Khrushchev if the Soviet
leader attended a special U.N. Assembly
meeting. Stevenson had answered in the affirmative.
Whereupon the White House informed
Ambassador Llewellyn Thompson in Moscow
was ordered to track down Chairman
Khrushchev in Siberia where he was traveling and inform
him that the new President of the United
States preferred to postpone any early meet­
ing. Khrushchev is reported to have hit the
cow to the edge of nuclear war. A distin­
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though in my heart I feel we are stronger. But I agree on the policy of equality. We regard the strength of the United States in a very different way.

"We have to judge governments by their actions," I told him, "and the United States has been the most successful in this regard. We have organized the mobilization of more men, and you have organized more bombers. These are the things that count."

Kennedy said that by the end of the summer he would have mobilized 1,500 additional troops to Berlin. This is a clear threat.

"I told Mr. Kennedy," Krushchev continued, "we would have 50,000 troops to Berlin, it would offer us an opportunity to send even more troops; since we had more troops than you, this offer was a substitute for atomic war and the end of the world, the Soviet government was officially offering to begin talks with the United States on limiting offensive and defensive missiles."

When Mr. Nixon was ready. If I read the announcement, I couldn't help thinking that this is where I came in with my President's Inauguration on January 20, 1961.

KEY ISSUES AFFECTING UNITED NATIONS—REPORT BY SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, my colleague from Missouri (Mr. Symington), who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, served as a member of the U.S. delegation to the recent session of the United Nations General Assembly. During this period he had an opportunity to participate in debates and discussions and served on the First Committee, dealing with political and security matters, and the Second Committee, responsible for economic and financial issues.

In a report to the Committee on Foreign Relations concerning his experiences, he summed up his views on a series of key issues affecting the United Nations. A limited number of complete copies of the report are available on request.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SYMINGTON REPORTS ON UNITED NATIONS GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

The United Nations is not the ideal organization. It is far from the best—actually the only—forum where nearly all the countries of the world can discuss their problems. Some say the United States is not obtaining its "money's worth" from its participation in the United Nations. I can only ponder the fact, however, that the total 1965 U.S. contribution to this organization including all auxiliary agencies, special programs, and peacekeeping forces, is less than the 4-day cost of the Vietnam war; in fact the total U.S. contribution to all aspects of the United Nations since its inception in 1945 is less than the cost of 5 weeks of that war.

RISING ROLE OF THE SMALL COUNTRIES

All nations, regardless of size, have an equal vote in the United Nations. This has resulted in the increasing number of less developed nations, approximately 90 in all, having produced a powerful voting bloc against the more developed countries. Far out of proportion to either their political power as individual nations, or their financial contribution to the organization itself.

This is not to suggest every country should be required to contribute an equal share of the United Nations budget, but that the developing countries, far out of proportion to their political power as individual nations, or their financial contribution to the organization itself.
nations of the world should give full recognition in assessing the future role of the United Nations. Under the existing system, programs are passed and financial support for their execution is granted on the basis of objective assessments of the United States and other developed countries.

VICTORY

The issue of U.S. involvement in Vietnam continues to have a disruptive influence on U.N. discussions. This effect on prestige is just one more reason for doing everything considered possible to extricate our Nation from this tragic and costly involvement.

CHINA QUESTION

The United States has not and will not support any proposal which would result in the recognition of the government of Communist China. I fully support that position. But, in my opinion, every effort should be made by our Government to have the United Nations state it would not object to the People’s Republic of China joining the U.N.

It is a long been my belief that the policy of the U.S. Government toward Communist China has been an unrealistic one. I have asked consistently that we should continue to turn our back on this 700 million people whose leaders say they desire to stay in the U.N.

Now that all peoples are beginning to realize the true implications of a nuclear exchange, it would appear that a change in our position is warranted. The United States-Soviet Arms Reduction Talks

In July 1968, at the time the Non-Proliferation Treaty was signed, the United States and the Soviet Union agreed to enter into discussions with respect to possible limitation and reduction of offensive strategic nuclear weapons delivery systems and of defenses to them.

Let us hope that both countries carry out the spirit and letter of that preliminary agreement and proceed with these discussions at an early date; because if some accord cannot be reached calling for a limitation in our respective missile systems, a prolonged, costly, and dangerous escalation in the arms race is inevitable. For the United States that would mean that the costs for strategic arms would rise to at least $30 billion annually; and could rise to a great deal more.

KOREAN QUESTION

The resolutions cosponsored by the Soviet bloc and the People’s Republic of China have a common purpose: They are designed to force the United Nations to end its vital role in preserving peace and security in Korea and in seeking the establishment of a unified, independent, and democratic Korea by peaceful means.

Rather than introduce these hostile resolutions year after year, I would hope that the supporters of North Korea would become genuinely interested in the peaceful reunification of Korea and the development of peace and stability in Northeast Asia.

THE "PUEBLO"

While serving as a delegate to the United Nations, my colleague, Senator John Sherman Cooper, and I made several attempts to instill life into the sterile negotiations which had been going on in Geneva prior to the release of the crew. In this connection, we made two suggestions which we thought would be helpful in this formal forum with such obvious and pressing problems as Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, the Middle East, and Biafra.

It did decide, however, to convene an international conference on the human environment to consider the problems of air, sea, and earth pollution; and it established a committee of the security council to consider international cooperation in the exploration and peaceful uses of the seas and deep ocean floor.

U.S. REPRESIDENT

Almost everyone with whom we talked, in and out of the United Nations, were of the view that the U.S. Representative to the United Nations lacked adequate prestige and authority to carry out the job in an effective and efficient manner. The post of U.S. Ambassador is one of the highest importance. It should never be regarded as a relatively unimportant adjunct to the State Department.

THE COMPREHENSIVE COMMUNITY COLLEGE ACT OF 1969 SEEKS RELEVANT CURRICULUM PROGRAMS WITHIN A RESPONSIVE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams) recently discussed the Comprehensive Community College Act of 1969 before a governmental relations luncheon for educators in Washington. His cogent remarks clarify the importance of the legislation, its goals, and when I speak to the college community as an educational institution, its role in the education of our future citizens.

Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs, I am sympathetic with the attempts made by legislators and educators alike to improve educational services for a broad cross-section of the population. It is not my purpose to argue the pros and cons of a particular educational philosophy. Our concern is rather to develop a relevant curriculum program for all those who attend, and find an institution which is involved in the work and aspirations of the community.

United States Senator for New Jersey, you are pleaing for a fresh approach to community colleges based on this hope.
And I think that the third of the Senate which has joined me in sponsoring this legislation is equally concerned.

Community colleges are in search of an identity—they are not second-class citizens—and that is why I am afraid that each of us can make to the future of education is to recognize this need, solve it, and not force community college programs to conform to State jurisdiction alone.

At the same time these two-year institutions must develop criteria for the Commissioner and his responsiveness to community colleges, not “junior” colleges. This bill is to develop community colleges.

Those of you who represent the more establishment of educational institutions and the one-year planning of the master plan will resolve these problems at a Community colleges to conform to State jurisdiction alone.

I hope this clarifies my intentions for some of the tasks of the Advisory Committee; the Pentagon has raised: To what extent will private citizens be able to bear the cost of educational programs? And the Pentagon is asking how much is the cost of the Pentagon's education programs to the Federal Government? And the Pentagon is asking the question: To what extent will private contributors be able to bear the cost of these programs? This bill undoubtedly has raised a lot of questions—possibly more than it will settle. But if the question of this point of view and the one-year planning of the master plan will resolve these problems at a level, they could be seen through a common—perhaps reflect in the master plan a combination of private and public facilities that offer the comprehensive programs to the total community.

If the private or public institution has an exclusionary admissions policy and concentrates all of its efforts on a transfer program, then it will not be included. If, on the other hand, the community college has an emphasis on continuing education, then it will not to the degree of community service, career, and remedial programs then they would be eligible.

I have this in mind for some of you who have raised this question.

Community colleges are at a different level of development and the one-year planning of the master plan will resolve these problems at a state level where they should be resolved. For example, the two-year branch campuses of the university system in Wisconsin and Kentucky will be covered by this bill. These secondary vocational schools will be covered also.

Another point which needs some clarification is the part of this bill which will carry out the provisions of this Act. Flexibility is the intention here. We do not want to disrupt programs which are already there. On the other hand, this legislation should help to resolve jurisdictional disputes where confusion and dissatisfaction prevail. Since each State is unique with respect to this problem, I am hopeful that the hearings will provide some direction to meet the intention of this Act.

One of the tasks of the Advisory Committee is to develop criteria for the Community College of Education to evaluate the viability of this agency and its responsiveness to community colleges.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the following:

PROPOSALS TO SUBSIDIZE DONATIONS OF MILITARY CONTRACTORS

Mr. METCALF, Mr. President, I was amazed to read in Saturday's Washington Post that the Pentagon has proposed that the taxpayer foot the entire bill for the defense contractors.

At present the Government subsidizes, through income tax deductions, a portion of the contributions to charitable and educational organizations by corporations. In fact the Pentagon matches the corporation's or individual's contribution, thereby providing an incentive to donors. The percentage amount of the Government's contribution depends on the tax bracket of the individual or corporation. At present, of course, with corporation tax at the 48-percent tax rate, Government programs fail to pay 21 2/3 percent of the cost of the programs. This is not true in all cases. The Pentagon is proposing to reduce unnecessary Federal expenses.

The policy now under consideration goes far beyond the present incentive system. It would include all contributions as operating expenses. In other words, they would be in the same category as hardware, labor, plant investment. The taxpayer would pay the entire amount of the contributions and the defense contractor would get the credit.

Mr. President, what is here proposed is putting defense contractors on a utility basis of State spending, utilities in a major expense, rather than merely as tax deductions, a portion of the contributions to charitable and educational organizations by corporations.

On the other hand, an outstanding example of the Pentagon's fiscal conservatism, upheld the telephone case in 1964, therefore, the Pentagon is proposing that it repay its defense contractors.

Mr. Untereiner's comments and we have a telling argument against the Pentagon's proposed policy. The California commission bucking the precedent of State utility commissions in this respect, upheld the Untereiner argument. The commission ruled, in the Pacific Telephone & Telegraph case, that the Pentagon should be permitted to be generous with taxpayers' money.

Why cannot a defense contractor help his community on the same basis as a small businessman or an individual? Why does he need preferential treatment? Is he less civic minded, less patriotic? I think not. Rather, this proposed policy shows, with the Pentagon's policy, that private and, being awesomely powerful in Government, are exercising that power to make more profit.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by an obstacle in the way of a new policy. A number of the organizations which are defined as charitable and educational organizations under the tax-exemption provisions of the Internal Revenue Act are charitable exponents of righting education. They presently enjoy contributions from a number of defense contractors and utilities. How wonderful it would be for the American Economic Foundation, the Sierra Club, is excluded from this Internal Revenue Service list because of an arbitrary ruling by the IRS. Mr. President, it is passing strange that this new policy which would cost the taxpayers tens of millions of dollars, is proposed now by an administration which is also, it says, trying to reduce unnecessary Federal expenses.

I think the taxpayer should give to the charity of his choice, not the choice of a utility or contractor who gets the public and tax credit.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the April 12 Washington Post article written by Peter Stearn. It is apropos. "Pentagon May Repay Firms' Charity Gifts."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record the proposed Defense Department regulations to change the Federal excise tax rules.

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

[From the Washington Post, April 12, 1969] PENTAGON MAY REPAY FIRMS' CHARITY GIFTS. (By Laurence Stern)

The Pentagon is proposing that it repay its contractors for their contributions to charities and educational organizations.
If adopted, the new regulations would provide for many millions of dollars in reimbursements for costs now disallowed under a ten-year-old Defense Department ruling.

The recommendation is also being circulated among three other big Federal Government agencies—the Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the General Services Administration.

Industrial and trade groups have already endorsed the proposed new policy. They have sought the change for some time.

"We think contractors who are the heart and soul of their communities," one Defense Department spokesman explained, "should get an average for their past two years' contributions to charity. The Pentagon would pay whichever of these amounts is lower.

Currently the Pentagon is paying out $45 billion a year in procurement contracts. A tenth of 1 percent would amount to $4.5 million—a rather meager amount, the spokesman said.

Current repayments are allowed by the Pentagon under fixed price contracts. It would extend this practice to cost-reimbursable and fixed price incentive contracts, which make up the lion's share of Defense Department contracting activity.

Capt. E. C. Chapman, chairman of the Armed Services Procurement Regulation Committee, the Pentagon's top procurement policy board, said he could not assign a dollar amount to the effect of the change.

COUNCIL OF DEFENSE AND SPACE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS

Under the proposal the Defense Department would repay contractor donations up to a tenth of 1 percent of the total contract. Alternately the contractor could get back an average for his past two years' contributions to charity. The Pentagon would pay whichever of these amounts is lower.

Capt. E. C. Chapman, Chairman, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: We have reviewed the proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.8 pertailing to contributions and donations. No recommendations have been received from AGC Task Units suggesting changes.

Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal.

Sincerely yours,

D. A. CHAMPAGNI, Director, Heavy-Utilities Division.

ENGINE MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

February 12, 1969.

E. C. CHAPMAN,

Chairman, U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: We have advised our members of your proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.8. The proposal is favorable. Should any other comments be received, I will advise you.

Cordially,

THOMAS C. YOUNG, Executive Director.

COUNCIL OF DEFENSE AND SPACE INDUSTRY ASSOCIATIONS


Capt. Edgar C. Chapman, Jr. (SC), U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (I. & L.), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: As member associations of the Council of Defense and Space Industry Associations, we are pleased to respond to your letter of January 15, with your views relative to the proposed revision of ASPR 15-205.8, Contributions and Donations. Member companies of our Associations indicated that they appreciate the modification of letters C9 and C25 in that Contributions and Donations are normal business expenses and are being recognized as such and therefore the member associations of CODSIA are not suggesting any changes in the proposed revision at this time.

We do wish to reflect a view expressed by some member companies of our Associations relative to the limitations to be imposed on those companies not CWSA qualified. Use of the average of the prior three (3) years expenditures for contributions and donations as a limitation to recognition of current inflationary trends and the percentage limitation of total costs incurred might prove unduly restrictive in those cases where volume is significant but is not the result of major reprogramming. We suggest it may be desirable that you give further consideration to the specific limitations.

We note that ASPR 15-205.44(e) treats with the allowability of grants to educational or training institutions, etc. and is in conflict with the proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.8. The member associations of CODSIA are presenting both the change to ASPR 15-205.44 and as an interim action to avoid confusion, we suggest modifying ASPR 15-205.44(e) to read as follows:

"(e) Grants to educational or training institutions, including the donation of facilities or other properties, scholarships or fellowships, are considered contributions and are subject to ASPR 15-205.8.

We again express appreciation for this opportunity to comment and the recognition given to this necessary and normal business cost.

Very truly yours,

EDWIN M. HOOD,

President, Shipbuilders Council of America.

JOSEPH E. LEE,

President, National Security Industrial Association.

CARL G. HARR, Jr.,

President, Aerospace Industries Association.

ROBERT W. BARTON,

Vice President, Western Electronic Manufacturers Association.

KENNETH M. JACKSON,

Chairman, Procurement Regulations Committee, National Aerospace Services Association.

JAMES G. ELIUS,

Manager, Defense Liaison Department, Automobile Manufacturers Association.

WILLIAM H. MOORE,

Vice President, Electronic Industries Association.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS


E. C. CHAPMAN,

Chairman, S.C., U.S. Navy, Chairman, ASPR Committee, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CAPTAIN CHAPMAN: The proposed revisions to ASPR 3-408 and 7-802, 15-205.6 and 15-205.84, have been circulated to all members of the Institute's Committee on National Defense for review and comment. Individual committee members have submitted comments on certain of the proposals which are attached herewith. However, the comments should not be regarded as a consensus of the entire committee but rather a compilation of individual views.

Effective January 1, 1969, Mr. Bruce N. Willis resigned his position with the American Institute of CPAs to accept a position in public accounting. Therefore, will you please direct further correspondence to my attention.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS H. HANLEY
Manager, Special Projects.

PROPOSED REVISION TO ASPR 3-408 AND 7-802 AND DEFINITIZATION OF LETTER CONTRACTS

Committee members commenting upon this proposed revision are of the opinion that approval of the proposal should be deferred. They believe that a more equitable division of responsibilities between the government and contractors with respect to the "definitization of letter contracts" should be considered. Some of the reasoning offered by committee members in arriving at this opinion follows:

The proposed change in the above regulations puts too much of the burden on the contractor for the definitive letter contract. Typically, the Government has as much at stake in delaying the completion of a definitive contract as does the contractor. The proposed change in the wording seems to take too much of the responsibility away from the Government and places it upon the contractor.

The contractor may have valid and good reasons for delaying the definitization of a letter contract. Quite often the “state of the art” is such that it is difficult to be committed in prior contractual experience. Also, the contractor must adhere to the “truth in negotiation” regulations which
could work to his detriment if he does not have sufficient time to obtain all the necessary information, particularly from subcontractors, before he signs the contract with the Government and definite a contract.

If it is important to have letter contracts, then it seems to us that it is necessary to allow the contractor as much time as possible to complete whatever documentation is necessary for finalizing the contract. It is obvious that the burden of proof cannot be entirely placed on the contractor as this proposed change seems to do.

PROPOSED REVISION TO ASPR 15-205.9, CONTRIBUTIONS AND DONATIONS

The consensus of committee members commenting on the proposed revision is a concern that the committee is mandating that contributions and donations made by defense contractors be allowable as indirect costs. Members believe, however, that the limitations placed upon the amount of contributions that can be included as allowable costs is much too restrictive. Some members believe it is acceptable to require that there be some history of what would be an acceptable base for the contribution, such as the company's contributions to the community. While we may believe the lesser of the three-year average or some percentage is necessarily acceptable. Localized contributions, in fact, might be in the position of making an assessment against companies irrespective of the nature of their business and their annual needs. These demands are frequently based upon so much per employee and accordingly any organization is required to recognize that growth in their contribution. While the percentage would permit the recognition of growth, some believe the percentage that we are attempting to get is much too low a figure to be realistic.

The percentage does not recognize the position of some companies that carry a large amount of business for the government. In one community, a defense contractor may be a prime business organization, and, accordingly, the largest contributor to the various charitable organizations supported by the community. In another situation, a defense contractor may be a very small part of a community and have had very little demands made upon it. Prior experience has probably been the most meaningful to the contractor that can be placed upon the amount of contributions that would be allowable. This section "in a cost grouping," which is used in the proposed revision, should be defined or deleted.

PROPOSED REVISION TO ASPR 15-204.34, RENTAL COSTS

Members of the committee who have commented on the proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.9 strongly recommend that implementation of the proposed changes be deferred.

Members believe that the proposed revision to this section of ASPR XV should be considered with other related sections of ASPR X and XV, and, accordingly, the largest contributor to the various charitable organizations supported by the community. In another situation, a defense contractor may be a very small part of a community and have had very little demands made upon it. Prior experience has probably been the most meaningful to the contractor that can be placed upon the amount of contributions that would be allowable. This section "in a cost grouping," which is used in the proposed revision, should be defined or deleted.

THE ABM SYSTEM IS A DISASTER

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the former general counsel for the Department of Defense, Mr. Roger Kent, of California, has written to the editor of the San Francisco Chronicle an extremely perceptive and concise letter about the ABM. The letter was published on April 7, 1969, and reads: We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed change.

FINANCIAL EXECUTIVES INSTITUTE.


Capt. E. G. Chapman, US.
Assistant Secretary of Defense (f. & L). The Pentagon, Wash., D.C.

Dear Captain Chapman: As the American Society of Professional Accountants, we have for acknowledgement your request for comment on the proposed revision to ASPR 15-205.9, Cost of Contributions and Donations. We are, therefore, pleased that Contributions and Donations are now to be brought into the accounting system and be recognized as a necessary cost of doing business. These demands are frequently based upon so much per employee and accordingly any organization is required to recognize that growth in their contribution. While the percentage would permit the recognition of growth, some believe the percentage that we are attempting to get is much too low a figure to be realistic.

In view of the change in policy, it appears to us that the tight limitations imposed by Paragraphs (a) and (ii) have the effect of bringing back into the regulation a substantial disallowance of this type of cost. We believe it would be more consistent with the policy to adopt the principles and the limitations of the Internal Revenue Code of 1926, as amended.

If Subparagraphs (i) and (ii) are to be retained, we think the phrases for that contribution "for which the cost grouping is applicable" "to which the cost grouping is applicable" in Subparagraph (ii) should be deleted. It is not clear what is meant and we do not believe it would have any material effect. Contributions are generally a G&A type expense which is distributed across an entire accounting period. We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed change.

Very truly yours,

W. Stewart Hotchkins,
PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST:
URGENT BUSINESS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the situation in the Middle East has become exceedingly critical, and the future peace of the world may be involved.

An editorial published in the current issue of Prevent World War III discussed the crisis in the Middle East, and it presents four steps which are necessary for peace in this troubled part of the world. To get peace in the Middle East, we must have first, negotiations based upon mutual recognition of sovereignty, and peaceful coexistence; second, an end to Soviet troublemaking in the Arab world; third, resettlement of the refugees in a way that will end their maintenance by international charity; and fourth, plans for regional development.

The magazine Prevent World War III is published by the Society for the Prevention of War, Inc., 60 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., an organization which for the past 25 years has been engaged in studying the causes and methods of preventing international warfare.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

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

PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST: URGENT BUSINESS

(Note.—To get peace in the Middle East, we must have: (1) Negotiated settlements based upon mutual recognition of sovereignty, and peaceful coexistence; (2) An end to Soviet troublemaking in the Arab world; (3) Resettlement of the refugees in a way that will end their maintenance by international charity; (4) Plans for regional development.)

In the year and a half since the end of the Six-Day War, the best that can be said about the Middle East is that no new general war has erupted.

On the other hand, tensions between Israel and the Arab states have not decreased and, in fact, have increased. Even more ominous, Soviet penetration in the area has accelerated, with a far greater likelihood of disaster in the event that the present unstable status should explode.

It is clear that the negotiation of permanent peace without the presence of Soviet troops is impossible in the short run. The Six-Day War, has provided Cairo with 150 Sukhoi-7 attack planes, some 210 MIG-21 jet fighters, many supermunitions, a training Nasser's forces, and more than 300 Egyptian pilots are in the USSR, being taught the use of the MIG-21 jet. When we read news dispatches about a Soviet readiness to negotiate an end to Middle East tensions, such declarations must be taken in the light of the recent facts.

It is clear that the Arab states, and particularly Egypt, feel themselves ready for a "Soviet-Israeli" settlement. Since the Six-Day War, President Nasser declared in a widely publicized speech at the University of Cairo, that the Chinese had "cut the arms we lost ... free of charge."

Obviously, the Soviets are taking every advantage of Arab belligerency, and doing all that they can to keep hard power alive. At no other time in history has a defeated power refused to talk with the victor in a war, the victor being the victor and not the aggressor. The Soviets can afford this intransigent position only because their backers in the U.S.S.R. made it possible.

In any event, the civilians in the Middle East are paying a high price for the continued presence of Soviet troops in the Middle East. They have established bases at such places as Alexandria. Obviously, they plan to replace the British Navy as a force in the Suez. Even these raids have grown into frequent attacks and border incidents, precipitated by El Fatah, the PLO, the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, and the Muslim Brotherhood. There are at least 1600 Russian technicians in Egypt, training Nasser's forces, and more than 300 Egyptian pilots are in the USSR, being taught the use of the MIG-21 jet.

When we read news dispatches about a Soviet readiness to negotiate an end to Middle East tensions, such declarations must be taken in the light of the recent facts.

It is clear that the Arab states, and particularly Egypt, feel themselves ready for a "Soviet-Israeli" settlement. Since the Six-Day War, President Nasser declared in a widely publicized speech at the University of Cairo, that the Chinese had "cut the arms we lost ... free of charge."

Obviously, the Soviets are taking every advantage of Arab belligerency, and doing all that they can to keep hard power alive. At no other time in history has a defeated power refused to talk with the victor in a war, the victor being the victor and not the aggressor. The Soviets can afford this intransigent position only because their backers in the U.S.S.R. made it possible.

In any event, the civilians in the Middle East are paying a high price for the continued presence of Soviet troops in the Middle East. They have established bases at such places as Alexandria. Obviously, they plan to replace the British Navy as a force in the Suez.

Many of the present trends and developments have a direct bearing upon the future of the United States. As noted elsewhere in this issue of Prevent World War III, even the official Arab Information Center maps distributed in New York and at the United Nations continue to refer to Israel only as "Israeli occupied territory." To ignore this is to perpetuate the illusion that the Arab states, during the past 20 years constitutes a flagrant disregard for the world community.

There have been overtures from Israel and her neighbors which require adjustment, but the existence of Israel has not been in question in the world's major capitals at any time for more than two decades—and so long as the Arab governments (except perhaps that of Tunisia) continue to adhere to an ideological position, set forth in official capitals has been made much easier by the growing economic development in the area. (We say economically.) For the first time, Russian warships are at the Suez. The Jordanian Ambassador has been established bases in Jordan, for the purpose of preventing commando raids. As a result, these raids have grown into more than daily incidents—and Israel is faced with the necessity of self-defense by mounting counter attacks, as any responsible government would have to do under the same circumstances.

Thus we get a series of escalating events which can only lead, at some future date, to full-scale warfare, unless peace negotiations are entered into promptly. The call for "direct negotiations" between the late belligerents becomes not merely a moral imperative, but a military necessity. If the fragile peace is to be maintained.

The United Nations has all too often neglected to take appropriate action when complaints of illegal guerrilla actions. Peace requires a fair-handed treatment of complaints, even though a USSR veto is apt to prevent any action against Arab commando activities. A statement of the "double standard" prevailing at the U.N.

To make the mixture still more inflammable, the only instilling toward totalitarism in Middle East, as the need to grow. As an added instance, the Israeli government resulting from the July, 1968, coup in the Moslem Republic of South Yemen, and expulsion of the Jesuits, the Boston Pilot (organ of the Archdiocese) noted that Al-Hikma, which is published in Amman, makes the King a prisoner of the terror, so far as Israeli border events are concerned. Indeed, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United Nations has expressly disclaimed any responsibility for policing the border as far as Jordan is concerned, with the purpose of preventing commando raids.

Against this background we must look at the new adversary growing in the number of border incidents, inspired by El Fatah, the PLO and the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine. All of these agencies have shown consistent lack of financial backing, and have all ready access to official Arab radio and press facilities. The three groups have worked out an "agreement" between King Hussein's government in Amman, which makes the King a prisoner of the terror, so far as Israeli border events are concerned, indeed, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United Nations has expressly disclaimed any responsibility for policing the border as far as Jordan is concerned, with the purpose of preventing commando raids. As a result, these raids have grown into more than daily incidents—and Israel is faced with the necessity of self-defense by mounting counter attacks, as any responsible government would have to do under the same circumstances.

Thus we get a series of escalating events which can only lead, at some future date, to full-scale warfare, unless peace negotiations are entered into promptly. The call for "direct negotiations" between the late belligerents becomes not merely a moral imperative, but a military necessity. If the fragile peace is to be maintained.
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To make the mixture still more inflammable, the only instilling toward totalitarism in Middle East, as the need to grow. As an added instance, the Israeli government resulting from the July, 1968, coup in the Moslem Republic of South Yemen, and expulsion of the Jesuits, the Boston Pilot (organ of the Archdiocese) noted that Al-Hikma, which is published in Amman, makes the King a prisoner of the terror, so far as Israeli border events are concerned, indeed, the Jordanian Ambassador to the United Nations has expressly disclaimed any responsibility for policing the border as far as Jordan is concerned, with the purpose of preventing commando raids. As a result, these raids have grown into more than daily incidents—and Israel is faced with the necessity of self-defense by mounting counter attacks, as any responsible government would have to do under the same circumstances.
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the area are being more and more curtailed, as the present turmoil is permitted to continue without a peace settlement.

Moreover, there is the need for border readjustments to ensure the security of each separate country becomes more obvious—especially as to Israel—and at the same time the refugee problem will increase, as delay leads to escalated tenancies.

To all this must be added another major factor: the continuing inability of the Arab governments to find any permanent solution to the problem of the Palestinian refugees.

RESIDENT ATOMIC HAVEN

The continued presence of large numbers of displaced Palestinians, mostly isolated in settlements or camps, and not resettled on land or farms in the area, provides a source of trouble and must be eliminated if any permanent peace is to be established.

President Johnson's Five Points for Peace in the Middle East included the call for "a just policy for the refugees"—and language of about the same kind is found in any set of proposals for dealing with this area.

For nearly 20 years UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees) has provided assistance to a group of people whose numbers have gradually grown to nearly a million and a half—mostly young men. This is the only major group of displaced persons anywhere in the world who have not been resettled in some way, following a long period of years.

The time has come when a good, hard look at the Middle-Eastern refugee question is required.

First, we must start with the understanding that there are really two refugee problems: one is the Middle Eastern problem, in which people were forced to move out of Arab countries (Iraq, Syria, Yemen, Egypt, etc.); and the second is the Palestinian problem, in which the establishment of Israel—now increased to include all of UNRWA's education materials, is engaged in a complete reexamination of textbooks not only in the American Agency but throughout the Arab world to their complete revision. This step is being vigorously fought by the local Arab authorities.

An even more serious problem has been the use of refugee camp facilities as staging areas for guerrilla bands intent upon upsetting any lasting peace effected by UN cease-fire arrangements.

Palestine Liberation Organization units, El Fatah, the PLO's first guerrilla formation, are recruited in large numbers from people inscribed upon UNRWA lists, and trained in new camps near the camps—which means that international relief funds are being used to create and support insurrectionists intent upon blocking the operation of United Nations peacekeeping resolutions, and destroying the possibilities of peace along cease-fire lines.

In his 1966-67 Report, the Commissioner General of UNRWA took cognizance of this complaint and noted that the Arab states had taken encouraging steps for the purpose of making the work of UNRWA as effective as possible; a new refugee education program was proposed, and a Deferred Compensation program established.

Refugee resettlement, which is so long a part of the peace settlement based upon mutual recognition of statehood by the Arab governments and Israel. UNRWA's STRANGE ROLE

Meanwhile, UNRWA has left the education of the Arab children in refugee camps to the local schools. It seems obvious that these young people have been constantly indoctrinated from an anti-Israel point of view. A first-grade reader in Syria, for example, contains the sentences:

"The Jews are enemies of Arabs. Soon we will rescue them from their hated country."

A book for older children indoctrinates its readers:

"Israel exists in the heart of the Arab homeland. Its extermination is vital for the preservation of Arabism."

When refugee education in the Gaza Strip came under Israeli surveillance following the Six Day War, 70 out of 76 textbooks in use there were found to contain similar material, and the Israeli authorities rightly terminated the use of such publications. As a result, UNRWA in many areas now depends upon temporary "teaching notes" produced to serve as substitute textbooks.

It is obvious that UNRWA's influence is growing in the areas in which it is active, in relation to the educational curricula of the local schools, as we have seen in the case of Syria, for example, where: 1967, hostilities.

The numbers of these two categories of refugees—Palestinians, and those of the new Palestinian communities—are increasing at a rate of nearly 20,000 each year, so that the total number of displaced persons in the refractory group is now nearly 20,000.

The Arab states have not been so fortunate in the reception they received in the several Arab countries—in spite of the great tracts of unused arable land available along the Persian Gulf. True, many of the urban Palestinians, and those of the new generations who have received technical training at the hands of UNRWA, have found employment in places like Lebanon, Jordan and Kuwait. As UNRWA reports indicate, however, the hard problem of the agricultural workers still remains—and it is this very problem that the Arab states have taken no steps to solve, as they are more concerned about attracting special contributions to UNRWA for rations diverted to the guerrillas. The fact that UNRWA is not only an agency of the United Nations, but also an instrument of the Arab League, and a kind is the Arab League's international charity.

Any attempts at resettlement—as distinct from internment—must meet insuperable obstacles from political sources contending that such resettlement would admit the Arab states to recognize Israel's right to exist. The Arab states must reduce the impact of the intransigent Arab position, which is that "Israel doesn't exist." It is this same position, even more than thecold war, that is so far as to "accuse" the United Nations of "plotting" to solve the refugee question—thus changing the status quo vis-a-vis Israel.

This is the reason official Washington is so circumspectly involved with the whole question of a peace settlement based upon mutual recog-
THESE ARE THE SOCIETY'S CONVICTIONS

1. The United States is deeply and unavoidably concerned in the future of the Middle East, and has a major responsibility for the peace that is there.

2. We must make up our minds whether we want to act in ways that will promote peace, or in ways that will make war more probable.

3. We must decide now whether we intend to increase Arab intransigence and bellicose intentions, or in ways that will make war more probable.

4. The Soviets did not ask permission of anyone before acting to create a war climate in the Middle East. Why should America, because she fears possible criticism, hold back from actions to promote a climate conducive to peace and security?

5. In Russian propaganda and diplomacy, the United States is painted as the worldwide aggressor, and they proclaim this line very difficult to estimate. No American action will change the propaganda line, so faithfully supported by the present Egyptian government.

6. Soviets on the Middle East on the Soviet’s proposed agenda of disarmament is not a step toward establishing peace. They have proposed auce that their recommendation of the Arabs, and talk of arms limitation based on a one-sided status quo is therefore an indication of bellicose intentions, not of pacific purposes. Nothing can or will change Soviet plans, except the knowledge that Israel can withstand any probable assault by Russia.

7. The bait of peaceful co-existence and negotiations toward controlled disarmament shoula draw us away from reality; the Arabs will postpone their war plans—and think of negotiations—only if they are convinced that Israel is strong enough to beat them again.

8. The more we act to keep Israel strong, the better are the chances for an era of peace to come in the Middle East. Or do we wish to continue chasing the illusion of friendship with Nasser?

9. If Arab states will come to the peace table only when they become finally convinced that the United States will re-arm Israel at the peace level to which the Soviets have armed them.

10. Only by matching the Russian build-up weapon for weapon will the Soviets understand America’s determination to deter or prevent a new war—which would bring with it the risk of engulfing the whole world. Supplying needed new arms to Israel is not a provocation for war, but the only effective guarantee of peace. There is no time to lose.

A STRANGE SET OF PRIORITIES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, along with many other Senators, I am deeply concerned about the strange set of priorities which seem to govern many of our crucial decisions at the national level. I certainly hope that in the age of rapidly developing technology we do not become so hypnotized by the hardware of war and outer space that we forget the fundamental purposes which we, as people who make up the real strength of America.

It is a tragic irony that we are proceeding with an anti-ballistic missile system—a system which will never be used unless the world is plunged into nuclear war and which most scientists tell us will probably not work even then—while at the same time we are cutting back on some of the limited programs we offered recently in an effort to reclaim some of the lost members of our society.

The anti-ballistic missile system that cost about $10 billion in its present form, or $50 to $100 billion if it is expanded into a full-fledged system such as its advocates really want. The figures are: $100,000 on the one hand, or $100,000 millions or 100,000 millions on the other.

Meanwhile, telegrams were sent last week ordering the closing of 57 Job Corps centers all across America, in the hope of saving an amount of money which the Labor Department estimates at $100 million.

In order to save this estimated $100 million, some 17,500 youths who would otherwise receive valuable vocational training along with basic education, medical and dental care, will be sent back to the slums and the depressed rural areas from which they came as volunteers to be converted into productive, taxpaying citizens.

This morning, before announcing the closing of these 57 Job Corps camps, the Secretary of Labor conceded that “one could not say that $100 million was a make or break item.” It certainly is not, at least for the Federal Government, which finds it very difficult to estimate the cost of a new airplane within that range of dollars.

But the kind of long-range education and job training which a deprived youth would have received in a Job Corps camp may well be a “make or break item” in his life.

Has America lost its sense of perspective? What are we really trying to achieve?

Is the development of supersonic airplanes, the landing of a man on the moon, the deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system an end in itself?

What would any of these achievements mean if it was realized at the expense of the deterioration of our society at home? Can we assure you that many, many Americans share this concern over the strange set of priorities which seems to guide our national policy.

In the last few days, a great number of telegrams have been pouring into congressional offices and the White House, protesting the closing of the Job Corps camps.

There are many aspects of the Labor Department’s action which concern people, both in Congress and in the Nation as a whole.

First of all, there is real concern that the Job Corps program as a whole is being adversely weakened, at a time when every available fact seems to indicate that it should be strengthened instead. The reasons which led to the creation of the Job Corps have not changed. We still have thousands of young men and women who have not been properly educated and trained to take their place in modern society. Many of these young people will not make it unless we take them out of their environment, give them concentrated and comprehensive remedial services, and then see it that when they go back into society, they find a place in the labor market, in school or in the armed services. So many thousands of people are saying this is no time to cut back on the Job Corps.

Second, there is understandable concern at the manner in which these cuts were carried out. They were planned by the Department of Labor, which has no legal authority over the Job Corps program as of this date. Congress was not consulted; a program which the Congress established has been greatly altered and a new program is being set up in its place without any legislative action.

Third, those of us who are deeply concerned about the conservation crisis in America are shocked at the almost total abandonment of the conservation camp concept. When he was asked about this at his press conference, the Secretary of Labor said:

"Ours is a manpower objective, not a conservation objective.

But Congress specifically gave the Job Corps a "conservation objective." Can this directive simply be ignored? The law requires that the Secretary of Labor re-arm the Job Corps enrollees be assigned to conservation camps. The Secretary of Labor says that no more than 32 percent will be so assigned under the changes which already have been ordered into effect. Can the Labor Department simply ignore this law—while insisting on strict obedience of the law from the citizenry?

Fourth, there is concern about the manner in which camps were selected to be shut down. On an issue of such great concern as closing 57 Job Corps camps, one would certainly think there would be a full disclosure of the standards to be applied, and an opportunity for consultation and discussion before the camps were ordered to close.

In order to discuss this great national issue of the closing of the Job Corps camps, the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty will hold a special public hearing this Friday, April 18, starting at noon. We will have as our witness Louis Harris, Associate of Louis Harris Associates, New York City, a widely known firm of public opinion. Mr. Harris recently completed the largest survey ever made of Job Corps graduates, their families and their employers, to learn the impact of Job Corps training on these young people.

In addition, we have invited the director of the Job Corps, Mr. William Kelly, to testify. We will hear from some of the conservation organizations, which are deeply concerned at what appears to be the scaling-down of the conservation camp program, and from the National Congress of American Indians, which is deeply concerned at the wholesale closing of Job Corps camps which have served Indian youth in the past.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Recess a number of documents relating to the closing of the Job Corps camps.
MR. PRESIDENT:

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.
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The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.

WOMEN IN COMMUNITY SERVICE, INC.

The President, The White House, Washington, D.C.

The purpose of the Job Corps program is to give young people a second chance to become productive members of American society. We, therefore, feel strongly that the Job Corps program should continue and that adequate consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Job Corps Conservation Centers, we suggest that centers be selected for curtailment on a sound basis after investigations of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. Hutchenson, General President.
GLOIRE, ARIZ., April 11, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Opposed to closing Job Corp, San Carlos, Arizona.

RICHARD A. MACIAS, ELYNDA A. MACIAS, ANGELA GUTIERREZ.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 11, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Four years close association with Job Corps program convinces us of its value to our entire Nation and to disadvantaged young men and women. Your determined efforts to maintain the services and potential of Job Corps. I'll support you all the way.

Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Planagan.

MILWAUKEE, WIS., April 12, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We urge continued support of Job Corps program. Personal volunteer experience with vocational centers, six women's centers and two large camps for young men, thereby gradually reducing the Job Corps to half its present enrollment of 738,000 and saving $100-million. But the point is to save lives, not dollars. It is not clear that the Nixon Administration has correctly asked, or otherwise.

Mr. and Mrs. Bruce Walters.

GREATERT DALLAS SECTION, NATIONAL COUNCIL OF JEWISH WOMEN, Dallas, Tex., April 12, 1969.

Senator GAYLORD NELSON, Chairman, Senate Committee on Employment and Manpower, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

We urge that the concept of the Job Corps center as it was originally conceived be retained. Fragmentation with vocational training only and no cultural enrichment will not break the poverty cycle. As members of WJC's national membership of many hundreds of thousands of women we urgently request that you do everything in your power to keep the Job Corps centers open.

Mrs. Sanford Fagin,

President.

Mrs. Morris Newberger, Vice President.

GLOIRE, ARIZ., April 12, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Opposed to closing Job Corps Center at San Carlos, Arizona. Benefits of this center to underprivileged youth of our country, employment of people from our community by this center and economic increase in the community far outweigh reason for closing center.

Dr. C. A. Bejarano.

WHITEFISH BAY, WIS., April 11, 1969.

HON. GAYLORD A. NELSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

I am interested in retaining the concept of the Job Corps as it is presently.

Mrs. Charles W. Pegasky.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND., April 11, 1969.

GAYLORD NELSON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

Urge sustaining Job Corps program. Have personal knowledge of the vitality and need locally.

Bertha Lichstenstein.

STUDENT TAKEOVER AT HARVARD IS INTOLEARABLE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the Students for a Democratic Society has proved again with the Harvard takeover that it is in fact Students for a Destructive Society.

The attempt by a small group of students to destroy the American system of higher education has gone beyond the bounds of tolerance when probably our Nation's most distinguished center of learning can be brought to a standstill by the mere thought of closure. It is serious when any university is threatened by those who have nothing but disruption on their minds, but the real danger to our free academic tradition is brought home full force when the target is Harvard.

If any institution in this country has worked hard to foster the liberal academic heritages our academic community holds dear, it is at Cambridge. The un­provoked, disrupting, and totally unwarranted revolt by a small group of anarchists cannot be allowed to threaten this model of enlightened learning.

As the Washington Post commented editorially today:

It may be that a majority of the students at Harvard would like to get what education they can from the University without having to destroy the institution or to make it over in conformity with the blueprints of the New Left.

Mr. President, one of the most responsible voices being heard through the tumult at Harvard is that of Franklin L. Ford, dean of the faculty of arts and sciences at the university.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a statement issued by Dean Ford and published in the New York Times on Saturday be printed in the Record.

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

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1969]

EXCERPTS FROM DEAN FORD'S STATEMENT AT HARVARD

[From a statement today by Franklin L. Ford, dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University in Cambridge, Mass., April 11, 1969]

As everybody knows by now, University Hall was occupied beginning shortly after noon on Wednesday. The degree of premeditation was indicated by the fact that the intruders had chains for securing the doors, crowbars for smashing windows if necessary, and they also had a large supply of apparently incendiary material.

So far as the decision to clear the building is concerned, I should make clear that continuous involvement centers on the thought that conclusion felt sadness and dread at the thought of the use of police within Harvard Yard. However, I remain convinced that, all things considered, there was no real alternative.

Many members of the Harvard community—perhaps a majority at present—do not share that conviction. But I should like to explain the considerations which finally determined the move in the hope that they will all be carefully considered by everyone arguing about it.

First, let it be kept in mind that a physically repugnant and intellectually indefensible seizure had occurred. It is not possible...
to discuss this issue without beginning with that event.

Specifically, the University Hall is not just another building, one which could be left occupied and isolated while instruction and research continue elsewhere.

Time Held A Factor

In University Hall there are confidential, personal files of all members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, complete financial records and current operating accounts of the faculty, the personal folders of all members of the freshman class, and a variety of other materials which are either confidential or necessary for the functioning of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, or both.

The events in the room containing the financial records was broken down by the intruders within hours of the occupation is an indication that time was necessary for accomplishing danger.

The people of Texas realize that the pollution in the air over New York City and Los Angeles will be duplicated in Dallas if they do not act now. I am encouraged to note that Texans are working to preserve the clean skies which are their heritage.

So that all Texans are aware of the present air pollution problems in Texas and the steps being taken to solve them, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "The Control of Air Pollution in Texas," written by Mr. Otto Paganini, be printed in the Record. The article is an excellent survey of the air pollution situation in Texas, I believe we will all find it interesting. There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROL OF AIR POLLUTION IN TEXAS

(By Otto Paganini, P.E.* )

The air is a natural resource and a product of the atmosphere; they have polluted the air through the operation of motor vehicles and other forms of transportation, which emit upward of 85 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere each year; with other community activities they have contributed thousands of million tons of pollutants to the air, which include the carbon dioxide, which mounts to million of tons.

We are not altogether to blame, because it exists only as the result of the demand for its products or services by the people who live like many others where the line of the air and water depends upon the demands made by the citizens. When they demand a wholesome atmosphere, however, they must pay the cost, because it is included in the price of the commodity they purchase, whether it be a material object or a service. Again this demand for clean air must come from the citizens, when man relinquishes any portion of his prized freedom. We must then face the other air-pollution problem.

In this case reasonably clean air was achieved by the creation of an air-pollution problem: a source of emission of a pollutant, a transporting medium, and a receptor. The source of the pollutant is the emission of the combustion process, smoke from the backyard burning of trash, noxious and innocuous dust or smoke from the many processes and industries, and municipal operations, gas from motor vehicle, truck, or other transportation conveyances, and air-plant life, and physical objects such as painted, metallic, glass, and plastic surfaces.

The laws concerning air pollution are fair: they apply equally to all; they are the result of the desire of all to secure a decent pattern of existence. Man, as an organism, must live and maintain himself in his environment for survival. Civilized man, in his desire to make his work easier and each day more pleasant, has developed so many means for accomplishing this end. Along with his achievements he has created a great deal of waste and, perhaps, may have destroyed more than he has created. The American Indian early complained of this propensity of white men when he observed the destruction of his people and his food supply, the buffalo, by the early American settlers.

The Problems

Since the industrial revolution in the late 1800's the citizens of this country and others have been creating so much waste (presently an estimated 100 pounds per day or solid waste alone) that we have polluted many of our streams, rivers, lakes, and—most perilously—our living environment of air that surrounds us. Although efforts were made to prevent pollutant, most air-pollution control was very feeble until the late 1940's, when the County of Los Angeles, California, brought it to the attention of the citizens of this country by creating the first air-pollution control district in that state, and in the country. It had been found that not only industry, but all the activities of the common man, thus all air-pollutants into the community atmosphere.

The citizens of this country, in their desire to go about their regular business, have unfortunately in a sense destroyed some 1.7 million acres of land* in laying out and building of an Interstate Highway System; to raise more food production, they have opened many acres of land, a condition which in turn permits erosion of the soil by wind and water; and in Dallas and other cities, they have polluted the air through the operation of motor vehicles and other forms of transportation, which emit upward of 85 million tons of pollutants into the atmosphere each year; with other community activities they have contributed thousands of million tons of pollutants to the air, which include the carbon dioxide, which mounts to millions of tons.


Based on the planned 41,000 miles of Interstate Highway System with 300-foot right-of-way which will allow for interchange and parks.


The 59th Texas Legislature, Regular Session, passed the Clean Air Act of Texas, 1965 C.B. S. 487-4; the 60th Legislature, Regular Session approved.
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lar Session, made additions, deletions, and changes to the Act (V.C.S. 4477-5). The Act provides that the Board, with powers to prepare and develop a general plan for the proper conservation of the air and to promulgate and adopt rules and regulations to prevent and reduce undesirable levels of air pollutants as permitted under the Act. The Board also has the authority to hold hearings, to subpoena witnesses and the production of papers and documents, and to take testimony. The Board may enter into agreements with the Texas Department of Health. It is the sole authority in the state in the setting of air-quality criteria, and in determining levels of air pollutants; it can enter orders or determinations as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act; it may utilize the services of other state agencies in carrying out the purposes of the Act; and it may hire outside persons when necessary to assist in making such orders and determinations.

The Clean Air Act of Texas further allows for an executive secretary who shall act as the administrator of the Board in carrying out its orders and in the conduct of the business of the Board. He shall be an employee of the Department of Environmental Health. The Texas State Department of Health shall provide the basic personnel and necessary support services. Other federal agencies as well as the Texas Radiation Control Agency, and problems pertaining to the control of indoor air pollution are not covered by this Act.

The Act permits a local government as defined by the Texas government to adopt rules and regulations which may be required to carry out the provisions of the Act. In addition, the Department acts necessary laboratory and other facilities as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act or rules or orders of the Board, the local government or any other governmental entity.

In connection with the hearing, Mr. Wimberly of your Subcommittee on Agriculture and Related Agencies, has presented the Texas Air Pollution Control, Department of Health, dated April 20, 1966, and signed by David F. Fugh, M.D., Diplomate in Public Health, Associate Fellow, American Academy of American College of Biology, to whom this fact: "To Whom It May Concern: This is to confirm in writing the conversation, which I had on April 18, 1966, with Mr. Wimberly of your Department concerning the extremely harmful effects produced particularly against Children with asthma by cotton gins in our area. I see patients from all over West Texas, especially in Odessa, San Angelo, Amarillo, Clovis, New Mexico, and Odessa, and as far south as Pecos and Pors Stockton. It would be easy to go through the files and find literally dozens of cases that are easily controlled with minimum amounts of medication and regular hospitalization. Such injections as poliomyelitis patients have simply an asthma attack. It is impossible to put into an injection or to produce a condition that is not an extremely irritating effects of lint, dust, and smoke from cotton gins. Anything which can be done to keep these emissions down is important because of the health problems that this source will be of real service to the asthmatics in this area. I would be happy to work with you in any way in furthering this objective."

The 60th Legislature, when it revised the Clean Air Act of Texas 1965, included Section 1501, which states: "The board shall establish its rules and regulations concerning the emission of particulate matter from plants processing agricultural products in their natural state according to a formula derived from the process weight of material of each kind. The board may not require its rules and regulations that such plants meet a standard that will results in a dust emission of more than eight percent of the process weight of the material entering the process."

Examples of Industries that process agricultural products in their natural state are cotton gins, rice dryers, and grain elevators, where these grains are dried and stored. Most plants processing grain after harvest are in their natural state can within this requirement without providing any type of treatment or control once water is from the conveying air stream. Studies made around these plants have shown that emissions from plants of this type exceed particulate-matter limits set by the Board in Regulation 1, governing the Texas Air Control Program of the Division of Occupational Health and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services, Texas State Department of Health. MAJOR SOURCES OF POLLUTANTS Cotton gins In recent years one of the major contributors of pollutants to the community atmosphere has been cotton gins. This situation has resulted from the changes made in the method of harvesting seed cotton. No longer is just the lint with its seed separated from the stalk. The gin, in the past, picked the cotton in a time consuming and straight piloting. Now, because most of the seed cotton that is harvested is either machine or hand picked and does not have the seed removed from the stalk, the gin, in order to produce a 500-pound bale of marketable staple cotton free of trash, must remove anywhere from 50 to more than 3,000 pounds of trash and dirt from the seed cotton before and after separation of the seed from the lint. This necessity results in the emission of dust, lint fly, and parts of the stalk, leaves, and bolls, some of which may contain residues of chemical pesticides. Most gins are located in rural communities and towns. Some, however, are located in large urban areas.

The Texas Air Control Board, in cooperation with the Department of Environmental Health, has cooperated very closely with the Texas Air Pollution Control, in obtaining the necessary laboratory and other facilities as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act or rules or orders of the Board, the local government or any other governmental entity. The Board's rules and regulations may not require in its rules and regulations that such plants meet a standard that will results in a dust emission of more than eight percent of the process weight of the material entering the process."

The Board is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act; it may utilize the services of other state agencies in carrying out the purposes of the Act; and it may hire outside persons when necessary to assist in making such orders and determinations. The Texas Radiation Control Agency, and problems pertaining to the control of indoor air pollution are not covered by this Act.
that many cotton gins, some rice dryers, and many grain elevators have installed primary-type dust and/or lint-trapping devices to reduce such emissions.

**Smelters**

Smelters in the state include those that produce aluminum, copper, ferromanganese, ferroalloys, and iron. With the exception of several secondary aluminum and lead smelters, most Texas smelters are primary producers of these metals. Emissions which result from these smelter operations are chlorine, ferromanganese, ferroalloys, fluorides, sulfur compounds, and some metals. In the case of sulfur compounds, a process in which fluoride compounds are used as a fluxing agent, the reduction plants have incorporated recovery systems to prevent undue emissions of this material. As previously noted, one copper-lead smelter utilizes bag filters for recovering lead fumes to prevent their loss to the community atmosphere: the sulfur compounds, however, are emitted to the atmosphere under controlled by scrubbers of tall stacks for dispersion of the sulfur oxides into the atmosphere at heights that are less liable to create nuisance conditions.

When meteorological conditions are not favorable for good dispersion of the sulfur compounds the operations are reduced until weather conditions become favorable for such dispersion at the heights provided. In the zinc smelters tall stacks are utilized to disperse the sulfur fumes, and in the case of incinerating and smelting of the zinc ore concentrate. The tin smelter utilizes a rotating process to retain the tin in the crucible.

Settling chambers and electrostatic precipitators are employed to entrap the arsenic that sublimes from the ore concentrates before the material is charged to the furnaces. When meteorological conditions are favorable for complete destruction of the hydrocarbons, the coke production, a by-product, is used at both plants. Both plants are in the process of providing facilities to prevent emissions of iron-oxide fumes and carbon monoxide in the steel-making operation. In the process which produces the by-product coke, hydrocarbon-recovery units are used, but because of the coke-oven doors and other leakage points, the coke-queenchning operations still emit some undesirable quantities of smoke and acid gases.

In the Texas secondary lead smelters, the electric furnaces to produce the steel and pig iron from the raw charge. The sidestreams from these furnaces are exhausted into the community atmosphere. Only two of these plants presently prevent these emissions.

**Petroleum refining**

Petroleum refining, an important industry in the state, in years past was a major source of hydrocarbons, smoke, and the sulfur-combined-sulfur dioxide and oxides of sulfur. More recently, however, much has been done by this industry to abate the incineration of hydrocarbon gases. The presence of these hydrocarbons in the atmosphere is out. These smokeless units, or incinerators emits numerous pollutants. In addition, the operation of our motor-vehicle transportation units and the maintenance of poor general sanitation cause the emission of unburned hydrocarbons, noxious and innoxious gases, and dust into our community atmosphere. These pollutants result from poorly maintained and adjusted internal-combustion engines used in our motor vehicles and from the operation of industrial plants, rubber, soil, and other particulates that are permitted to accumulate on our streets. The installation of smokestacks, understructure, in combination with good street sanitation, can minimize these emissions.

**Municipal activities**

The everyday operations of all our municipal units contribute pollutants to our respective community atmospheres in many ways. The burning of refuse at public disposal sites, the burning of backyards, and sewage treatment plants are just a few. The incineration of garbage, rubber, soil, and other particulates that are permitted to accumulate on our streets. The installation of smokestacks, understructure, in combination with good street sanitation, can minimize these emissions.

Many of our municipalities, through the efforts and encouragement of local health and sanitation and street departments and the Environmental Development Program, Environmental Health Services Section, Texas State Department of Health, have done much to abate emission of this type. This improvement has been welcomed by these agencies before city councils and mayors to encourage the institution of collection services, the conversion of burning open dumps into sanitary landfills or their replacement by the use of proper types of incinerators. The burning of refuse will prevent emissions of smoke and acid gases and, along with regular street-cleaning services, can make a contribution, a number of cities have passed ordinances which prohibit the burning of solid waste within their areas of jurisdiction.

**Agricultural operations**

Agricultural operations create air-pollution problems by cultivation of the soil in fields denuded of vegetation coverage. In such situations the soil becomes arid by wind erosion, especially in the High Plains.
area and the arid regions of West Texas. The Extension Service and the Plants Sciences Departments, Texas A & M, are working in some areas to prevent this wind erosion. The planting of various crops in close succession, to provide nearly continuous protection against wind erosion, is one method that is being employed to counteract this wind erosion. Another is the selection of the best crop for the various areas to cut down losses of soil by wind action.

Carbon black
Smoke emissions result from the improper combustion of fuels and waste organic materials, such as coal and spent coke. Carbon-black manufacturing industry, because of the nature of its process, emits considerable carbon particulate matter along with smoke. Smoke is also emitted with the furnace-oil and gas and thermal-type carbon-black manufacturing methods, except that, with proper trapping devices, such as bag filters, carbon black produced by these methods emits little or no black. In this state one must not willfully emit smoke from any operation in excess of the amount allowed by Regulation II, Air Control Board, whose duties it is to protect the air resources of Texas may do so by promulgation and passage of rules and regulations to protect these air resources. The Board has been quite active and has promulgated and passed regulations to control the emission of particulates, smoke, sulfur compounds, and motor-vehicle exhaust. The Board, through its executive secretary, and with the staff of the Air Control Program, Di-Lo, Occupied-Properties, and Radiation Control, Environmental Health Services Section, Texas State Department of Health, has been most instrumental in obtaining con-ditions by persuasion, education, and cooperation of those who are not in compliance with the rules and regulations passed by the Board.

Several cases filed against violators of these rules, however, show means failed have resulted in settlements out of court with payment of fines and issuance of court orders in which the offenders agreed to abate the nuisance.

Some areas of the state present special problems because of their emissions of pol- lutants into the atmosphere. A number of these are of the point-source, or single-source type. In Houston and El Paso, for example, the conditions do combine at certain times to create conditions which cause smaze or undue pollutant loadings to occur. These situa-tions are offensive to some persons living in these areas. In addition, smaze conditions have been noted in the Dallas and Fort Worth areas as well. Local air pollution control programs, as well as state programs directed by the Texas Air Control Board, are maintaining a high standard of work- ing together to achieve clean air in areas where emissions of pollutants are problems. It is our hope that all of these programs are working to prevent further pollution of the atmosphere and to conserve the air resources in those areas where emission of pollutants does not occur or is of little consequence at this time.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION SERVICE IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, an article published recently in the Washington Post focuses on the excellent initial achievements made by the Cooperative Extension Service program administered by America’s only totally urban land-grant college, Federal City College.

Throughout the 99th Congress I urged that the benefits of the Cooperative Extension Service—USDA—long familiar in rural areas in the form of 4-H programs, be adapted to the urban environment. What is needed is for at least 10 Americans now reside. I have, in fact, previously introduced proposed legislation to provide for the establishment of such a center at a District of Columbia institution of higher education. Consequently, I am very pleased to see this legislation from the reported success of Federal City College’s initial cooperative extension work.

Mr. President, many Senators having origins in the countryside know firsthand the help of the Cooperative Extension Service efforts make in youth development. I have contended that as our population moves from the country to the city, extension work—especially in its youth development and home economics aspects—should do the same. The early achievements of the Cooperative Extension Service program administered by the Federal City College indicate the soundness of that judgment, and I look forward to increased Cooperative Extension Service efforts in other urban centers.

I ask unanimous consent that the article written by Elizabeth Shelton, be printed in the Record.

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

COUNTRY-STYLE NUTRITION IN THE CITY
(By Elizabeth Shelton)

The Nation’s only totally urban land grant college, Federal City College, is copying its countryside successes in the homemaking and 4-H programs to District of Columbia.

The Cooperative Extension Service program was described yesterday by the College’s Associate Vice President, Dr. H. Lippeatt, who said trained nutrition aides are helping Far Northeast and Model Cities area housewives to try healthier meals.

In some cases, the aides, who are residents of the areas served, have become “emotionally disturbed” by conditions of malnutrition, approaching starvation, in homes they have visited. Dr. Lippeatt added.

A group of 12 of the aides, trained intensively by the Federal City College, were sent out to rap on doors, is working in the Northeast area. Another 15 recently began canvassing the redevelopment area bounded by Massachusetts and Florida aves., 15th st., nw, and Bladensburg rd., ne.

Dr. Lippeatt estimates the 37 nutrition aides will be able to reach 1800 families with five or more members by June 30.

The aides have not had “100 per cent success,” but “the snow time the district of ‘the day,’” Dr. Lippeatt conceded, but, she said, there has been a great deal of interest in “better buying.” She added, “we have found almost all families are open to the idea. They are willing to buy the fresh fruits and vegetables, they are even willing to pay a little more.”

A homemaker who has been using raw milk is so pleased she can get twice as much for her money by using dried whole milk in her cooking and disgusting it with flavors when using.

In poor families where obesity, due to cheap fatty meats and a predominance of sugary drinks, are problems, they are being encour-aged to substitute dried skim milk. The nutrition aides also discourage sugary fruit drinks made with powder and faltering but nutritious orange and fruit juices. Dr. Lippeatt explained. When hunger in the District was last surveyed, she added, “the amount of milk in diets of young children was very high on the list of inadequacies. The aides visiting their neighbors wear name tags and hand out brochures reading, ‘I am a Cooperative Extension Service Aide. I work with Federal City College. These are
the kinds of things I can help you to do. 
"The services offered are illustrated by pictures.

On Service's youth development program, Dr. Lippeat said it is expected between 1000 and 1500 young people will be working with youth growth programs by the end of June. "This is only the beginning, the first stage," she said.

Dr. Lippeat, whose offices are at 815 Mt. Vernon pl. nw., is a former dean of the Home Economics Department of the University of Maryland and a former deputy to the Director of the Women's Job Corps.

HUMAN EVENTS RECEIVES 25TH ANNIVERSARY COMMENDATIONS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, 25 years ago, in Washington, a small group of knowledgeable and patriotic Americans joined in starting a new medium of communication from our National Capital, which at that time was a weekly newsletter called Human Events. It was printed on a four-page folio. This efort to bring to serious-minded Americans some of the great issues of the day with reports of new developments in our National Capital struck a responsive chord in this country, and the infant enterprise developed with unbelievable rapidity.

Some years later, the format of Human Events was changed from that of the usual newsletter to that of a magazine. It has continued to grow and prosper in this new format and Human Events is now firmly established as one of our country's important and widely read media, emphasizing the achievements of good government and the challenges confronting its preservation as viewed primarily, from the standpoint of those devoted to constitutional conservatism. On the occasion of its 25th anniversary, Human Events published a special birthday edition which included expressions of commendation, congratulations, and other sentiments from a well-known and highly regarded American readers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record pages 39 through 44 of the April 12 "birthday edition" of Human Events. These sentiments, and perhaps all American readers of this country may generally read these expressions of high regard for one of America's most lively and factual weekly magazines.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greetings on Human Events' 25th Anniversary

Holmes Alexander, Author and Syndicated Columnist—"I want to congratulate Human Events on its 25th Anniversary. No other publication has been so constant in its duty to bring facts and viewpoints to the American readership. Human Events has been resilient in times of crisis and has persevered in times that called for revaluation of news representation. It has been inflexible only on fundamentally important matters that weigh on the republic and the form of government which our country was founded upon."

Tom Anderson, President, Southern Farm Public Relations Association—"It is apt to say that Human Events has been one of my favorites. It is newsworthy, factual and educational. The writing style of the editors, that is, critical, knowledgeable and patriotic Americans. The editorial line is entertaining and highly readable. Sadly, that cannot be said of many so-called conservative publications. Human Events deserves its recognition as one who believes in God, family, country and freedom."

Dr. Edward B. Annis, Past President, American Medical Association—"The national liberal communications media are determined to present a distorted, fragmentary, and often deliberately misleading interpretation of current events under the rubric Human Events—and they are all too present—on the other side of the story, and the whole story, for every story is hers from a necessarily broad perspective."

Rep. Leslie G. Arends (R-III)—"I should like to extend my congratulations to this publication which has been great value over the years in presenting a point of view that so often has gone unexpressed in other media of communication. I have been a regular reader of Human Events and to say the least, it has regularly presented the important facts that often escape notice."

Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), Chairman American Conservative Union—"The resurgence of conservatism in our country during the past 25 years is in no small part, to the faithful reporting of Human Events and we can never thank them enough. Human Events, a beacon light in the fog of managed news which has been foisted on the American people by the liberal press."

Kenneth G. Bentson, Dr. Geo. S. Benson, Dr. Lippeat, whose offices are at 815 Mt. Vernon pl. nw., are a former dean of the Home Economics Department of the University of Maryland and a former deputy to the Director of the Women's Job Corps.
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Some years later, the format of Human Events was changed from that of the usual newsletter to that of a magazine. It has continued to grow and prosper in this new format and Human Events is now firmly established as one of our country's important and widely read media, emphasizing the achievements of good government and the challenges confronting its preservation as viewed primarily, from the standpoint of those devoted to constitutional conservatism. On the occasion of its 25th anniversary, Human Events published a special birthday edition which included expressions of commendation, congratulations, and other sentiments from a well-known and highly regarded American readers. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record pages 39 through 44 of the April 12 "birthday edition" of Human Events. These sentiments, and perhaps all American readers of this country may generally read these expressions of high regard for one of America's most lively and factual weekly magazines.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greetings on Human Events' 25th Anniversary

Holmes Alexander, Author and Syndicated Columnist—"I want to congratulate Human Events on its 25th Anniversary. No other publication has been so constant in its duty to bring facts and viewpoints to the American readership. Human Events has been resilient in times of crisis and has persevered in times that called for revaluation of news representation. It has been inflexible only on fundamentally important matters that weigh on the republic and the form of government which our country was founded upon."

Tom Anderson, President, Southern Farm Public Relations Association—"It is apt to say that Human Events has been one of my favorites. It is newsworthy, factual and educational. The writing style of the editors, that is, critical, knowledgeable and patriotic Americans. The editorial line is entertaining and highly readable. Sadly, that cannot be said of many so-called conservative publications. Human Events deserves its recognition as one who believes in God, family, country and freedom."

Dr. Edward B. Annis, Past President, American Medical Association—"The national liberal communications media are determined to present a distorted, fragmentary, and often deliberately misleading interpretation of current events under the rubric Human Events—and they are all too present—on the other side of the story, and the whole story, for every story is hers from a necessarily broad perspective."

Rep. Leslie G. Arends (R-III)—"I should like to extend my congratulations to this publication which has been great value over the years in presenting a point of view that so often has gone unexpressed in other media of communication. I have been a regular reader of Human Events and to say the least, it has regularly presented the important facts that often escape notice."

Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R-Ohio), Chairman American Conservative Union—"The resurgence of conservatism in our country during the past 25 years is in no small part, to the faithful reporting of Human Events and we can never thank them enough. Human Events, a beacon light in the fog of managed news which has been foisted on the American people by the liberal press."

Kenneth G. Bentson, Dr. Geo. S. Benson, Dr. Lippeat, whose offices are at 815 Mt. Vernon pl. nw., are a former dean of the Home Economics Department of the University of Maryland and a former deputy to the Director of the Women's Job Corps.
publications, continue to expound the conservative doctrine, to provide a forum for some of the best of conservative writing and thinking in the United States. It is a lighthouse around¬four pages of informed analysis and a challenging expression of liberal-conservative conflict in Washington and in exposing the heavy-handedness of every opposition organ becomes more and more needed. To obtain any kind of balanced picture, it is essential that you have to get the truth in the current news."

"Congratulations on your 25th Anniversary! Human Events has rendered a great service by staunchly defending free government and constantly reminding the people of the venerable ideals of the Constitution. My best wishes for your continued success!"

"The Department of Economics, Georgetown University—On its 25th Anniversary Human Events deserves the greeting of a good American citizen and its courageous reporting of news, events and interpretations that ordinarily cannot be found in most periodicals and newspapers. It fully represents what Jefferson meant: 'When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe.'"

"UPDATE: Assistant to Senator Mitchell, and Assistant to the President, I have found Human Events to be an indispensable source of information on the conservative movement and it has furnished an avid reader of Human Events, a complete source of such a publication. Since the conservative point of view has so few advocates, Human Events' role in the preservation of the Constitution. My best wishes for your successful publication now.
sion which is either eliminated or sub-
moltered by general news media.

John M. Fisher, President, American Se-
curity Council—"I have found that Human Events has been an excellent instru-
ment affecting our national security and re-
sponsible and articulate in expressing its opinions, and an important forum for the
discussion of our problems.

Frank Fick, President, Flick-Ready, Corp.—"Whether we are losing the battle and are
holding the line, or reversing the tide of false
 teaching, Human Events will go down in his-
tory as an important force in showing things in
tireless and encouraging manner.

Rep. Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.)—"Con-
servatism needs more than routine exposition
of conservative positions. What the country needs is to be understood, it needs enlightened
interpretation. That is what Human Events has
been providing for a quarter of a century—a
service most beneficial in this world of sharp-
tly contending political philosophies. It there-
fore gives me pleasure to pay tribute to the
editors and staff of Human Events in this
25th Anniversary Issue.

Res. Rep. (R-N.M.)—"Human Events
is one of my favorite publications. Consistently—it is objective in its reporting,
correct in its analysis—it remains a most im-
portant source of background information.
The weary of liberal rhetoric, Human Events
offers—as it has for the last 25 years—a clear,
reassuring, informed interpretation of events.

Patrick F. Frawley Jr., Chairman, Schick
Safety Razor Co.—"Human Events is 'must
reading.' It has given a real value to me as a
student of the American way. The subject of
this development in the Conservative point of
view in a manner which is completely responsible and ethical. By so doing, it helps to make the
true conservative position clear to the public.

Sen. Edward J. Gurney (R-Fla.)—"Ever
since Human Events was founded it has been
a valuable source of information for the
Conservative community. In my own case, it
has saved my staff and myself of tedious
research and helped to keep us informed on
the thinking in this country. Many of us
read Human Events as a guide and use it to sup-
plement our own knowledge. I hope the editors continue to publish this fine
newspaper, and in doing so, continue to
help give the Conservative community a
voice in this country, by helping to balance the information on
which national policy is based. I wish you
success in the years to come.

Rep. Charles W. Van Zandt (R-Tex.)—"Human Events has served as an effective voice in
combating and answering the privileged
liberal dogma. It has also served as a thought-
ful and constructive exponent of the conser-
ervative cause."

Sen. Clifford P. Hansen (R-Wyo.)—"Let
me extend my congratulations to the editors
and staff of Human Events for articulating a valid point of view that all too often would be not adequately
covered elsewhere. I can assure you that
there are many of us who appreciate the efforts that you have made in the past and look forward to
your continued efforts in the future.

Walter Harnischfeger, Chairman, Hornsch-
Fecher Corp.—"I was well acquainted with Mr.
Haugheon who founded this publication. It
is one of the most outstanding publications which is consistently writing articles on economic and
political conditions and expressing the truth.

It has always been a strong and consistent
forerunner in informing the public on the
true, the real. Professional, political, economic and world affairs. In doing so, it has
been the yardstick by which many others
have been measured. I am delighted to see
this publication continuing to gain in popu-
larity year by year.

Henry Hazlitt, Author and Economist—
"If Human Events did not exist, I for one
would very much like to see a much
more disinterested one. Human Events has
been of great value to me in my
work, in my studies, and in my writing. It
has been an excellent source of information
and I have found that it has given me a
real value to me as a
student of the American way. The subject of
this development in the Conservative point of
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against the follies of the mass-age; but the editors of Human Events cheerfully take arms against our sea of troubles."

"To Jeff's Berry Farm—"Congratulations to Human Events on its 25th Anniversary. It has been my pleasure to watch your growth, for it is an interesting, enlightening and courageous; and may you continue to provide such articles for your readership."

Elbridge C. Spalding, Syndicated Columnist, President, Americans for Constitutional Action—"Ours is an age when restless extinction is the norm. Where the news media are floundering in a fog of emotional irrelevance. Our people are oppressed and unenlightened. To the leaders of Human Events brings clear vision and sound analysis. On my lecture tours, I have been told repeatedly by concerned citizens, they didn't know what was happening in this country until a friend gave me a subscription to Human Events. I rejoice in this 25th birthday of Human Events and in its growing acceptance by our people. Where Human Events goes, light is shed."

Victor Lasky, Author and Syndicated Columnist—"I am a subscriber to Human Events from the day it was founded and an occasional contributor. Through the years as a member of the family that I want to congratulate not only the newspaper, but curator. It is now, and has been, the key of the predominantly liberal editorials presented by the majority of the news media."

T. Edward Barrett, Editor, Circle—"Human Events is by far the finest publication in its field. It is required reading, in times of national disaster. I read it every week and would never be without it."

Eugene Lyons, Author and former Senior Editor, The Reader's Digest—"I have been a subscriber to Human Events from the day it was founded and an occasional contributor. Through the years as a member of the family that I want to congratulate not only the newspaper, but curator. It is now, and has been, the key of the predominantly liberal editorials presented by the majority of the news media."

J. Daniel Mahoney, State Chairman, Conservative Party of New York—"Human Events has been a tremendous source of information, caused and journalistic leadership to the entire conservative community. The growth of the conservative movement in the last 25 years is all part of the inspiration and guidance which Human Events has provided over the past 25 years. Not only has Human Events been in the forefront of day-to-day political developments, it has also played a key role in shaping the thinking of the conservative leaders who are now at the forefront of the American conservative movement. All of us owe a great debt of gratitude to Human Events for its tire work over the years."

Clarence Manion, former Dean, Notre Dame Law School—"I can hardly believe that Human Events has been in existence for only 25 years. It seems to me that the solid Conservative convictions that it helped me to form are much older than that. But I am sure of one thing. Human Events now, as in the past 25 years, is our champion who more than ever before them to 'go along with the crowd,' butter-up politicians and bureaucrats, and let 'expedience' cause them to let down their standards."

Nell McCaffrey, President, Conservative Book Club—"I have been following the political trends over the past quarter-century that has been so consistently reliable, accurate, perceptive and courageous as Human Events. Without Human Events, many conservatives would have been flying blind and would have never been heard. My one regret is that it took most of these 25 years for this valuable weekly to do what it hopes to reach the 200,000,000 much faster. That will be a sign that our country has turned the corner."

Charles A. McManus, Executive Director, Americans for Constitutional Action—"For 25 years Human Events has consistently been in the forefront of the crusade to provide accurate and comprehensive political management and its courage in world affairs, Human Events gives heart and direction to those who face the problems confronting our nation every day that I have subscribed for many of my friends."
Edgar Ainsel Mowrer, Author and Syndicated Columnist—"During the quarter-century of its existence, Human Events has kept the torch of freedom burning, notably at times when those who are over-optimistic, have sought to replace it by a torch of peace. This is a great achievement."

"In the course of 25 Item, I have found it to be a background analysis of the forces at play within and without America shaping form and direction of the growth of the under-the-table dealings designed to siphon away tax dollars from legitimate use, or a simple barf defiling the pomposity of some powerful influence. In short, Human Events has been a forceful voice for national liberty and individual freedom. No one who cares about the future of our country, or the future of the world, should doubt that Human Events will continue to shape and influence the growth of the forces of freedom."

This is the 25th Anniversary of Human Events. We are proud of the fact that this is the 25th Anniversary of Human Events, because we know that Human Events is one of the most informative publications in the United States. It has helped to shape the public's thinking and to direct it in the right direction. We are proud of the fact that it has been read by millions of people and that its messages have been spread far and wide. We are proud of the fact that Human Events has been a great influence on the political and social events of the past 25 years and that it will continue to be so for many years to come.

"It has been a great privilege to have been associated with Human Events for the past 25 years. I have always felt that it was an honor to be able to contribute to a publication that has such a fine tradition of service to the American people."

"I hope that Human Events will continue to be as influential and as informative in the future as it has been in the past. I wish it well in the years to come."

"It has been a great pleasure to know and work with the editors and publishers of Human Events. They have always been willing to listen to what I had to say and to consider my suggestions. I have always felt that they were each a great deal of help to me in my work."

"In conclusion, I want to say that I am grateful for the opportunity I have had to work with Human Events and I wish it well in the future."

"I wish to express my appreciation to all the people who have contributed to Human Events over the years. Without their support, it would not have been possible for the publication to continue to grow and to flourish."
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in your efforts to serve a major segment of our political thought."

John P. Sears, Deputy Counsel to the President, Great Britain, observed: "I have the highest regard for the content of Human Events and wish to compliment it upon its 25th Anniversary for a job well done. Human Events represents a reality of politics and the right which can never be disregarded."

Prof. Hans F. Sennholz, Grove City College, upon the 25th Anniversary of Human Events, states: "It is a clear window to the political maelstrom that is Washington. It is a clear window through which we are able to see the direction of politics, and above all, the ascendency of Caesar."

George C. Shattuck, M.D., Harvard Medical School, upon the 25th Anniversary of Human Events as a reliable source of important news, much of which has been sighted or overlooked by the daily press.

Charles B. Shuman, President, American Farm Bureau Federation.—"I want to congratulate Human Events on its 25th Anniversary of service to the conservative cause in America. It has been a valuable reference source and has helped to arm people to understand the dangers of centralized and socialized controls in agriculture. Human Events provides a concise review of the crucial years and has been an asset to us in finding a middle ground between those who believe in the market economy and those who favor centralization of economic decisions."

Adm. Lewis L. Strauss, former Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission.—"I had not realized that Human Events was approaching a milestone. When my late, great friend, Frank Hanighen, founded Human Events a quarter-century ago, I became a constant reader of this remarkable publication and it was of enormous value to me to be able to read an analysis of current history, domestic and foreign, which, knowing Frank Hanighen, I could be certain was honest and penetrating. I have been out of public life for 10 years—and three years beyond the Biblical span—and my horizons no longer extend so far as once they did, but I see that Frank's successors maintain the high standards set, and I congratulate them and wish them my warmest greetings and respect."

Gen. Stuart Thurmond (R.-S.C.)—"Human Events is to be congratulated for giving the people the inside story on what's happening in Washington. It has rendered this undemanding service for 25 years and I wish Human Events continued success in the crucial years ahead."

Rep. John F. Seiberling (D.-Ohio).—"I have always found this publication to be most helpful in keeping me informed of the trends in American life and politics, and it continues to live up to this standard for the next 25 years of its existence."

Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Assistant to the Chairman, North American Rockwell Corp.—"As a long-time subscriber to Human Events, I extend my congratulations to you and all concerned as the 25th Anniversary approaches. I am sure this fine little paper, from the time of its founding, has provided insight and analysis to its readers and has helped to support a strong constitutional stand against the ravages of the growing state."

Richard A. Viguerie, President, Richard A. Viguerie Co.—"Human Events was one of the first political publications by which I became aware of the importance of keeping an eye on the policies which are developed by our leaders and which are of vital interest to Human Events."

Prof. Ludwig Von Mises, New York University.—"Human Events is for all of the people more important than the preservation of the fundamental human right, the right of the individual and the individual way of life in order to plan to integrate himself into the system of human society. In this fight for freedom and against totalitarian enslavement of all, Human Events has accomplished a brilliant job. All true friends of freedom and prospering individualism and those who are the greatest contributors will be no less successful in these endeavors in the coming years."

John Wayne, Author.—"I find Human Events to be a valuable reference for discussing facts concerning current issues and commonsense opinions to be gleaned from these facts. May they have another 25 years! That'll take care of me, at least."

H. Charles E. Whittaker, former Associate Justice, United States Supreme Court.—"I have always regarded Human Events as very conscientious and responsible, and I believe that, over the years, it has been of great value to the conservative community which has been so seriously assailed."

Alice Widener, Editor, U.S.A. Magazine.—"During the 25 years that Human Events has grown from a little to a big publication, the quality of its contribution to freedom and to sound, conservative thinking has been enormous. In a quarter-century of managed news in Washington, D.C., Human Events has remained unmanaged; that is, an independent voice, not a puppet with strings attached. It has played a unique role in maintaining a free press in our beloved nation."

Earl Warren, Former Supreme Court Justice, (Calif.)—"As a man of the law, I know that a free press has been one of the great treasuries of the nation and is of value to the conservative community."

As Chairman of the Constitutional Rights Foundation, I extend my congratulations to you and all concerned as the 25th Anniversary approaches. I am sure this fine little paper, from the time of its founding, has provided insight and analysis to its readers and has helped to support a strong constitutional stand against the ravages of the growing state."

Rep. Bob Wilson (R.-Calif.) Chairman, Human Events—"I congratulate the people of America on its 25th Anniversary of your splendid newspaper. I find it gives me information that I cannot get out of the press which is essential to an understanding of the things that really take place in our capital. As a citizen, devoted to my country, I am most appreciative of what you have done throughout your 25 years. Congratulations."

THOMAS HART BENTON, OF MISSOURI

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, today in Kansas City, Mo., one of America's most distinguished living artists celebrates his 80th birthday. Thomas Hart Benton bears the name of his great-granduncle, who, as a U.S. Senator from Missouri from 1821 to 1831, made much of the legislative history of his time. At the turn of the century, Thomas Hart Benton's father, Col. Thomas Hart Benton, served as a Representative from Missouri in the 55th, 56th, 57th, and 58th Congresses. It was while his father was serving in Congress that young Thomas Hart Benton received an offer from the New York City Corcoran Gallery in Washington, D.C. So it is fitting, I believe, that we in the Senate acknowledge and salute the 80th birthday of this son of a Representative and great grandnephew of a great Senator who has made the Benton name even more distinguished in his chosen field of art.

But let me not leave the impression that this 80th birthday is more than just another milestone in the remarkable career of Thomas Hart Benton, for here we have a man who is hard at work every day in his studio, continuing to create some of the great art of our time. I invite Senators who may not be familiar with the work of Thomas Hart Benton to view his oil painting, "Country Politics," which he has generously lent me for display in my office. I also wish to call attention to the fact that the Library of Congress begins today, in the Great Hall of the main building, a panel exhibit of lithographs and books illustrated by Thomas Hart Benton.

Last night in New York City the Associated American Artists Gallery opened an exhibit of all of the lithographs of Benton. Today the New Britain Museum of American Art in New Britain, Conn., opened an exhibit of lithographs and some oils and murals of Thomas Hart Benton. Also, today, in Fort Worth, Tex., the Amon Carter Museum of Western Art opened an exhibit of the lithographs of Thomas Hart Benton.

Today the University of Texas Press is publishing a fine book entitled "The Lithographs of Thomas Hart Benton,"
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written by Creekmore Fitch, which brings together for the first time all of the graphic work of Benton.

Many Senators have visited the Truman Library in Independence, Mo., and have had these last works in the entrance hall, and those who know Benton’s historic murals in the State capitol building, Jefferson City, Mo., realize that these are only a part of the magnificent legacy of talent that Thomas Hart Benton has created. In his drawings, lithographs, watercolors, oil paintings, and murals, Thomas Hart Benton has given us the greatest panorama of American life by any contemporary artist.

In his autobiography, entitled “An Artist in America,” Benton has shown that he is a great writer as well as a great artist. I can assure Senators that he is a great talker and conversationalist. What Thomas Hart Benton is, I suppose, is the truly modern equivalent of the Renaissance man.

I want to make the remarks with a biographical summary of the life of Thomas Hart Benton to date.

Thomas Hart Benton. Born April 15, 1889, Neosho, Newton County, Mo.; son of Maecenus Eason Benton and Elizabeth Wise Benton. In 1897–99 Thomas Hart Benton attended grade schools in Washington, D.C., and was first introduced to formal art in the library of the Corcoran Gallery. In 1906–07 he attended Western Military Academy at Alton, Ill., until he began the serious study of art at the Chicago Art Institute. In 1908–11 Benton was a student at the Académie Julien in Paris. In 1912 he returned to America and settled in New York. In 1916 he had his first public exhibition with a series of paintings in the Forum Exhibition of Modern American Painting held at the Anderson Galleries in New York. In 1918 he enlisted in the U.S. Navy. In 1919 upon discharge from the Navy, Benton returned to New York and had an exhibition of drawings and watercolors which were based on his Navy activities. In 1922 Benton participated in the Philadelphia Exhibition of Modern American Art and purchased the famous Philadelphia collector, Albert C. Barnes. In 1922 Benton married Rita Placencia. It was in the mid-1920’s that Benton began a series of paintings on American historical themes. These were mural-sized works. They were controversial because, with their sculptural and three-dimensional character, they were in opposition to prevalent beliefs of the day. The medium of the mural paintings should not break wall surfaces but remain flat and linear. It was also during this period that Benton began exploring the life of America, its history by foot, bus, and train. In the past 45 years Benton has traveled more widely in America than any other artist, indeed he has probably seen and drawn more of the life and America than any other American artist ever has. In the late 1920’s Benton lectured on art at Dartmouth College and at Bryn Mawr College. At Bryn Mawr he met and married Florence Wright on architecture and mural painting at Brown University, Providence, R.I. Benton’s first child, Thomas P. Benton, was born in New York City in 1926. And at about the same time Benton purchased his permanent summer home on the island of Martha’s Vineyard, Mass.

In 1928–29 Benton joined with Joseph Cicchelli in the Delphic Studios in New York City, and received a commission with Orozco to do murals for the New School for Social Research.

In 1932 Benton received a commission to do murals for the Whitney Museum of American Art. In 1933 Benton was awarded the gold medal of the Architectural League for his mural work. It was also in 1933 that Benton received the commission and executed a mural for the State of Indiana. Covering the theme of social evolution of Indiana, this mural was shown as Indiana’s exhibit at the 1933 Chicago World’s Fair and is now installed in the University of Indiana auditorium at Bloomington.

In the spring of 1934 Time magazine carried a feature article on the regional-drawing and painting. This thumbnail sketch of some of the highlights of the life of Thomas Hart Benton simply illustrates some of his accomplishments. His life has been a full one and as he continues to try his hand at bronze sculpture, it is a great pleasure for me to bring this anniversary to the attention of the Senate.

EXTENSION OF ROYALTIES TO RECORDING ARTISTS AND RECORDING COMPANIES

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on Tuesday, April 8, 1969, the Nashville Tennessean published an editorial in support of the amendment to the proposed copyright revision bill introduced by the distinguished junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. Williams).

While I am not at present a cosponsor of the proposed legislation, I believe it is my duty to give my strong support for the principle of extending royalties to recording artists and recording companies.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

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

JUST AMENDMENT FOR MUSIC CITY

Sen. Harrison Williams, D-N.J., has proposed an amendment to the general copyright revision bill pending in the Senate which would guarantee royalties for artists, musicians and record producers when their records are played on radio, television and juke boxes.

The amendment is of special interest in Nashville, where artists and record companies are losing large sums of money every year because the royalties they have never been included in the copyright laws.

When their records are sold to the public,artists and record companies share in the proceeds, just as composers and publishers do. But under present law, when their records are played on radio, television and juke boxes, the artists and record companies get a royalty which is not shared by the artists and record companies.

Under Senator Williams’ amendment, artists and record companies would get the same royalty received by composers and publishers when their works are used in television and motion picture networks. A juke box fee would be established and the artists and record companies would get 25%
PRESENT CONDITIONS IN DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Occupation Increased Dominican Dependency," published in the Washington Post of March 30, 1969.

This is a very interesting analysis of the present situation in the Dominican Republic.

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

OCCUPATION ENCE -- DOMINICAN DEPENDENCY

(BY Lewis H. Diuguid)

Santo Domingo, March 29.—After U.S. Marines broke up the Dominican civil war, and worldwide criticism was at a peak, President Balaguer passed the word that the intervention must be a success.

An army of technicians soon replaced the Marines and aid money flowed in at unprecedented rates.

Four years later, this is still a divided nation. Now it is also obsessively dependent. Democracy is a clean catchword in the remarkably cynical Dominican game of politics.

The causes of this situation are found more in the country's troubled history than in recent events, but U.S. intervention was a big part of that history long before the Marines landed April 28, 1965.

Interviews with Dominican scholars, politicians and technicians, as well as their U.S. counterparts at nearly every level, belie the general assumption heard in Washington—that, as one State Department official put it, the country is at the moment an integral part of the intervention has turned out for the best.

Economically, there is some improvement and prospects for more. But politically, the always tenuous sense of national purpose has been eroded by the new dependency. The ability of the civil war resuming is great. The main deterrents so far are division within the army and the belief that the U.S. Marines would surely land again.

U.S. officials charge that latter assumption, but few Dominicans do. Many Dominicans continue to believe that all important decisions are American-made.

When a minor politician decided recently to run for the presidency next year, he made his declaration and in the next breath announced that he was departing for Washington. In virtually any other Latin American country, such a sequence would have meant political suicide. Here it is considered good politics.

The question is reflected in the inability of AID to find Dominicans willing to undertake development projects. The attitude seems to be, "Let the Americans do it." Often they do, thus increasing the dependency. Businessmen admit that when they conceive an idea, their first thought is the need for a foreign loan.

Nationalism seldom appears, although it is at least implied in the term "Dominican." Many performers and others across the country, Senator Williams' amendment presents a just request. It should be adopted.

A POSITIVE PLAN OF ACTION

Mr. HANSEN, Mr. President, Congress has not been presented a positive plan of action by the President. I applaud his activities of the past 12 weeks and look forward to working with him in the months and years ahead.

All that the United States has to offer is his interest in the pursuit of peace abroad and to the development of new structures and new programs for the pursuit of progress at home.

The message that President Nixon has presented to us provides for a blueprint to go to the States. It is responsible and far-reaching. It is responsible and far-reaching. It is ready for implementation.

It may be a victory.

The recent unrest in an elegant statement by Balaguer suggesting that he might take his constitutional option to run again.

Balaguer supporters say visible projects are working with a number of fronts. I have long contended, and have so stated on a number of occasions, that we do not need a whole new series of laws to combat crime; rather we should see to it that the Department of Justice and all branches of law enforcement are determined to prosecute violations of the law.

Another important area is the program of tax credits to be recommended by the President. The enactment of additional private resources, in order to meet our urgent social needs, is a significant step in the right direction. We must provide better alternatives than have been available so far. We can encourage industry to train more people so that jobs will be available and waiting for them.

The Nixon administration's plan to reform our postal service, with a comprehensive reorganization of the Post Office Department, will benefit all. My bill on Post Office reorganization, which I introduced, and I know that Postmaster General Blount and his staff are studying it and other plans.

If all in all, it is obvious that President Nixon has placed statesmanship above politics. It is a refreshing approach. It will, indeed provide for an abiding satisfaction of achievement, and I pledge my best efforts to those worthwhile ends.

MISS CAROL MUELLER, EL PASO, TEX., REPRESENTATIVE OF TEXAS TO INTERNATIONAL FARM YOUTH EXCHANGE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to welcome to Washington today
Miss Carol Mueller, of El Paso, Tex., who has recently been chosen to represent the State of Texas in Norway as the International Farm Youth Exchange. Carol will spend 6 months in Norway living with rural families and learning of their practices and way of life. On her return to the United States, she will give lectures around the Nation on her experience during her travels and help better to strengthen the close ties of America with the people of Norway.

Miss Mueller has long been active in the promotion of the 4-H Clubs of the United States and has an outstanding record with that organization dating back to 1954 when she showed and won her division at a livestock exposition in the sheep category. Carol will make a fine rural ambassador to Norway; this is an honor of which she is much deserving—the State of Texas is proud of her.

ELECTRIC POWER AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, on March 19, Secretary of the Interior Hickel delivered an address before the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, Atlantic City, N.J., March 19, 1969.

I am glad to have this opportunity to explain the attitudes of the Department of the Interior as they relate to electric power.

You know, when I served as Governor of Alaska, I learned that the 49th state has the highest power costs in the nation. The average price for 600 kilowatt hours per month in Alaska is $14.67. The national average is $10.37 for the same amount of electricity.

I also know the value of public power because—Alaska—most of the power is public power.

When I became Secretary of the Interior, I found that I had also become chairman of the board of a very big electric utility. The Department of the Interior gets its power from an interconnected system of almost 172,000 kilowatts. It markets 65.7 billion kilowatt hours annually. And, it collects about $256.6 million per year.

That's pretty big. But, I also found out that TVA is number two, so we're just going to have to try harder to assure every American of the benefits of public power—whether public or private—at the lowest cost, consistent with reliable service and an adequate rate of return on investment.

Americans deserve no less.

This goal isn't going to be easy. It will take a cooperative effort on the part of private cooperatives and public power groups like yours, and the Federal Government.

It is going to have to be a three-way partnership, with no one dominating the other. None of us will get everything we want.

But, we will get more than we would if we fought each other.

Public power—particularly the rural cooperatives—have done a lot of good in this nation.

You brought electricity into the Kansas countryside where I was born and raised. You have lifted the have of many happy homes of hard work from the backs of many farm families.

Private power, too, has done an excellent job in the more concentrated areas of America. It has provided the backbone of our industrial society.

But, we will get more than we would if we fought each other.

While we pat ourselves on the back, we must also keep our eyes focused on the road ahead.

With less than seven percent of the nation's population, this country leads all others in generating electricity.

Our 1966 production represented 36 percent of the world's total. In another way, this is two and one-half times the amount produced in Russia—the second ranking nation.

In 1969, 22 million new kilowatts of generating capacity were added to our electric power system—the largest annual increase in history.

Starting in 1988, the addition of 14 million kilowatts is scheduled over the next few years. The annual capacity increase is now 25 percent greater than in 1967. And, this increase alone is greater than our total capacity in 1968.

By 1949, this nation's power producing capacity may well be over three times that of 1969 and twice that expected by 1970. This means we have to try harder whether we're one, two, or last.

When we talk about the future development of the power resources of the nation, it is also one of assessing the market for the Yukon, and for the Pacific Northwest which would enable us to have a very-high-voltage transmission system for the entire Western United States.

The study is now being reviewed by the Western States Coordinating Council, a group of western utilities, public and private, and the Federal Government. This group sponsors and coordinates research to advance the technology of utility industry.

The Council has started a $4 million, five-year research program. Its objectives are to reduce the cost and increase the reliability of transmission lines at all voltages.

Another is to provide engineering and design guidelines for ultra-high-voltage transmission. These will be the giant lines of the future.

To further related action, the Department is planning to install 600,000 kilowatt generators at Grand Coulee Dam. These will be the world's largest hydro-generators, and Grand Coulee will be the world's largest power plant.

I am also continuing to the Department's transmission planning. Each project is concerned with the broad engineering aspects which should be considered in western development. Each one is an alternate plan for a large power transmission system for the entire Western United States.

The study envisions alternate water diversion possibilities to supply power development. It is concerned with the efficient use of public water.

The study envisions alternate water diversion possibilities to supply power development. It is concerned with the efficient use of public water resources and the promotion of the 4-H Clubs of the United States. We also operate nearly 17,000 miles of transmission lines. This is being done cooperatively with private utilities and non-Federal power-particularly the rural co-operatives.

The Department of the Interior will continue to interconnect its facilities with both private and non-Federal power groups wherever it makes sense to do so. We can continue to interconnect our own systems, as an example of economic development, and that these interconnections are safe and free from blackouts.

Furthermore, we can work to assure that the benefits of our interconnections are shared by all.

This is one example of how the Government can set the tone.

Another is in the field of research. My Department has 27,500 miles of transmission lines.

We are building the world's longest—and largest—extra-high-voltage direct current transmission lines. This is being done cooperatively with private utilities and non-Federal groups. We also operate nearly 2,200 miles on conventional extra-high-voltage transmission lines.

It is time, if we are to be the economic leaders of the world, that we move forward in the field of power development. It is time we are the leaders.
**Combined financial statement of Senator and Mrs. Case**

**ASSETS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash in checking and savings accounts</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life insurance policies with the following insurers</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annuity contracts with Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association</td>
<td>$31,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement contract with Federal employees (providing for single life annuity)</td>
<td>$31,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate: consisting of residence building lot on Elm Avenue, Rahway, N.J., and house in Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>$65,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangible personal property at Rahway and Washington house</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undistributed share in estate of Senator's mother</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**LIABILITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None except mortgage above listed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INCOME IN 1968**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senate salary and allowances</td>
<td>$31,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dividends and interest on above securities and accounts</td>
<td>$24,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net gains on sales of property</td>
<td>$7,996</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Telephone &amp; Telegraph Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati Gas &amp; Electric Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Edison Co. of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumers Power Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Motors Acceptance Corp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa Electric &amp; Power Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROPOSED MERGER OF YOUNGSTOWN SHEET & TUBE CORP., AND LYKES CORP.**

Mr. SAXBE, Mr. President, for some period of time I have been concerned with a growing phenomenon in our country which can best be described as the rise of the so-called corporate conglomerate. I have recently been advised of another example of this startling trend in the State of Ohio. That example is the proposed merger of the Lykes Corp., hereinafter referred to as Lykes, and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co., hereinafter referred to as Youngstown. Under the proposed Lykes-Youngstown merger, a new corporation was organized on February 20, 1969, under the name of Lykes-Youngstown Corp. The proposal has already been agreed upon in principle by the board of directors and this proposal needs only shareholder approval at this particular point in time. The proposal is as follows: The Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. will organize a new subsidiary and transfer all its assets to this wholly owned subsidiary, which will then assume Youngstown’s liabilities. The Lykes Corp. presently is a holding company owning as wholly owned subsidiaries Lykes Brothers Steamship Co. and Lykes Financial Corp. Lykes-Youngstown Corp. will then be a holding company holding Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. and Lykes Brothers Steamship and Lykes Financial Corp.
approximately $132,032,000. Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. had 1968 revenues of approximately $703,190,000. It therefore appears that this is another example of the proverbial minnow swallowing the whale, here indicating the likely change of 34 percent of Youngstown common stock for “subordinated debentures” of Lykes-Youngstown Corp., and the subsequent dilution in the equity position and voting power of the present stockholders. There are further adverse sociological effects in a merger such as the one involving Youngstown Sheet & Tube Co. In particular, the interests whose concern is primarily with profit and loss statements. Further these outside interests have little time or inclination to involve themselves with the myriad of problems which face our communities across the Nation.

A recent study by the staff of the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability shows that the mergers involving corporations with assets of $1 billion or more had 43 percent of the Nation’s total manufacturing assets. The study further points out that 451 corporations with assets of less than $1 billion owned an additional 30 percent of the Nation’s manufacturing assets. Another group of 791 medium-sized corporations own assets of $25 million to $190 million owned another 8 percent of the Nation’s total manufacturing assets. The remaining 18 percent of the assets were held by approximately 185,000 corporations. It is important to note that the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability shows that 185,869 corporations owned virtually all of the manufacturing assets of this country.

More significant is the fact that a relatively small number of corporations, 1,320 to be exact, own approximately 82 percent of the manufacturing assets of this country. Most studies plotting the number of mergers and acquisitions show a rapid rise in this phenomenon since the year of 1965 when there were approximately 1,700 mergers. In 1966 there were approximately 2,000 mergers, and 1967 study by the Cabinet Committee on Price Stability shows that 185,869 corporations owned virtually all of the manufacturing assets of this country.

The conclusion is inescapable that this Nation is heading toward a situation where a relatively small number of corporate mergers will hold the bulk of the manufacturing assets. In fact, were it not for the present antitrust legislation, in particular the Clayton Act, we could reasonable expect that viewing the number of mergers as it relates to the number of corporations, we might end up with as few as 300 corporations controlling the imagination. Consequently, a veritable handful of corporations in this country could be envisioned as controlling all of the assets. One does not need a doctorate in economics or finance to see that this would be, to say the least, an unhealthy situation.

Since this is the situation with which the Nation is faced, I for one welcome the administration’s new antitrust policy. In particular, I welcome the determination of the Nixon administration to attack the acquisition of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. by the giant conglomerate, Ling-Temco-Vought. It would appear to me that section 7 of the Clayton Act—the Celler-Kefauver Amendment of 1950— is being abridged when leading corporations in one industry are acquired by conglomerates that specialize in many different lines. Clearly, the failure of section 7 which asks if there is a substantial lessening of competition is met. I would now call upon Attorney General Mitchell to order Laren, chief of the Justice Department’s Antitrust Division to give serious consideration to the study of possible mergers being taken under section 7 of the Clayton Act to prevent the impending merger between the Lykes Corp. and the Youngstown Sheet & Tube Corp. Surely this proposed merger is analogous to the Ling-Temco-Vought-J. & L. merger.

ENDANGEROSED SPECIES

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, for many years I have been interested in many programs designed to save various species of wildlife. It is a pleasure to be able to report that a program at the Endangered Wildlife Research facility at the Patuxent refuge near Laurel, Md., is a result of my funding amendment several years ago—is moving forward. Scientists there, under the able direction of Dr. Ray Erickson, are learning many of the secrets behind the whooping crane which will help save some of our most endangered species from extinction.

Work is also moving forward at refuges and research stations in the various States. Recently the Slouyr Falls, S. Dak., Argus-Leader published a most interesting article on the Giant Canada goose, written by Rod C. Drewlen and Lyle J. Schoonover. 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:

GIANT CANADA GEAES ARE MAKING COME­ BACK—REPUBLIC TO BE KEPT

(By Rod C. Drewlen and Lyle J. Schoonover)

The giant Canada goose once nested in suitable habitat over large portions of the Northern Great Plains. Early settlers gathered their eggs during the spring and hunted them throughout the year.

By the early 1900's they had nearly disappeared from their original range in South Dakota, and in the 1900's most authorities believed that Canada, to be extinct. In 1962 Dr. Harold C. Hanson, of the Illinois Natural History Survey, examined Canada goose nest, samples gathered from the Missouri and Minnesota. These geese were much larger than other subspecies of Canadas he had examined and studied for many years in other portions of the United States and Canada.

The Nebraska government fitted the early description of the giant Canada. Upon further investigation, he found a number of isolated giant Canada goose flocks, both captive and wild, embedded in western Nebraska and the prairie provinces of Canada, including the geese that nest in the area around Wibaux, Mont.

START PROGRAM

In 1962 a cooperative program was started between the South Dakota Department of Game, Fish and Parks and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife to conserve free-flying giant Canada goose to portions of their original breeding range in South Dakota. Particularly was the goal to increase the number of geese in the area around Wibaux, Mont.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

The first phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

GIANT CANADA GEESE ARE MAKING COME­ BACK—REPUBLIC TO BE KEPT

(Continued from page 8868)

The second phase of the restoration program consists of the department farm out pinioned breeding pairs to interested parties having suitable facilities and habitat on private lands.

Gooslings produced from these projects are wing-clipped and retained for future release as free-flyers in surrounding habitat. Presently, there are five cooperators involved in this program and the number of captive phase varies from two to seven pinioned pairs, plus the young that are produced annually.

The largest cooperater flock is maintained by rancher William Schlider, Faulkton, and contains more than 100 geese. Other cooperators include the Belvidere Rod and Gun Club; George Hauk, Cottonwood; Ivan Pray, New City, and the late Ray Hart, department waterfowl biologist.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres. In addition, the county and one of the whooping crane flocks are also involved in this program.

In the first phase of the restoration program, a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence, is taken from an average clutch of 5.4 eggs. At Sand Lake, eggs from first clutches are gathered daily and replaced with a dummy egg. Upon completion of the first clutch of eggs, the dummy eggs are removed. This stimulates about 60 percent of the pairs to start a second nest.

The second phase of the restoration program consists of the department farm out pinioned breeding pairs to interested parties having suitable facilities and habitat on private lands.

Gooslings produced from these projects are wing-clipped and retained for future release as free-flyers in surrounding habitat. Presently, there are five cooperators involved in this program and the number of captive phase varies from two to seven pinioned pairs, plus the young that are produced annually.

The largest cooperater flock is maintained by rancher William Schlider, Faulkton, and contains more than 100 geese. Other cooperators include the Belvidere Rod and Gun Club; George Hauk, Cottonwood; Ivan Pray, New City, and the late Ray Hart, department waterfowl biologist.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.

First phase involves maintaining a captive flock, presently consisting of about 90 pinioned breeding pairs, at the Sand Lake National Wildlife Refuge in Brown County, South Dakota. The Refuge is about 90 acres and includes a brooder house, wintering pen, breeding pens for individual pairs, and a 30-acre fenced area, all enclosed within a woven wire fence.

The restoration program consists of three phases, and includes maintaining a captive flock for production of young; a landowner-cooperator program whereby the department farms out breeding pairs to interested parties and the release of free-flyers in suitable habitat.
WE MUST MAKE A CHOICE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on March 11, 1969, the Petroleum Situation, a publication of the Chase Manhattan Bank, contained an article entitled "We Must Make a Choice."

This illuminating article centers on the controversy created by the proposal to erect foreign trade zones at Machiasport, Maine, and Kadoka, South Dakota, based upon misinformation. It pitted one region of the United States against another.

But the impression is erroneous—it is based upon misstatement. The article concludes that because of both improper and inadequate communications, it is a development that has pitted one region of the United States against another. And in the same context, the Tennessee Valley Authority is said to be using in the region improper and lasting damage of that sort of conflict have been apparent.

The problem had its beginning last year with a proposal to build an oil refinery in Maine. Sometimes the announcement of a new petroleum industry is a normal event, but in the area in which it is to be located. Recently, the residents of a community in another New England state—Rhode Island—successfully resisted the construction of a refinery in their area. But, in the case of Maine, the proposed new plant was welcomed. It would provide certain economic advantages. There would be some opportunities for employment—but not many, because modern refineries are operated mainly with automatic controls. The plant would also constitute a new tax base, of course.

But the foremost reason for wanting a refinery in Maine, reportedly, was based on the belief that it would provide lower priced petroleum products. Somehow, there has developed a widespread impression that petroleum products cost much more in New England than from any other cause. There is indeed a breakdown of communications. It is not out of line—it is the highest nor the lowest, and is below the U.S. average. A comparison for other petroleum products will indicate a similar situation. Because of variations in local distribution costs, prices in other parts of New England range slightly above or below the Boston level.

Although petroleum product prices in New England are currently in line with those elsewhere in the nation, the conclusion is reached that petroleum products in New England are always in line with those elsewhere in the nation. The article concludes with a thorough analysis of the need for the proposed refinery at Machiasport and Kadoka.

Present prices for petroleum products in the New England area are compared with the present prices for the same products in other areas of the United States as well as the average price.

The conclusion is reached that petroleum products in the New England area are generally larger than 10 acres and have small islands, since geese show a preference for secure island nesting sites. On water areas lacking islands, artificial nesting structures can be erected. The U.S. Forest Service plans to erect artificial nesting structures on some of these stock dams located in the National Grasslands.

For all of the markets shown, the cost of crude oil is based upon the U.S. average price. And the refinery margin is based upon the average at the Gulf Coast—the scene of the nation's largest and most competitive refinery complex. Chicago, Philadelphia and Norfolk all have refineries nearby that serve part of the local market. The refinery margin is essentially the same as at the Gulf Coast.

Clearly, the price of gasoline in Boston is not out of line—it is neither the highest nor the lowest, and is below the U.S. average. A comparison for other petroleum products will indicate a similar situation. Because of variations in local distribution costs, prices in other parts of New England range slightly above or below the Boston level.
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in the event of another international war, they could not afford to do so, to the nation they should not.

Many good arguments can be presented for free trade between nations when the benefits derive from peaceful economic contacts, but the security of the United States is tied directly to the degree of its petroleum self-sufficiency.

It is absolutely essential to any developed nation that it have an adequate and continuous supply of energy, and the United States is no different. In oil and natural gas, it is tied more in the home, in industry, in commerce, agriculture, and by all the Armed Forces. For the nation's vast transportation system, oil is virtually the only form of energy used. Clearly, any prolonged shortage of oil would be devastating. And an adequate domestic supply is the only sure way of avoiding such a shortage.

Recognizing the dangers posed by rapidly rising oil prices, the President of the United States imposed mandatory controls in March 1959. In part, the Presidential proclamation reads as follows:

"If the President believes that such controls are necessary to insures a stable, healthy industry in the United States capable of exploring for and developing new sources of the nation's energy, he may prescribe such requirements of our national security which make it necessary that we preserve to the greatest extent possible a vigorous healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

"To limit imports in a manner that would be entirely equitable is an impossibility. But the President of the United States was reasonably well conceived. They were, however, susceptible to manipulation for political reasons and were therefore difficult to administer. From the beginning there have been numerous efforts to alter or circumvent the regulations—and some have been successful. It is, of course, unrealistic to think that any change that gives an economic advantage to some individuals or companies or regions will go unchallenged. Others, understandably, will clamor for equal treatment for competitive reasons. And each change in the Import regulations has to a degree undermined the original intent of the control. The extent of the erosion thus far has raised widespread concern over the future status of the control—and some doubts that it will survive.

Surely, if import controls were removed, the action would mark the beginning of the end for domestic producers. The price of domestic crude oil would doubtless rise to 35 to 40 percent. And this would remove much of the incentive to search for new reserves. Producers would continue to produce oil from existing fields, but not from reserves already found, but they could not afford to use their capital to find more—it would instead be used to keep existing fields of economic endeavor that provide a better rate of return.

Within a few years the nation's dependence upon oil imports would rise from 40 percent now to more than 60 percent. And, as a result, the nation would be placed in a highly vulnerable position. Upon past experience, there is positively no reason for believing that petroleum imports would be continuously available, instead, there are ominous indications of dwindling offshore oil resources. In the event of another international war, the position of the United States would be critical. A successful military effort would require fully adequate supplies of petroleum at all times. And, because the private economy depends upon petroleum now, if during World War II, it would be impossible to ration supplies to the degree they were during that conflict—to do so would lead to a breakdown of activities that would necessarily go on in support of the military effort.

Unauthorized imports of foreign oil would have a severely damaging effect upon the future supply of natural gas in the United States. Most of the reserves are found incidental to the search for crude oil, and if the financial incentive to find oil is destroyed, new gas reserves would not be discovered either. The wellhead price of natural gas is much too low to warrant a separate search for gas alone. Natural gas can be imported, but only to a limited degree. For the most part, consumers would have to do without, if the supply from domestic sources was limited.

Over the past ten years, domestic producers have spent a total of 44 billion dollars in their efforts to find oil and natural gas reserves in the United States. In the next decade, they will need to spend twice that much if the nation's current level of self-sufficiency is to be maintained. These capital expenditures flow through, and favorably influence many sectors of the nation's economy. But, under the circumstances created by unlimited imports of foreign oil, relatively little of this money would be spent in the United States. Refineries operating on lower cost foreign crude oil would amount to about 6 dollars per year for the average consumer of gasoline and 13 dollars annually for the average residential heating oil customer. But most if all of the saving would disappear within a comparatively short period of time. As soon as the self-sufficiency of the United States fell by a significant amount, the price of foreign crude oil could be expected to rise. Because of their direct financial interests, it would be perfectly natural for the governments of foreign producing countries to seek a higher price for their oil. The United States and Western Europe together constitute nearly three-fourths of the Free World market for crude oil. And by the time the United States had to import half of its needs, the combined self-sufficiency of the two areas would be no more than 40 percent. Under such conditions it is inconceivable that the price of crude oil from abroad would not be raised repeatedly to the maximum level the traffic would bear. The price of domestic crude oil would rise again too, but by this time a great deal of damage could have been done.

The United States can have somewhat cheaper priced petroleum products for a brief period by using unlimited quantities of foreign crude oil. But it can do so only by paying an exceedingly high price in other terms—by seriously jeopardizing the national security and by causing widespread damage to a great many economic activities. The economic impact would be felt by numerous levels of government deprived of tax revenue, by several industries, but mostly by thousands upon thousands of small businessmen. It is noteworthy that those who would benefit most from unlimited imports of foreign oil—the large international petroleum companies—have nevertheless supported restrictions. From the time mandatory controls were first imposed these companies have consistently put the nation's best interests ahead of their own.

The nation must soon decide which route it wishes to follow. And the responsibility for making that decision rests heavily upon those who will be involved. History has recorded the mistakes of the past and will continue to do so in the future. But, surely, if all the lines of communication are kept open and fully utilized, if all the pertinent facts are brought out and carefully weighed, and if the long range effects are measured accurately, the chances for making the best decision will be much improved.

John C. Winzenz,
II. Direct percentages in relation to part I:

a. Percentage of base population interviewed

b. Percentage of those who signed the document

c. Total percentage of those who would not sign the document

1. Percentage of those who agreed with the document but would not sign it

2. Percentage of those who absolutely would not sign the document

d. Percentage of those who realized what the document really was

Statements Made by Individuals Who Would Not Sign This Survey Document

These are just some of the statements that were given, but they are a good sample of many responses received.

1. Some called it a lot of trash.
2. Many felt that the document is advocating a coup d'etat.
3. Many felt that they believe in the principles stated in the document.
4. Some felt that the document is very vague and would not be desired.
5. Many felt that it was a direct rebuffal of the Government.
6. One teacher at a local junior high school, after reading it, stated, "Do you really believe in this document?" When the man responded with a definite yes, the teacher asked, "You believe in what you want to you communists."
7. Many would not sign the document for fear of repercussions.
8. Some would not sign the document because it failed to clarify how the government would be replaced, and had there been any mention of elections they would have signed it.
9. Four individuals accused the surveyor (a Negro) of trying to develop his own black state.
10. This document is "advocating the abolishing of our government and the possible establishing of a dictatorship."
11. One individual refused to sign the document and called it a very radical document, he also thought it was poorly written.
12. A few felt that it was an outdated document, and left too much for interpretation.
13. An individual stated it was not necessary to reaffirm the principles to which he had dedicated to his life to, and had sworn to uphold when he took the Oath of Allegiance.
14. One man said the document was "basically stupid and a lot of trash." Also, this individual felt people should have the right to abolish the government.
15. Some individuals would not sign it because they wanted to know what it would be used for.
16. Another individual stated: "Who wasted an afternoon writing this?"
17. Another stated it was "radical, and there is not enough in the law to keep up what is in the law." to uphold the government.
18. Too much "legal talk."
19. It does not give enough to the majority class.
20. One individual left the room and refused to even talk about the document again.
21. Others stated they would not sign it this way.
22. Another individual thought the document was "pretty", but not workable.
23. A gentleman asked if the document had anything to do with the "Communist Party of America."
24. One individual said that it "sounds like that long haired kid stuff!"
tention to replace him the day after he had been the object of a vicious attack by Sen­
ator Dirksen for his efforts to enforce Title
VII of the Civil Rights Act, Senator Dirksen
having also suggested that he would talk to the
new administration to try to enforce the
Title VII of the Civil Rights Act and to see to it that the likes of Mr. Alexander
would be fired. Mr. Alexander, in his resigna­
tion, had said that the Nixon administration's
policy concerning enforcement, with having omitted from its goals the
vigorous enforcement of the "laws on emp­
loyme...
NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, April 10, 1969, under authority of the order of April 3, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

C. R. Brown, of Kentucky, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Brazil.

William J. Handley, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Turkey.

Robert C. Hill, of New Hampshire, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Spain.

Keith B. Keating, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to India.

William Leonhart, of West Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Valentine F. Carson, of Nebraska, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Finland.

Altman O. Valenzuela, of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Hungary.

The following-named officers of the Civil Service Commission for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Lewis Butler, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Robert C. Mardian, of California, to be General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

L. J. Andolsek, of Minnesota, to be a Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1975.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Walter L. Mazzel, of Vermont, to be an Assistant Secretary of Transportation.

THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Robert C. Herold
Arthur R. Whittam
Malcolm W. Gray
James H. Brewster
Gene A. Forest
John H. Powers, III
Laverne Amundson
Frank C. Lewis
John J. Castulk
Dennis W. Mahler
John F. Wessman
Karl Kaufman
Ernest R. Smith, Jr.
Michael W. Thie
Thuren M. Drown
Brian W. Mills
Donna L. Dobbs
Frank K. Cole
Brian Pickover

The following-named Reserve officer to be permanent commissioned officer of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

Watson R. Wilkinson

The following named Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Stanley J. Spurgeon

WILLIAM MCPHERSON

IN THE AIR FORCE

Philip N. Whittaker, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

Joseph Rohrlich Jr. FR33810 for reappointment to the grade of colonel in the Regular Air Force in the grade of colonel from the temporary disability retired list under the provisions of sections 1210 and 1211, title 10, United States Code.

Orley B. Caudill, FR13074, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, and with duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain (medical)

To be first lieutenants (medical)

Adams, Michael, 3006976.
Amonette, Rex A., 3201243.
Behringer, Blair R., 3202580.
Bostman, Dennis L., 3202680.
Bolli, Robert L., 3202677.
Bordelon, Fred C., 3202999.
Burton, Larry D., 3202869.
Castulik, L. J., 3201597.
Chudnow, Frederick, 3201802.
Clark, Michael, 3201931.
Dahl, John L., 3201802.
Darnell, Robert, 3202401.
DeBartolo, John F., 3201597.
Derboghossian, Zaven, 3202580.
Dobbs, Donald G., 3201423.
Durkin, William M., 3201597.
Emmons, Donald, 3201597.
Emmons, Donald, 3201597.
Freisinger, John J., 3201931.
Garcia, Freddie, Jr., 3202580.
Garcia, Freddie, Jr., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
Garrick, Thomas R., 3202580.
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Paul E. Brown
Wayne F. Campbell
James G. Neder
Thomas C. Dean
Walter F. Ford, Jr.
Charles E. Ganel
John R. Gregory
Frank H. Graham, III
Robert P. Hansen
Norris G. Henthorne, Jr.
Ulysses S. Grant
Walter T. Hickey
Robert J. Hopman
Charles W. Holmes
Edward A. Horne
William H. Hunt
Michael R. Jackson
John B. Kelly
William R. Knapp
Patrick F. Cates
John A. Janecek
Michael L. Parks
Simon Poljakow

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 14, 1969:

FOREIGN SERVICE
Cari J. Gilbert, of Massachusetts, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Thomas K. Cowden, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture.

INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION
Brantley Blue, of Tennessee, to be Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission.

IN THE MARINE CORPS
The following named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Acri, Albert A.
Adams, Andrew W.

Bissette, Alfred F.
Binion, Sammy G.
Bragg, Montie C.
Burnham, Thomas E.
Cerqua, Vincent
Chapin, Marcus P.
Dawson, William C.
Dearing, Hugh H.
Docherty, Daniel J.
Dodd, John B.
Eveler, Bernard H.
Florian, Frederick N.
Ginger, John
Hodge, Tommie S.
Huson, Clarence E.
Jenkins, Eugene
Johnson, Charles A.
Kaplen, Gordon E.
Kennedy, Michael B.
King, Carl E.
Lindsay, Jimmie A.
Madda, Anthony N.
Madenford, Eugene C.

The following named (Naval Reserve Office Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Blevins, Earl A.
Gardner, William D.
Greene, J. H.
Howard, John E.

The following named (Naval Enlisted Scientific Education Program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

McConahy, Dennis A.

The following named (commissioned warrant officers/warrant officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of first lieutenant in the Marine Corps, for limited duty, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Marx, Ronald E.
Mayo, James E.
Morris, Wayne V.
Napier, Freddie
Norton, Arthur W.
Novak, Francis P.
O'Dell, Jerry W.
Pulda, Terrence T.
Pullin, Jesse P.
Rizzo, Joseph F.
Robuck, Kenneth D.
Schuette, Walter R.
Sheld, Williams V.
Stone, Robert A.
Tredick, Robert B., II
Tracy, Terry N.
Webb, Jesse E.
Wilson, Joseph C.
Yantorn, James J.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 1, 1969, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of its secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a Joint resolution of the Senate that passed the following titles:

On March 26, 1969:
H.R. 8438. An act to extend the time for filing final reports under the Correctional Rehabilitation Act of 1966 until July 31, 1969.

On April 1, 1969:
E.J. Res. 584. Joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and for other purposes.

On April 7, 1969:

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed concurrent resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 15. Concurrent resolution to print as a Senate document studies of the Alliance for Progress, for the use of the Senate.
S. Con. Res. 16. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of the engravings of Dwight David Eisenhower.